

Columbia River Regional Forum
System Configuration Team Meeting
July 17, 2025
FINAL Official Notes

Representatives of Corps, ODFW, WDFW, BPA, NOAA, and others participated in today's SCT hybrid meeting facilitated by Trevor Conder and hosted via Microsoft Teams.

Draft and final SCT notes are available on the COE's TMT website under the FPOM link. For copies of documents discussed, contact Trevor Conder at trevor.conder@noaa.gov. See the final page of these minutes for the list of attendees of today's meeting.

1. June Minutes

- Tom Lorz said that given the lack of people we should wait a month because Charles Morrill, WA, is going to have a comment. Morrill was on vacation.
- Conder said that the only issue he saw was with a couple dates that were wrong that were copy-paste from an older set of minutes.

2. FY26 Rankings and Priorities

- Ranking Scores and Allocations
 - Royer shared out the scores that she had received as of 8:55 am, July 17, 2025.
 - Royer had four scores compiled for the meeting.
 - When she sent out the scores, she included the project specific PBud allocations.
 - Ladder Cooling
 - For the ladder cooling projects, when they submitted their capability, they planned to go to construction in 2026, but that schedule is not going to pan out.
 - The need will be just for design.
 - No way to spend the entire \$3M for MCN ladder cooling contract because we are not ready to award a construction contract. Royer also thought that a construction contract would potentially cost more than \$3M.

- The strategy is to have some vertical meetings and get concurrence to reallocate some of the large chunks to other things so we can do additional work.
- Will be going through that process but have not started yet.

Conder asked why Royer was speaking only to MCN and not to JDA, IHR, or LMN.

Royer said that was just an example of a project, there are a few where we have budgeted multi-million dollars for construction and we are just not there in the schedule. So, the large chunks, we would not be able to execute that amount on those projects next fiscal year. So, just to clarify, we are not ready to award a construction contract for the ladder cooling structures the next fiscal year.

Erick Van Dyke, ODFW, said he had a couple questions to help figure out how to go about this. He said he thought she was right, it is inefficient, but it continues to fall into that category for us as well. He said right now, the FY26 PBud column has values in what it looks like four items. He asked if he was reading that correctly.

Royer said that was correct.

Van Dyke said that seemed like a new approach, but additionally, there are three other categories that he kind of identified looking through the spreadsheet. There is a blank cell, there is one that has zero, and there is one that says not budgeted. He asked Royer if she could explain how those are different.

Royer said that she could.

- PBud explanation:
 - Zero: Projects that we submitted a capability for, but they were not included in the PBud.
 - Not Budgeted: Projects that were not included in our original budget request.
 - Blank: Projects that we do not budget for, usually programmatic oversight projects, they are included on the sheet because we do provide a little bit of funding for that.

Van Dyke said that was helpful. He said that the only ones that you had capabilities for are the four that Royer picked, the ones that have zeros in them she did not believe she had capability to fund.

Royer said no, we express capability, it was not included in the administration's budget.

Van Dyke said oh right, thanks for checking him on that.

Royer said yeah, no worries.

Van Dyke said the blank ones are the ones that have fallen in and off of this list multiple times over the last many years that he had been a part of this group. So, it seems like a moving target that we do not really know what that will be and are unsure whether we help provide input that makes any difference on those. He said that he was curious, he did not provide Royer any scores because a lot of these were like that. Van Dyke said that what he did do was try to think about this a different way this time. He said that we have at Oregon provided input on our priority schematic, for a lack of a better word, and it is focusing in on Lower Columbia River actions in particular, starting at MCN. He said that he would send in his scores and rationales, but he was uncertain what SCT is really doing here. He said it seemed to him what Royer was doing in her intro was something that made sense in his head, that she was picking out the ones that had money in it, that you were not thinking you were going to be able to implement. He said that he was curious which one she thought she could implement to begin with that is, not also caught up in the same limitations and constraints that she had described, for the one that she had money in now, and how do we figure out how to utilize that to make some progress here. He asked if that made any sense.

Royer said that she thought so. She said that she just wanted to clarify because this whole budget process is confusing.

