

**COLUMBIA RIVER TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT TEAM**

May 26, 2026

Facilitator's Summary

Facilitation Team: Emily Stranz & Colby Mills, DS Consulting

*The following Facilitator's Summary is intended to capture basic discussion, decisions, and actions, as well as point out future actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings; it is not intended to be the "record" of the meeting. Official minutes can be found on the TMT website: <https://public.crohms.org/tmt/agendas/2026/>. Suggested edits for the summary are welcome and can be sent to Colby at [colby@dsconsult.co](mailto:colby@dsconsult.co).*

**Lower Monumental Dam Adult Conversion**

The unscheduled TMT meeting was convened to discuss a [Spill Operational Adjustment](#) at Lower Monumental Dam (LMN) consistent with a May 25, 2026 Stipulation Amending the Court's Preliminary Injunction Order, tied to adult passage delay criteria at the project. Doug Baus, USACE, reported that, beginning Tuesday, May 26, 2026, the Action Agencies (AAs) are implementing a 40% daytime spill operation for eight hours per day, starting between 0400 and 0800 hours when feasible, for three consecutive days. Doug highlighted [hourly spill percentage data](#) showing LMN spill dropping from about 76% the previous day to 40% on May 26, and referenced the DART running three-day adult passage tool and updated cumulative travel-day information for Ice Harbor (IHR) and LMN.

*TMT Process and SOR Framework Concerns*

Several TMT members questioned if the memo should be treated as a System Operational Request (SOR) and whether the normal TMT process was followed. Kelsey Swieca, NOAA, asked if the adjustment had been posted to the TMT website prior to the meeting, noting concern that the group needed time to review the document. Jay Hesse, NPT, Tom Iverson, CBTYN, Tom Lorz CTUIR/FPAC Chair, Charles Morrill, WA, and Erick Van Dyke, OR, expressed frustration that, from their perspectives, the operation appeared to have been implemented before broader TMT deliberation and without notification. They emphasized that the Stipulation and the FOP require TMT engagement and deliberation, questioning why the AAs implemented an emergency operation, given that at the 5/21 TMT meeting the region had coordinated to stay the course with the 2026 FOP operation. Aaron Marshall, USACE, clarified that the Stipulation had been coordinated and filed by plaintiffs' and defendants' counsel; some TMT Members were concerned that not all parties were involved in those discussions.

Tom I. noted that the FY26 FOP governs and explicitly calls for TMT process to assess and coordinate on adult delay, Appendix 6 to the 2026 Water Management Plan describes the TMT process including SOR submission and deliberation. He expressed concern that the Corps relied on the FY25 FOP as the operational basis, and Jay expressed concern whether the meeting was following the standard SOR process. The Corps clarified the document as a spill operational adjustment that includes SOR-related footnoted language and said the team could poll either today or tomorrow. Kelsey suggested postponing a poll until all TMT Members had a chance to review the document and Jay asked that it be added to tomorrow's meeting agenda.

*Technical Clarifications and Biological Concerns*

Charles and Jonathan asked whether all available information had been used to justify spill as the cause of the delay and whether the biological impacts were sufficient to warrant an emergency intervention. They asked about evidence beyond the "black dot" indicator in the DART tool, including adult dam counts and whether the analysis showed actual fish pooling in the IHR reservoir. Erick added that the DART tool is retrospective and is not a passage model.

TMT – May 26, 2026 (Tuesday)

The Corps emphasized that this call was intended for sharing information on the operational change, rather than in-depth discussion on cause or resolution. In response to concerns that adult dam counts suggested fish were moving upstream rather than pooling below LMN, the Corps clarified that there was roughly a 4,000-fish difference in visual counts between IHR and LMN, which was being used to assess passage.

Jay asked for clarification on whether the operation would create within-day flow fluctuations at LMN and if those flows could be kept stable for downstream-migrating juveniles. Tony Norris, BPA, explained that while a perfectly steady flow is not possible, the actual flow change during the eight-hour spill block was small. Additionally, grid impacts could be managed through flexibility at other projects, including Chief Joseph (CHJ) and Grand Coulee (GCL) dams, where generation could be adjusted to offset changes at LMN. Jay requested the effect on juvenile migrants and on flows through the mid and lower Columbia be minimized as much as possible.

#### *Next Steps and Actions*

The Corps confirmed that the operation had already started on May 26 and would continue for three consecutive days, also referencing language indicating that the operation would continue until 50% of the daily adult cohort arrived at LMN, after which the FOP 2026 spill operation would resume.

- **ACTION**: LMN passage will be added to May 27 TMT agenda for full SOR deliberation and polling.
- **ACTION**: The Corps will confer with legal/policy staff regarding the region's concerns and bring any updates to the May 27 TMT meeting.

#### **Questions or Comments from Non-TMT Members**

There were no questions or comments from non-TMT Members.

**The next regularly scheduled TMT meeting will be on May 27 at 9AM PDT.**

**Columbia River Regional Forum  
Technical Management Team  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
TUESDAY, May 26, 2026**

Today’s unscheduled TMT meeting was held via Microsoft Teams and conference call, chaired by Doug Baus, Corps, and facilitated by Emily Stranz, DS Consulting. Minutes were collected by Andrea Ausmus, BPA (contractor, CorSource Technology Group). A list of today’s attendees is available at the end of these minutes.

**1. Lower Monumental Dam (LMN) – Adult Conversion – Doug Baus, Corps-NWD; Kelsey Swieca, NOAA Fisheries, and Tony Norris, BPA**

Stranz introduced the meeting as a check-in for LMN Adult Conversion with additional conversation.

Baus said that yesterday there was some coordination with the [court](#) to give the Action Agencies (AA) the ability to alter spill at any of the dams to address fish passage delay.

a) [Spill Operational Adjustment](#)

- Baus introduced the Spill Operational Adjustment (SOA) document to TMT.
- “Consistent with the May 25, 2026 Stipulation Amending the Court’s Preliminary Injunction Order (hereafter stipulation)<sup>2</sup>, beginning on Tuesday, May 26 the Corps will implement a 40% daytime spill operation for 8 hours per day during daytime hours (targeted start time between 0400-0800 as feasible) and continue for 3 consecutive days to address adult passage delay at Lower Monumental Dam.”
- The SOA goes on to talk about the specific criteria, the same provision in the 2025 FOP Operation. It also includes added justification in an attached memo, the running cumulative three-day Ice Harbor (IHR) to LMN travel days with black dots, and information about the Daily Passage Index.

b) [Hourly Spill %](#)

- LMN Spill %
  - May 25 Average Spill: 76%
  - May 26 Hour 1: 76.4%
  - May 26 Hour 5: 40%
- The TMT notification was to highlight the change that was made and is shown in the data.
- The plan is to continue to implement this consistent with the 2025 FOP Operation and the [Stipulation](#) filed with the Court.

Date / Time	Little Goose			Lower Monumental			Ice Harbor			McNary			John Day			The Dalles		
	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill
05/25/2026 01	54.3	41.5	76.4	51.7	39.0	75.4	53.3	39.9	74.9	181.5	124.0	68.3	180.1	119.1	66.1	160.8	68.0	42.3
02	53.7	41.5	74.5	51.7	38.9	75.2	54.8	39.9	72.8	181.1	124.0	68.5	179.7	119.1	66.3	160.4	68.0	42.4
03	54.3	41.6	76.6	51.8	39.1	75.5	53.3	40.0	75.0	180.7	124.0	68.6	179.6	119.1	66.3	159.9	68.0	42.5
04	54.3	40.9	75.3	51.8	39.0	75.3	53.4	40.1	75.1	180.3	124.2	68.9	179.7	119.1	66.3	159.7	68.0	42.6
05	48.4	15.8	32.6	51.8	39.1	75.5	53.4	40.1	75.1	181.0	124.3	68.7	180.2	119.1	66.1	159.6	68.0	42.6
06	49.0	15.6	31.8	51.6	38.9	75.4	53.4	40.1	75.1	182.1	125.7	69.0	180.8	119.8	66.3	159.1	68.0	42.7
07	49.1	15.7	32.0	53.1	38.8	73.1	53.4	40.1	75.1	193.6	136.6	70.6	190.5	130.1	68.3	167.0	68.0	40.7
08	48.8	15.6	32.0	51.6	38.8	75.2	53.4	40.1	75.1	195.6	139.2	71.2	189.9	130.1	68.5	167.3	68.0	40.6
09	48.7	15.6	32.0	51.5	38.7	75.1	53.3	40.0	75.0	196.0	139.4	71.1	192.5	130.1	67.6	170.4	68.0	39.9
10	49.0	15.6	31.8	51.5	38.7	75.1	53.2	39.9	75.0	196.1	139.4	71.1	193.0	130.1	67.4	170.6	68.0	39.9
11	50.4	15.7	31.2	51.5	38.7	75.1	54.8	40.0	73.0	195.4	139.5	71.4	191.2	130.2	68.1	181.6	68.0	37.4
12	49.0	16.9	34.5	55.7	42.9	77.0	57.3	44.0	76.8	195.7	139.5	71.3	193.1	130.2	67.4	180.0	68.0	37.8
13	58.8	45.5	77.4	55.7	42.8	76.8	57.4	44.0	76.7	197.2	139.6	70.8	192.1	130.2	67.8	182.9	68.0	37.2
14	58.5	45.6	77.9	55.9	43.0	76.9	57.2	43.9	76.7	196.4	139.6	71.1	191.2	130.2	68.1	180.7	68.0	37.6
15	58.8	46.0	78.2	57.2	42.9	75.0	57.2	43.9	76.7	196.1	139.7	71.2	191.2	130.2	68.1	180.3	68.0	37.7
16	59.4	46.7	78.6	55.6	42.9	77.2	57.2	44.0	76.9	195.5	139.7	71.5	190.4	130.1	68.3	180.6	68.0	37.7
17	58.2	45.4	78.0	55.8	42.9	76.9	57.2	43.9	76.7	195.9	139.6	71.3	191.1	130.1	68.1	191.9	68.0	35.4
18	59.5	45.2	76.0	55.8	43.0	77.1	57.2	44.0	76.9	196.4	139.3	70.9	191.0	130.1	68.1	192.6	68.0	35.3
19	58.1	45.1	77.6	55.9	43.1	77.1	57.3	44.0	76.8	196.6	139.5	71.0	191.7	130.1	67.9	193.2	68.0	35.2
20	58.0	45.1	77.8	55.9	43.0	76.9	58.8	44.0	74.8	196.1	139.2	71.0	188.6	130.1	69.0	192.6	68.0	35.3
21	57.9	45.1	77.9	56.0	43.1	77.0	57.2	44.0	76.9	195.2	138.9	71.2	187.8	130.1	69.3	187.1	68.0	36.3
22	58.0	45.1	77.8	56.1	43.3	77.2	57.3	44.0	76.8	196.0	138.8	70.8	189.1	130.1	68.8	189.6	68.0	35.9
23	58.1	45.1	77.6	56.2	43.3	77.0	58.9	44.1	74.9	198.5	138.6	69.8	191.9	130.2	67.8	193.9	68.0	35.1
24	57.8	45.0	77.9	57.4	43.1	75.1	57.4	44.1	76.8	196.5	138.4	70.4	189.5	130.3	68.8	189.1	68.0	36.0
24-hour average	54.7	34.9	62.2	54.1	41.1	76.2	55.7	42.2	75.7	192.3	135.4	70.4	188.2	127.4	67.7	177.1	68.0	38.6

Date / Time	Little Goose			Lower Monumental			Ice Harbor			McNary			John Day			The Dalles		
	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill	Total (KCFS)	Spill (KCFS)	% Spill
05/26/2026 01	54.4	41.7	76.7	53.7	41.0	76.4	57.4	44.2	77.0	186.4	129.5	69.5	189.3	130.3	68.8	175.0	71.0	40.6
02	54.4	41.7	76.7	53.6	40.8	76.1	57.4	44.1	76.8	185.8	129.2	69.5	188.2	130.3	69.2	168.5	71.0	42.1
03	53.9	41.8	74.8	53.8	41.1	76.4	57.3	44.0	76.8	185.6	129.3	69.7	189.9	130.3	68.6	168.2	71.0	42.2
04	54.6	40.9	74.9	53.1	39.4	74.2	59.3	44.6	75.2	186.2	130.1	69.9	187.7	130.3	69.4	169.1	71.0	42.0
05	53.0	17.1	32.3	53.5	21.4	40.0	59.2	45.9	77.5	186.1	130.1	69.9	188.2	130.3	69.2	169.6	71.0	41.9
06	53.7	16.8	31.3	54.3	21.3	39.2	59.4	46.1	77.6	186.6	130.0	69.7	188.4	130.3	69.2	169.2	71.0	42.0
07	53.4	16.7	31.3	54.1	21.4	39.6	59.4	46.1	77.6	186.6	130.0	69.7	187.7	130.3	69.4	169.1	71.0	42.0
08	53.3	16.7	31.3	54.2	21.4	39.5	59.3	46.0	77.6	186.0	129.8	69.8	189.5	130.3	68.8	168.6	71.0	42.1
09	53.2	16.8	31.6	54.8	22.0	40.1	59.2	46.0	77.7	186.6	129.9	69.6	190.6	130.3	68.4	170.3	71.0	41.7
10	53.4	16.8	31.5	56.4	22.0	39.0	59.3	46.0	77.6	187.2	130.1	69.5	188.8	130.3	69.0	170.9	71.0	41.5
11	53.5	16.9	31.6	54.9	22.0	40.1	59.3	46.0	77.6	187.9	130.0	69.2	189.8	130.3	68.7	171.2	71.0	41.5
12	52.5	17.0	32.4	54.1	22.2	41.0	59.3	46.0	77.6	187.2	130.1	69.5	190.2	130.3	68.5	168.1	71.0	42.2

c) Questions/Comments

OR Question about “Any Location”

Erick Van Dyke, OR, said that he was still trying to catch up a lot of this and one of the things that he thought Baus had said was that any location AAs are able to make changes at using the 2025 FOP. He said that he was trying to figure out how that is going to be applied. He asked if that fit what was in the 2025 FOP.

Baus said what he meant to say, as far as he is focused right now on LMN. So, he wanted to highlight specific to LMN that the first issue is that the AAs are currently implementing the operation of the 2025 FOP at LMN, specific to that. He said that the comment that he had talked to, alluded to at the very start was regarding coordination that occurred with the court that gave the AAs the ability to alter spill at any of the eight dams to address fish passage delay. He asked Van Dyke to note that Baus was just providing that notification to the TMT as an update. That coordination did occur yesterday with the court and so that is outside of his knowledge outside of what he just said.

Van Dyke said that Baus did recognize what he was pointing out.

Baus said that he did but wanted to clarify, for today’s conversation we are talking specifically to LMN.

Van Dyke said that this is all very confusing and new, so thanks for now.

NOAA Question about Process

Kelsey Swieca, NOAA, said that she wanted to make sure TMT had a clear understanding of process here. She asked Baus to confirm if this SOR was distributed or linked on the TMT website so that we were all clear on where to find it.

Baus said that as noted in the title this called a Spill Operational Adjustment. There is a footnote at the bottom:

<sup>1</sup> The term SOR is included per the parties' stipulation, though it is not necessarily consistent with TMT process for the Corps to submit a System Operational Request (SOR) to itself for operation modification consideration.

Baus said that it is attached to today's TMT agenda.

Swieca said that she just wanted to make sure. She was refreshing her agenda, and she had not seen it come through yet, but she knew that website could take a second to upload. She asked to give folks a second with it up on the screen to have an opportunity to read it before we take this conversation too far. She asked Stranz if that sounded fair.

Stranz said that she thought so.

Tom Lorz, Umatilla/CRITFC, told Swieca that it did just pop up and repopulated on his TMT website so hopefully most people should have access to it now.

Stranz said that she had it now too.

ID Comment about Timing

Jonathan Ebel, ID, requested to make a note that was pretty last minute that we had to refresh to get a multipage notification that people need refresh as the TMT meeting is going on. He said that he wanted to make note of that.

Stranz said that it was an unscheduled meeting and after a holiday we know things are moving fast and there has not been a lot of time for coordination.

Lorz said there are going to be a lot of questions about the process of this and our lack of notification and how this all worked. He said that he knew that had gotten under a few people's saddles.

Nez Perce Question about Process

Jay Hesse, Nez Perce, said that he had a process question in terms of how to view this as he was reviewing it. He said that this highlights that it is a notification and seems to dissociate it from an SOR. He asked what the process is, he asked if this was a tell, or if TMT would be going through the normal SOR process as he reviews the document. He said that it was his expectation that TMT would be following this as an SOR. He asked if that assumption was correct or incorrect.

Baus said that the Corps was planning on, as noted, the implementation started today. He said that the Corps did recognize that this was a real and emerging issue. He said as it relates to taking feedback from folks, the Corps would be happy if folks want to talk about this, the Corps was there to listen. He said because the action was already being

implemented, he wanted to highlight that the operational change had already occurred, but the Corps were here to listen. So, if there was feedback that folks wanted to communicate then the Corps were happy to listen to what folks, TMT members or alternates, have to say.

Hesse asked for clarification. He said that the stipulation states, “Federal Defendants will promptly submit on Tuesday a System Operational Request (SOR) on the May 26 modification, for deliberation.” He asked if we were following the SOR process as outlined in the TMT guidelines and was this the document that is doing that, or should TMT still be waiting for a formal SOR.

Baus said that this is the document as far as what the Corps had for today as identified in the title. The name is at the top and there is a footnote further explaining that situation. So the information that we have today is the information the AAs plan on moving forward with for coordination with TMT today.

Stranz asked Baus if this meant that TMT would have some conversation so that everybody understands this and then do a polling on it.

Baus said if that was what folks want to do, TMT could poll on it, or if folks want to go around and offer comments TMT could do that as well.

Hesse said that he believed the stipulation says and defers to the FOP which says the TMT process will be utilized and followed. He said that he thought that TMT needed to follow the guidelines for TMT to the letter. Which theoretically says an SOR will be submitted by 2:00 for deliberation the next day. He said that we could talk about timeliness and when we might poll, maybe if this is established as an SOR do we vote on it and do the full process at tomorrow’s TMT.

Stranz said that TMT could, we have taken SORs that have not been submitted with that timeline before, and we have polled on them. She said that she thought that we could do that today if TMT wanted and since we do have a scheduled meeting tomorrow it might make sense to let folks digest this and have more conversation in polling tomorrow. She said that she thought that TMT could make that decision.

*ID Question about the Running DART tool*

Ebel said that he had enough indigestion from this already. In flipping through the document quickly he was looking to see that all available information had been used to identify spill as the cause of this delay, as well as, the biological impacts that would necessitate this action rising to the bar of essentially an emergency intervention by the Corps, in contradiction to the recommendations of the Fish Managers (FM). He asked if the Corps assessed and looked beyond the running three-day DART tool.

Baus said from the Corps’ perspective, Ebel would not be hearing a bunch of debate and deliberation today with respect to the operation that was implemented starting this morning. He said that the Corps was happy to listen to other TMT feedback either in the form of polling or what he heard was that there may be a preference to do formal polling tomorrow. He said that was okay with the Corps. He said that he wanted to let Ebel know

that the Corps implemented the action effective this morning and it was their intent today was not to deliberate the provisions in the 2025 FOP regarding the adult delay criteria.

Ebel asked Baus to repeat. He said that he did not understand.

Baus said that as folks have been tracking there had been ongoing issues in the court and there was some coordination with the court yesterday regarding this topic. That coordination resulted in the court's direction to use the criteria from Section 7.1 in the 2025 FOP, regarding fish passage delay, which the Corps is currently doing. He said that he rolled through the hourly data to show that the change had been made. He said that if folks wanted to talk more about that today the Corps was able to listen to get feedback on that, or if folks wanted to do that tomorrow, that was okay as well. TMT does have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow. He said that he wanted to let Ebel know that was what the Corps would be communicating today.

#### Process Check - Stranz

Stranz said that she saw that there were a lot of hands up and that she was not quite sure if everybody was solid on the process moving forward. She said that she wanted to close that loop.

#### Yakama Comment on the Corps Response

Iverson said that he wanted to express frustration and confusion. He said that the Corps have always been very deliberate about their words and sticking to the definitions they put forward. The [2026 FOP](#) was not ambiguous about how it would handle adult delay at LMN. He said that it was very clearly written in there that the Corps would use the TMT process to address adult delay. If you go to [Appendix 6 in the Water Management Plan](#) (WMP) you have a full description of the TMT process. Under System Operations Request it says a TMT member can write an operation to the other TMTs. It does not say the Corps cannot write SORs or that the Corps can never do that. He said that he was baffled. He said that the FMs had read the FOP and they initiated the meeting last week to address delay at LMN just as the FOP prescribed and there was no discussion except let's get through the weekend to monitor, but there was no expression of dire concern of emergency and then all of the sudden on Friday there was an emergency. He said that he did not understand why the Corps is not following their own process; why we ended up needing a stipulation to confirm that actually it is in the 2026 FOP to do an SOR, and they have emergency protocols in Section 4.1 of the 2026 FOP if they really believed there was an emergency. He shared that it was just really pure frustration that the Corps is not following its own process on this and that we are not being allowed to actually debate the science on this before a decision is made. The FMs did try to tee this up before an emergency ensued when we saw just a couple of dots the FMs asked to have a conversation on the science and there was no engagement by the federal agencies. He said that he wanted to express frustration. He felt like the process was very clear and it is just unusual for the Corps to be so ambivalent to words and language based on their historic clinging very tightly to definitions and processes. He thanked TMT for letting him vent a little.

Umatilla Comment on Process

Tom Lorz, Umatilla/CRITFC, said that was one of the big reasons that they object to is the process by which this occurred. He said that he would talk about the operations later but the fact that this was only discussed with certain select people in lawsuits and not to the greater region, that in their view is a major breach of policy. He said that their read of the preliminary injunction in the FOP says that this would be dealt with in TMT. There is a TMT process to deal with emergencies, and the Corps has all of the emergency contact numbers. If they felt this was such an emergency they could have called on Sunday or Monday and said hey, we are going to make this operation, we could have had a discussion of the facts and issues at that time and then moved forward. He said that they see this as a breach in how the Corps is supposed to be acting and has stated in many declarations to people in the court system how they do react, and how they are supposed to act. He said that he wanted to get this on the record that we object to how this process has gone forward. Lorz said that they do not feel the Corps are following any of the documents that have been cited and are supposed to be our guiding governing documents.

Corps Response on Process

Aaron Marshall, Corps, said that he wanted to note that on process for this, it is important to note that defendant's and plaintiff's counsel coordinated on this stipulation that was filed with the court yesterday. He said that he wanted to recognize this process that we are following right now is unusual, but we are operating under court order and it was collectively, the plaintiff's and defendant's counsel that filed the stipulation with the court signed on to it. He said that he just wanted to make folks aware of that because as Lorz mentioned not everyone was involved in this process. So, it is important to keep that in mind.

| *Tom Lorz (Unverified) 1:26 PM*

| *Not all plaintiffs were involved in the signing.....*

Lorz added point of clarification plaintiffs yes, but not all plaintiffs and not all amicus parties. He said that he thought we should be very clear about who those discussions were with and who they worked with.

Marshall said that he agreed.

Stranz asked if there was more clarity about who was involved or who was not.

Lorz said since he was not involved, he could not tell her.

Marshall said that if it would make things go a little easier, he could read off which parties were involved on the stipulation, but he did not know if that would help or not. He said that he was recognizing that not everyone was involved necessarily.

Stranz said that she was not sure if that would be helpful to others. She asked if TMT could let us know.

Ebel said that we were here to discuss the technical merits. He asked if TMT could stick to the technical merits of this.

Stranz said yes, we are having to talk some process first, but we will get there.

NOAA Question about Process

Swieca said that she was going to bring TMT back to whether or not we would have to go through the whole process, including voting today, or whether or not that makes more sense tomorrow. She said that she wanted to bring it back to what Marshall was just discussing. She said that it was her understanding that the production of this document was an important part of those conversations that occurred yesterday and if we were to delay polling until tomorrow perhaps, we should ensure that the parties that participated in that agreement yesterday are comfortable with that. She said that maybe that would be a check-in with the Corps to see if they feel that we need to do that check-in or if they are comfortable waiting to vote tomorrow, if we decide to move forward with that path.

Baus said that he was hearing Swieca and the Corps was leaving the door open for the conversation today, if folks want to poll today, they were comfortable with that or not. Either way. He said what he heard he say was if folks want to postpone, if the comment and feedback is postponing polling until tomorrow, he thought that the Corps was okay with that. That is if that was the feedback that we were getting.

Swieca thanked Baus for the clarification, he may have already said that but it was good to have it clearly stated.

Nez Perce Question about Stipulation Order and TMT Process

Hesse said that he was requesting that the stipulation order be added to the agenda so that all of the parties can have access to that.

Hesse said that it was still unclear to him that the Corps is committed to the normal TMT process as an SOR processing with this. He said that Baus' last statement sounded even more definitive, that polling would be allowed at some point but in the first things it sure did not sound like that was an expectation. He said that he was trying to understand if we were in a normal SOR process because the stipulation language sure seemed pretty clear to him that was what we were following.

Baus said that he wanted to respond to Hesse that he wrote down Hesse's request for the stipulated order for tomorrow's agenda. He said that he wanted Hesse to know that he would ask but did not know. He was wanting to confirm that he had heard Hesse, and he would see what he could do to that, he was not sure that he could.

Stranz said what she had heard Baus said is that this can at this point be treated as an SOR with a polling process, either today or tomorrow. She asked if that was accurate.

Baus said that he would encourage folks by the letter of the memo to walk away from today's meeting with information contained in today's attachment. As noted in the top, the title is a Spill Operational Adjustment that highlights SOR and then footnotes that with how this document was characterizing where we are and how we are moving forward. He said that he wanted to highlight today as noted, the Corps is open to hear what people have to say so if folks wanted to poll today, we can poll, if they want to poll tomorrow, we can poll tomorrow.

Washington Comment of Concern

Morrill said that he appreciated what he had heard and he shared Iverson's sense of confusion and Hesse's concern over the process that the Corps had identified an emergency action. He said that the Corps have already implemented it, and he thought without due process for discussion on the merits. He said whether we vote today or tomorrow he found himself disappointed in how this was playing out. That there was no discussion. The Corps had an opportunity to comment last week; there was no reaction from the Corps. He said that it was pretty clear that not all of the plaintiffs or parties were part of the discussion yesterday, so when we get to the technical issues and the question that was asked, as Ebel had, did the Corps look beyond the black dots. That information is not available, so it is a very frustrating process at this time. Washington was certainly not very happy with the way that this had played out. He said that he wanted to share that perspective because we have made it clear in the past that the agencies and Tribes do not view the black dot as a biological metric so having implemented this as an emergency action without discussion is frustrating and disappointing.

Stranz thanked Morrill for sharing that and said that she was sorry that folks have been frustrated.

d) Technical Comments

Idaho Question about Conditions

Ebel said since the Corps wrote this in the SOR process, it is often the person who is writing these things. He asked if the Corps could highlight the conditions that lead to a reduction in conversion rates for Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Adults through the Snake. He asked when that occurred, when do the increased travel times and to what extent of an increase in travel time result in lower conversion.

Baus said that as far as that goes he wanted to note, and had kicked it off in the intro, that the Corps were not planning on debating the cause or the resolution of the delay.

Ebel said that he was not looking for the cause. He said that he was looking for the biological, the perceived or real biological impacts of the slowed passage that we are observing and whether it rises to the level of non-routine change in operations.

Baus said again, the logic that was laid out to make the decision had been presented in today's information. He said again, he was not prepared to debate that information so he would stop there if there was anybody else from the Corps that wanted to weigh in on that to feel free to do so.

Marshall said that he wanted to jump in and say if not everyone had an opportunity to read through the attachment currently shown on the screen that provides the rationale for this operational adjustment. He said that it might be worth our while to postpone the polling and discussion until tomorrow once everyone had a little bit more time and opportunity to digest this.

Ebel said that he guessed it does not say a lot. He said that he could pretty quickly summarize. There are some instances, there is not a blockage, but there is slowed passage at LMN. It is throwing black dots in the tool, according to DART's tool, and those

programming logic rules. And juvenile passage is slowing, subyearling passage in the Snake for juveniles is going to increase imminently and that is about as far as this goes.

Ebel said that question was had all information been incorporated into this decision, and part of that bar, from ID's technical perspective, is to assess the biological impacts that can be predicted coming from what is actually a slight slowdown in passage at LMN, as well as, whether it is directly attributed to spill, whether it would have resolved itself on its own. And its predicted impact on conversion rates and survival to where fish need to go, be it hatchery fish into the racks of the hatcheries or for wild fish to their spawning grounds. He said that he would argue that given the temperatures of the river, the extent of the slowdown and which fish are slowing down, and actually when the counts diverged, which were weeks ago, that the answer to a lot of those is no. Ebel said that we can debate it tomorrow as well but he had been kicked around on the technical aspects of SORs before – provide this piece of information, that information, and that one over there – so just let it stand that it goes both ways.

*Yakama Nation Comment on 2026 FOP Section 7.1*

Iverson said that the 2026 FOP Section 7.1 footnote says that the Corps would be looking at all information including adult dam counts and he was not seeing that analysis provided here. He said what jumps out at him was under the Corps' justification they say over 3800 adult Snake River salmon are congregating in IHR pool, as if they are all pooled up below LMN. He said if you actually included adult dam counts at the four Projects, you would realize they are not pooling up. This is not a barrier, they are moving slowly, yes, but they are all moving up the system as you would expect the migration. Iverson said that it challenges him at why the Corps did not include adult dam counts in their analysis.

Iverson asked if anyone was going to address his question about 3800 fish pooled up in IHR. He asked if that was a fact according to the federal agencies. He asked where did that figure come from.

Ebel said that he should not speak for them but he would like to provide the Cliff Notes, but maybe the 3800 is probably just the difference LMN and IHR. He said that those counts around this time every year get funky where all of sudden you are seeing at Lower Granite (LWG) and Little Goose (LGS) where all of the sudden fish start flying past dam and the counts at a lower dam all of the sudden become lower than the counts above it and so things start to get weird, if happens at the end of May every year. So, you know that the difference has actually been there for a while but if that has got to be what they are doing.

Iverson said that he appreciated Ebel's explanation, but he was asking the feds if there were 3800 adult Chinook pooling in IHR reservoir. He said to him that is such an absurd statement.

Stranz asked TMT to slow down a little bit. She said that Iverson had a question that he would like somebody who helped author this paper respond to. She said that she saw Chris Peery put his hand up and asked if he was the one to turn to for that.

Chris Peery, Corps, said he was not involved with any of these discussions over writing this document. He said similar to what Ebel had said he was sure what they were looking at was the difference between counts between IHR and LMN right now and the difference between those two projects. He said that he would further add that the kind of things that he looks at as a fish biologist in the Corps' operations, they do look at the counts of the fish going upstream, it is why they collect those counts. They are required in the BiOp to collect these data, and it is so they can monitor conversion of fish as they move upstream and have some measure of how passage is going within the system. He said that he and other biologists that work in the system look at those counts daily, sometimes hourly if they have access to that. He said personally, what he looks at is the conversion between the Projects, the cumulative counts between the Projects, to determine if those cumulative count curve lines are broadening, which would indicate that there is a slowing of fish between the Projects, and how that relates to what you would see if you were just looking at the ten-year average or last year's run. He said that those are the things that would help indicate if there was a passage issue developing in the system. He said again he was not involved with these discussions that led to this change but as a biologist in operations that is how they use that count data. And there is ~4000 fish difference between what we see between IHR and LMN right now, if you looked at the counts this morning.

Swieca said that she wanted to highlight this conversation, as she thought that all of TMT recognized, is quite challenging and quite nuanced as we are trying to navigate both technical policy and legal in this conversation. So, it has been challenging and she thought that we can do our best to try to address very specific questions and navigate those three tiers of interaction that TMT was having here. She said that she wanted to highlight that and recognize the constraints on some agencies at this point in time.

Stranz asked if maybe TMT could just look at the adult numbers. Stranz said that Hausmann added it to chat for Iverson.

| *Ben Hausmann (Unverified) 1:44 PM*

| *I had nothing to do with the 3800 number but 24764 have passed ICH, 20871 have passed LMN*

| *Tom Iverson (Unverified) 1:46 PM*

| *So, how many have passed LGO and LWG?*

| *Ben Hausmann (Unverified) 1:47 PM*

| *18224 LGS, 18211 LWG*

| *Tom Iverson (Unverified) 1:48 PM*

| *Thanks Ben.*

Stranz said that Iverson had asked in chat how many had passed LGS and LWG and Hausmann had responded. She asked if Iverson had any follow up.

Iverson said that he thought that it was applying too much precision to our actual counts, and he thought that if you look at adult counts over time there is natural fluctuations as

others have already pointed out. He said that he just thought to say that there is some big group of fish that are blocked by this spill operation, he thought that was nonsense. He said that he did not believe that was true.

Montana Question about the Relationship between Spill and Adult Movement

Brian Marotz, MT, said that he was trying to understand the relationship between spill and adult movement. He asked for the Cliff Notes on that.

Stranz said that it might be a bigger side conversation because she knew that there are different perspectives on that one.

Lorz said that Cliff Notes might be generous.

Ebel asked if we should answer Marotz's question here or should we do it offline.

Stranz said that it depends. Whatever works, it did not matter to her, if people felt that it would be helpful to talk about as a group then we could do that, if it is a longer conversation that would be better served offline, that could happen too.

Marotz said that he suspected that it would be a longer conversation so he was open to an offline call if they were willing to provide information on this so he could get a better sense for it.

Swieca agreed.

Stranz said she would ask for that conversation to be offline. She noted that Ebel was willing and eager to share that so if he could follow up with Marotz that would be helpful.

Ebel said that he could do that and he would try his best to provide it in a balanced way, providing different perspectives on the issue.

Nez Perce Question about Operational Context

Hesse said that he understood that he was going to treat what TMT got today as a functional SOR that would go through the full discussion and polling process tomorrow at tomorrow's TMT meeting. He asked if the Corps would provide response how it is going to react to that polling and we will have an opportunity to express objection and elevation at that time per the normal guidelines. He said that if that assumption was incorrect, he would need to hear that before the end of this call.

Hesse said that under this emergency action he would like to highlight the importance of implementing it in a way that does not create within day flow fluctuations at the LMN Project. So, keeping total flow from that project relatively stable and not creating within day swings that would cascade downstream. And given that operating a flex spill operation would add, under his quick math, 140 – 150 MW of energy for eight hours on to the grid, he was not sure how BPA would manage that with demands, but he would highlight that managing that should be done in a way that does not reduce flows through the Mid and Lower Columbia. He said that we need to keep those flows as high as possible for the juvenile migrants that are currently going downstream. So those two

operational contexts for this emergency implementation that is ongoing until we have a full time to do the deliberations and debate tomorrow would be appreciated.

Stranz asked if there was any response or perspective that folks could share in response to those two requests.

Tony Norris, BPA, said that it was impossible to keep the flow perfectly the same. The spill gates have stops and do not have a precise flow measurement and we can only operate units in increments, so it is inevitable that there is some change to the flow, but the flow change across the eight-hour block this morning was pretty small. As it relates to the energy, BPA has flexibility at other projects on the system that do not include changes to downstream projects.

Stranz asked Norris to repeat that, she was not sure that she understood the power system.

Norris said that if BPA needed to increase power at LGS and/or LWG, they could modify their operation at Chief Joseph (CHJ) and Grand Coulee (GCL) to back generation off there as needed for those hours because they have the flexibility to shape storage at GCL. That is why they were able to implement this operation on short notice.

Ebel asked if Hesse was not asking them to minimize that. That was what he was hearing.

Norris said that he was not aware that there was a fish operation at Grand Coulee, there is no way to around that, BPA is going to have to manage the power system for reliability. They are going to increase generation at a project, they are going to have make adjustments at another project, and so they will do that where there is flexibility to do so.

Ebel asked what the degree of flow reduction was out of GCL and CHJ that offsets the increase in generation at LMN.

Norris did not have that answer handy for Ebel.

Ebel said okay, he was just wondering if it was small or if it is a biologically [interrupted].

Norris said that the H/K at those projects is significantly higher than LMN.

Ebel said pretty big.

Norris said that you can imagine that the flow change at GCL is quite a bit smaller than the flow change at LMN powerhouse.

Ebel said that was what he was trying to think through. He thanked Norris.

Hesse said that he appreciated the response. He said that he tried to ask it in a way that highlighted the in-river conditions that would be best for fish and to have the AAs accommodate those in the best way possible. He said that he thought that discussion took place.

Norris said that today prior to the spill block, discharge out of LMN was ~54 kcfs, during the spill block total flow ~54.2 kcfs and after the spill block total flow was up just a little bit at ~58 kcfs, so very small changes.

Question about Tabling

Stranz asked if there were any concerns from anyone if TMT tabled the rest of the conversation for tomorrow’s TMT meeting and at tomorrow’s TMT meeting have the full process on the SOR including deliberation and polling and then take it from there. She asked if there were concerns with doing that part tomorrow.

Lorz said that the concern he had was that if someone wanted to object to this, they are going to have to wait another day and then would object and then they would have to raise it to RIOG and then they won’t meet\_ So if someone wanted to actually impact this operation sooner than that timeframe, he thought it was supposed to end by May 28, he was not sure if by waiting until tomorrow that was going to allow for that, and even today it probably would not. He said that this is probably a foregone conclusion since this operation is going to happen regardless of what is stated in the next two days. He said it was also concerning that TMT dis not seem to have a process that allows people with a difference of opinions to actually have an impact that operation.

Nez Perce Question about DART Running Three-Day Table

Hesse said that he thought that Lorz’s point was a good one. He was wondering if we could pull up the DART tool and actually get into some of the specifics a little. He said that it seemed like reading this notification/SOR as we speak, he was likely missing something, but it seemed to be heavily, if not entirely weighted on the black dots. He said that he thought if we could run that tool for the IHR to LMN passage, the default that comes up, and go to the running three-day table.

Running 3-Day Table Single Departure Event per TagID – Adult PIT Tag  
Date Through 05/25

Running 3-Days End Date (departures events = 7) = shaded red: Arrived on Avg (3) Day = 50%	Adult PIT Tag	Departure Events Ice Harbor Per period	Lower Monumental Entry Events for fish departing IHR during period = shaded gray: 50% arrival day = shaded green: Prediction Range based on departures and detections for individual days included in 3-day cohort	Cumulative Arrival Percent Lower Monumental						Total Lower Monumental Entry Events for Fish departing IHR during period	Percent Not Arrived for period	Adult Visual Counts Ice Harbor for period	
				Calendar Days after Ice Harbor Departure									
				0	1	2	3	4	5				6
2026-05-25		26		0	0.0	119.2	30.81	134.0	69.21		5	65.6	1177
2026-05-24		44		19	0.0	22.7	66.9	54.0	152.3	84.1	23	47.7	2007
2026-05-23		44		19	0.0	13.4	39.1	64.3	71.3	161.1	24	40.8	2123
2026-05-22		37		23	0.0	21.4	43.2	62.3	104.9	83.8	35	32.4	1996
2026-05-21		39		21	0.0	17.9	41.0	48.7	53.8	109.2	42.1	171.8	2418
2026-05-20		32		21	0.0	15.4	37.5	43.8	46.9	65.6	108.8	68.8	2501
2026-05-19		34		21	0.0	17.6	32.4	41.2	44.1	58.8	61.8		2156
2026-05-18		22		15	0.0	18.2	36.4	59.1	59.1	63.6	43.6	68.2	1771
2026-05-17		36		20	0.0	20.0	44.4	81.3	63.1	100.0	75.0	79.8	2300
2026-05-16		52		40	0.0	30.8	46.2	87.3	61.5	65.4	71.2	74.8	3636
2026-05-15		71		55	0.0	40.8	54.9	62.0	66.3	67.6	71.8	77.8	4972
2026-05-14		68		56	0.0	41.2	66.2	72.1	76.5	76.5	77.9	82.4	5203
2026-05-13		78		70	0.0	48.7	76.9	83.3	87.2	87.2	87.2	89.7	5396
2026-05-12		77		72	0.0	45.5	71.4	77.0	87.0	88.3	89.6	93.5	5232
2026-05-11		92		85	0.0	47.8	67.4	77.2	85.9	87.0	88.0	92.4	5820
2026-05-10		148		146	0.0	50.0	66.0	77.0	86.0	87.0	89.0	94.0	6840
2026-05-09		80		77	0.0	53.3	72.1	83.0	87.5	88.8	91.3	96.3	6243
2026-05-08		64		62	0.0	54.7	76.4	84.4	85.9	90.6	93.8	96.9	612
2026-05-07		43		42	0.0	44.2	76.7	81.4	83.7	90.7	95.3	97.7	3771
2026-05-06		27		27	0.0	40.7	77.8	85.2	88.9	96.3	100.0	100.0	2376
2026-05-05		14		14	0.0	28.6	78.6	85.7	92.9	92.9	100.0	100.0	1365
2026-05-04		10		10	0.0	20.0	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	870
2026-05-03		7		7	0.0	14.3	85.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	468
2026-05-02													537
2026-05-01													439
2026-04-30													379
2026-04-29													279
2026-04-28													171
2026-04-27													63
2026-04-26													72
2026-04-25													24
2026-04-24													78
2026-04-23													65

Hesse said that he wanted to highlight that adult passage, the black dots are signified when 50% passage for a running three-day total, which is the left-hand column, each one of those rows is 50% is not reached in the column with a ‘2’ in it, that is two days. And the gray bars, the last three as you go down through this were all achieved with fish passing yesterday. And yesterday’s operations were the 24/7 min-gen spill the rest operation. There was a catch up, a number of fish passing on those days that allowed 50%

passage for the May 20 date to be achieved, on day five, those fish passing yesterday before this operation was implemented achieved the sufficient to achieve the 50% on day four for May 21 fish group, and those fish that passed yesterday were sufficient to achieve the 50% passage for the May 23 group of fish on day three. It was not achieved on day two, but the forecast in the shaded green bars indicates that 50% passage, based off of today's operations, should be achieved on day three and for the next day, either on day two or day three. It is likely or possible within this that the black dot for the 50% on day two would disappear tomorrow with or without this operation in place. He said that he wanted to highlight that fish were passing in a significant way to improve these passage dates prior to this emergency operation being put in place. He said that he just wanted to get this right that the emergency operation says that it is going to be put in place the at least three days regardless of black dots. Hesse asked for confirmation on that, that even if the black dot on day two does not show up tomorrow this operation will be maintained through Thursday. He asked if he was reading that correctly. He said that he wanted people to be aware of the black dots and how they are working and then he needed to clarify what was written down here for relationship of operations relative to those achieved by either standard operations or the first day.

Baus said as we have been talking about, the provision for adult delay was taken from the 2025 FOP Section 7.1 and as noted, in that document as well, as in this document, he believed he had seen that as well though he was having difficulty finding it. He said that the short answer is yes. It is a three-day operation, and the rationale generally was to basically allow for an increased opportunity for adults to pass LMN. He pointed to the paragraph starting "Assuming greater than 50%... ..does NOT arrive at the upstream project by day 3" and project outflow... we continue for an additional day. Baus said yes, it is a three-day operation, but then the Corps would continue evaluating that moving forward. He asked if that answered Hesse's question.

Hesse said that was helpful. He said that he guessed knowing that we have put off the deliberations of the operations until tomorrow he asked if there was any reaction for the US government staff that drafted this memo on how that improving trend and decreasing timeframe to meet 50% was viewed in stacking this prior to the operation being implemented. He asked how yesterday's improvement in passage timings played into the final thought process or did he need to wait until tomorrow to get some of that.

Baus said that his only response to that would be – the tool is designed in a manner to monitor and evaluate adult passage conditions, specifically adult delay based on the parameters and how the model was developed and being utilized. That tool assesses adult delay and the outputs of that are black dots and so the model makes best efforts to evaluate all the appropriate parameters and as long as the delay is highlight then that would be observed. Once it was no longer apparent then the Corps would revert back to gas cap operations. Baus said that he wanted to emphasize to Hesse that it was really important that when people talk about this, that the operation is described in this document and the 2025 FOP, we need to caution ourselves, the operation has a lot of specific criteria and so accordingly it is really important that if any questions to be answered specific to that language that has been communicated and he would just caution folks that if things were heard that we always revert back to this document or the FOP to ask specific questions about anything that may be confusing.

Hesse asked if there was anything that Baus could say about how the tradeoff to juvenile fish impacts from doing this was considered just to help my thinking before tomorrow, he knew that he was probably pushing tomorrow's discussions. He said that they had some graphics here, but the black dots do not do that.

Baus said that all he had for now is the information that is contained in the document on page 2 of 4.

*Yakama Comment about 2025 FOP vs 2026 FOP*

Iverson said that he wanted to point out that 2025 FOP is not in play; 2026 FOP is and that says defer to a TMT process to determine the operations for adult delay. He said that while he appreciated that the Corps put in a reinstatement clause in this pseudo-SOR and you chose to select the 2025 FOP reinstatement criteria it does seem like maybe we could discuss at TMT tomorrow different reinstatement criteria using a collaboration forum that is identified in the 2026 FOP. He said that he hoped that they could think about that. He said that TMT needed to look at the data and see what it is telling us but certainly if those dots are disappearing maybe we could get back to the court ordered injunction.

| *Gabe Scheer (Unverified) 2:07 PM*

| *For clarification, the DART tool is not a model of fish passage, it is a static metric that tabulates conversion and does not incorporate environmental, biological or operational parameters*

*Oregon Comment about DART Tool*

Van Dyke said to reiterate Scheer's point, it that this is a retrospective tool, it is not a model. He said that it uses real data that you observe after the fact. He said that the thing that stood out to him is that he spent some time last year providing this group some background on that the tool actually works. He said that it did not seem like the machine had learned much from it. He said that it was evident in the single approach being emphasized throughout what Iverson referred to as a pseudo-SOR that he was just now reading. He said that there were a lot of process failures here. Obviously for folks who are trying to work together to learn things. He said that he was seeing in this that this is more amplified positioning using a single approach that has for quite a long time now been debated in this group and many others as not necessarily fitting the tool that provides us a reality check that is meaningful for some but an easy trigger for others. He said that they are very disappointed that this is where this has fallen.

| *Ben Hausmann (Unverified) 2:11 PM*

| *DART staff are willing to come back to TMT to explain the delay tool to everyone again if that would be helpful. It is NOT modeling fish passage. It is using empirical data.*

*Umatilla Request for TMT Meeting*

Lorz shared two points. One was that he did not see subyearlings in the Corps' little summary of juveniles. He asked them please have that or be ready to talk about that. Two, he asked if tomorrow there would be opportunity to discuss modifications or if this

was where the Corps was going to tell us to go talk to our lawyers. He asked if TMT was going to be available as an avenue to make in-season management changes. If not, he was questioning why we have TMT tomorrow to talk about this.

Stranz asked Baus or Marshall if they could provide a response.

Baus asked Marshall to correct him if he was wrong. He said that it was his understanding that the Corps was implementing the current operation as discussed, as far as it is up in the top of the memo. Again, already as noted, it is the same operation in the 2025 FOP that had all the provisions and details, and they are implementing that operation, and he would leave it at that. He said that he knew that it was not 100% answering Lorz' question, because it sounded like he was asking what the point of tomorrow was, he said that he could not answer that. What he could answer is what he was trying to clarify what he was trying to communicate to Lorz, what they are doing right now, and he guessed that was the plan moving forward and he would leave it at that. He could not speculate on the future.

Lorz said he was trying to say if we have a meeting tomorrow and say the black dots are gone, normally the Corps would implement this and then they would wait for the black dots to be gone. If the black dots are gone tomorrow does TMT have the ability to make modifications to this operation. As Iverson notes, 2025 FOP is not the Fish Operating Plan that we are being governed by. He asked if TMT had this flexibility. He asked if the Corps view that as flexibility or was there something that we need to take elsewhere. He said that he did not want to come to TMT and then be told well we cannot talk about it. He said that was what he was trying to figure out here.

Baus said again, for example operation is day one, to get to Lorz' question, tomorrow would be day two, depending on what happens tomorrow the operation is still a three-day operation. He said that he guessed at minimum it was a three-day operation. To get to Lorz' point, if we did not get adult delays for tomorrow. for example Wednesday, he said that he was again citing the 2025 FOP, and he had heard repeated over and over and over again, he said that he was not\_ The justification is to help clarify what the Corps was doing, it was not to say that they are doing the operation, it is to help clarify, that was an operation, like so many operations that were implemented in a previous year. He said that his point was that he was just trying to clarify for help because there are a lot of details and that is the reason for citing the 2025 FOP, it is merely to provide that specific detail. That is why he continues to go back to that operation. He told Lorz that in that operation, day one was implemented today, day two will be tomorrow, Wednesday, and then Thursday it would be continuing and then again as laid out in the \_.

Lorz said that he got what Baus was saying. He asked if TMT would be able to use adaptive management.

Baus said that he would like to end with, he thought that Swieca said this most eloquently about 45 minutes ago, which is we are doing our best today to have technical, legal, and he thought she had said policy conversations in today's meeting. Baus said that he thought that we were doing that. He said that he apologized if his response is not satisfactory perhaps, maybe some of the legal inquiries, but he was doing the best that he could to share the information that he had right now.

- | *Jonathan Ebel (Unverified) 2:14 PM*
- | *Models can use empirical data. Nearly all statistical models do. The DART tool summarizes passage observations into a 3-day running average with no environmental, operational, or behavioral context. I think the comments are relevant to Mr. Baus's statement that the tool connects passage to spill, which it doesn't.*

Marshall said that he would say that if folks are willing to offer any comments that they would like today or tomorrow but this operation is underway and as Baus mentioned, they would be doing it for three days consecutive this week. At their level at the Corps, he wanted to note that they were operating under court order and this was implemented through a stipulation submitted in the court by Corps' attorneys and we will not be making any changes during a TMT meeting, if there were any comments or suggestions we will have to take those back to our attorneys and let them take it from there.

Stranz asked said that was helpful information for folks to manage expectations. She said that it made her wonder if people would rather do a polling today to have that conversation today to get things on the record and increase the likelihood that there was time for some kind of action other than continuing the current operation, recognizing that it is going to be a conversation that happens at a different level than TMT. She asked if that was what she was hearing.

Morrill said he had a question about this. He said that the Corps had committed to the fact that based on the attorneys and what the legal counsel decided, it is going to implement this action for three days regardless of any input from the agencies and Tribes from biological technical concern. He asked why TMT would meet tomorrow. He said that it seemed to him, if the Corps were looking at a three-day operation, maybe we should consider meeting at day three and discussing the continuation of, or the cessation of the operation. He said that he wanted to toss that out because he did not think anything was going to change from what we heard in the discussion today. He said that he read that the Corps is going to connect the operation for three days, assess and make a decision whether to continue or not. He said that he did not know whether that decision was going to be made by the legal counsel or whether TMT had the opportunity to have a discussion to say, yeah, we are where we need, we are not where we need to be, what do we recommend going forward. He said those were his thoughts.

Ebel said that we should be able to see whether this situation resolves itself by tomorrow at TMT given the prediction intervals, the two-day predictions, Van Dyke's technique for being able to assess the probability that an additional dot would be thrown out be the tool being used. He told Morrill that if he waited until day three, all it was doing was \_ We can make that assessment tomorrow.

Morrill said that he agreed with him, but his question was whether the Corps would be willing to go there.

Ebel said that he did not know, it seemed like this conversation is devoid of technical input, so he was not sure what people are going to do.

Morrill agreed, he said that if the Corps was willing to consider that as an adaptive management technique and deviate from the fact that they said they are going to conduct this operation for three days.

Ebel said that he disagreed, it is neither adaptive nor crisis, it is just a policy/management decision. From Idaho's technical perspective, we are not going to learn anything about adult passage under these conditions, if we do not let it ride. The decision was made by the Corps to change operations, which makes it difficult yet again, third year in a row, to learn something about passage under these conditions. He said that he did not think the court's decision was technically the right decision. He said that he did not think tomorrow that it is probably going to stay the same.

Morrill said that the fair question would be to ask the Corps, if we see this turn around tomorrow, is the Corps willing to consider adaptive management and say okay, we can end it today and not go into day three or was the Corps committed to going to day three.

Stranz said that she thought what she heard from Baus and Marshall was that this was going to be a three-day operation.

Morrill said that was what he thought he had heard.

Baus said that characterizing it as a three-day operation was appropriate. He said, as he had noted before, and would note it here again, there are some subtle details in there. So if you look at the paragraph, and that is why he keeps repeating himself on the 2025 FOP, it is a three-day operation, but it is also an evaluation, as Morrill had noted, that if the situation has not corrected itself, as noted we will continue evaluating it. So back to Morrill's question, the Corps will do it for three days, so as far as making any, as already noted, with what had been coordinated with the court, unfortunately we would not have the ability to deviate from operations coordinated with the court yesterday, for example, at a TMT meeting on Wednesday.

Stranz asked if Baus was saying that the operation that was coordinated with the court yesterday will last for three days, and there would be an opportunity for more evaluation, which at that point could include TMT's input on whether or not this operation continues past day three. She asked if that was what Baus was saying.

Baus said again, if we go back to the paragraph ending with, "This would continue until 50% of the daily cohort arrives at the upstream project (Lower Monumental Dam). Once resolved, spill up to the 125% TDG cap 24 hours per day will resume." He said that he was trying to repeat himself to keep saying that it is more comprehensive than just three dots, it is three dots and then watching and then evaluating.

Ebel told Stranz that it meant yes, the operation could go longer than three days.

*Nez Perce Comment on Tomorrow's Expectations*

Hesse said that he thought that we all need to be thoughtful before tomorrow. He said that he would ask the Corps to convene with your lawyers and review the stipulation. The stipulation says that "Federal Defendants intend to modify Court-ordered spill levels at Lower Monumental Dam under Section 4.1 on Tuesday morning, May 26, 2026." He said that was the level of detail in there, it does not say that we are going to follow the

2025 FOP, it says the Corps is going to modify operation and then the next section says, “They thereafter intend to engage with TMT consistent with Paragraph 2, above”, which is reinforcing the TMT process and SORs. And it says the “Federal Defendants will promptly submit on Tuesday a System Operational Request (SOR) on the May 26 modification, *for deliberation*.” Hesse said that he was not hearing much deliberation and he was hearing a whole bunch of effort on changing an operation with extended expectations beyond the emergency. He said for tomorrow’s meeting to be meaningful, his expectation was that this would follow the SOR process, where we can make sure that all of the information is on the table. We can poll, the Corps could react at that time, on their decision and those decisions can either be elevated or not. He said that Baus’ earlier comment that the Corps could not, would not, make any changes tomorrow would be inconsistent with the TMT guidelines for SORs. And so hopefully we can get that straightened out before tomorrow.

Stranz asked Marshall/Baus for any thoughts on the way that Hesse had laid that out.

Baus said that they heard him and they would get back to them tomorrow and thanked him for his patience. He said anyways, kudos to Swieca again for doing our best jobs here to navigate between technical, legal, and policy operations in real time. He said that they would hear back from folks tomorrow.

Stranz said that this was a tough one for sure and she was sorry that this is rolling out the way that it is because she did hear the frustration and exasperation in everybody’s voice. She said that unless there was anything else that folks felt needed to be said today, she suggested that we close the meeting and give folks a couple more hours to coordinate internally prior to tomorrow’s TMT meeting. She said that she would ask Baus that he add this SOR to the agenda if he had not already for tomorrow. She said that everybody could come prepared to deliberate on it. She asked if there was anything else that needed to be said before we closed out today.

Morrill said that he was just not sure what he wanted to deliberate on for tomorrow. He said if we come back into the discussion, not knowing whether we would have the ability to follow what we think is a normal discussion process around an SOR.

Stranz said that we would follow the normal discussion process for an SOR tomorrow.

Morrill said okay.

Stranz asked if there was anything else for today.

Morrill said that he guess, what Stranz had said was that we were going to follow the process, he had not heard that from the Corps.

Stranz said that she had heard it from the Corps.

Baus said that he was tired. He wanted to say that he heard Morrill, and the Corps would do their best to provide updated information with him at this time. He said that everyone on the phone knows that we are tracking some significant issues out there on the landscape. He said that he heard Morrill and he would try his best to come prepared tomorrow and provide clear communication.

Morrill said thanks.

Marshall said that he appreciated everyone's questions and comments. He said today they would be discussing with their legal and policy folks and taking back the comments and feedback that they had heard.

Stranz said thank you for circling back on that.

Ebel asked if nonfederal folks could provide information or observations, like to share including graphics and things like that for tomorrow's discussion. He asked if those were going to be shut down.

Stranz said of course, TMT members are always welcome to share their perspective and information that they are looking at. She said that if he wanted to provide links ahead of time, that might be helpful, we could navigate in real-time.

Ebel said thank you.

**2. Agenda – *Wednesday, May 27, 2026***

Meeting Location: Microsoft Teams

**Today’s Attendees:**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>TMT Representative(s)</b>
NOAA Fisheries	Kelsey Swieca
Oregon	Erick Van Dyke
Washington	Charles Morrill
Kootenai Tribe	
Confederated Tribes of Colville Reservation	Dennis Moore
Umatilla Tribe (CRITFC)	Tom Lorz, Pete McHugh
Yakama Nation	Tom Iverson
Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)	Chris Runyan, Eric Rothwell
Army Corps of Engineers (COE)	Doug Baus (Chair), Aaron Marshall
US Fish & Wildlife Service	Dave Swank
Idaho	Jonathan Ebel
Montana	Brian Marotz
Spokane Tribe (STOI)	Brent Nichols
Nez Perce Tribe (NPT)	Jay Hesse
Warm Springs Tribe	
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes	
Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)	Tony Norris, Ben Hausmann

Other Attendees (non-TMT members):

COE – Chris Peery, Dan Turner, Leah Hamilton,  
Megan Biljan, Catherine Dudgeon

BPA – Tammy Mackey, Leah Sullivan

DS Consulting – Emily Stranz (Facilitator)

CorSource – Andrea Ausmus (BPA note taker,  
Contractor)

Clearing Up – K.C. Mehaffey

Columbia Basin Bulletin – Mike O’Bryant

FPC – Gabe Scheer, Noah Campbell

Energy EPS – Joshua Rasmussen

Unaffiliate – Mike Buchko