- Allocation explanation:
 - The Columbia was allocated by the administration, in the PBud, \$12M.
 - The administration selected specific projects to be funded with the \$12M.
 - Royer was trying to explain that using the 'FY26 PBud' column.
 - This is not necessarily how she would propose to spend the \$12M so we will be going through the process of requesting to reallocate or change the spread of how the \$12M is spent.
 - All of the projects listed on the sheet are candidate projects for that \$12M reallocation request.
 - The \$12M only goes so far, so the SCT prioritization process helps indicate what the priorities are, so we know what falls above and below the \$12M cut line.

- This is folded into their decision-making process.

Van Dyke thanked Royer for describing how she was going to use this. He said he felt like that is not what we are talking about right now though, trying to get to an efficient approach, looking at what she was claiming is needed for each of those and that is not necessarily well informed at this point, especially when we are seeing totals of \$3 – 4M taking up the \$12M. There is going to be some subjectivity here. He said what he was noticing of the reality here was that she was having SCT rank things that we have absolutely no recognition or understanding of, and that are moving targets. So, he gets it, but he was not going to give her a bunch of scores for all these things knowing that it is \$12M and right now the spreadsheet is indicating there are four-line items that would use up that amount.

Instead, he was looking at those four items and figuring out which one was the highest in priority for Oregon to move forward on and which ones maybe are less of a priority for Oregon because really this process is triage using dollars that have been allocated already and just moving them around, if in fact the Corps chooses to do that. So, he did not think that they are in a different headspace for what the process we are involved in is. He said that he thought that the approach they are trying to express they are using is different.

Conder for him, it does matter a little bit because the President's Budget is not always what comes out in the end in the budget once Congress has their way with it. A lot of times it can change so that number could come in differently, which is why it is helpful to prioritize these so if the Corps suddenly gets a number that is different out of the whole process, then they at least know how the region prioritizes these items. He asked Royer if that sounded right.

Royer said yeah, she thought that sounded right. She said she thought that SCT should not get hung up on these numbers. These other projects that we have in the queue, and she was aware that SCT did not know what the final costs are, but she had the descriptions here of what we would like to do next year and so what is the merit of doing those things. She said that the merit of the projects is intended to be budget independent, and she understands that it does not always come out that way when people are scoring.

Tom Lorz, Umatilla/CRITFC, said the question that he had, and he was not sure if she had already answered it because his phone decided to drop the call. He said if you have zeros, that means you show capability, but it got zeroed out and by someone higher up on the food chain. He asked if you come to items, like you know you cannot spend \$3M on MCN for a cooling water structure next year, can

you take that money and put it where there are zeros, can you put it where there are blanks. He asked what was her flexibility to shift money around.

Royer said that is what they will be requesting to do. They can do that if they can get approval to do that and they will be going through that process.

Lorz said his question was given the changes that we have seen, is that approval going to be likely to happen, unlikely to happen? He asked if this is going to be part of the claw back? He asked if they are going to try to claw money back. He said that he was just trying to figure out because when he talks to his policy people, they come and say, hey you guys got \$12M. Lorz said that he said yeah, but we cannot spend it in the way we want. He said if he needed to send the message back saying hey, we need flexibility_ He asked if Royer needed help getting that flexibility or if she thought that this is just normal budgeting stuff and it should not be a problem.

Royer said she frankly did not know what to expect this year. She said that they would request the flexibility, and they would (*unintelligible*). She did not know; she did not want to get ahead of the administration.

Lorz said that he did not think anyone could get ahead of the administration because they change every 30 seconds or so, so good luck with that. He said he was just saying for Royer to keep us informed when she does know. If she finds out that they need something to please let us know and we will try to help her get it. He said that he thought this was one of those times where given the high levels of uncertainty we have going on, more communication is probably better than less because Lorz thought we are all in the same boat trying to do stuff and trying to do things that are good and that kind of stuff and trying to make improvements. You might just need some help getting that done.

Royer said yeah.

Morrill said that he wanted to confirm that the PBud, where it says '0', those were within the Corps' capability, but that project was not included in the PBud. He asked if that was correct.

Royer said that was correct.

Morrill said that he shared Lorz' concerns and thoughts, and others as well, but he thought he found it very difficult for us to rank these at this point in time. There are a couple that stand out, the PIT Trawl. He said that his other question that he was curious about was about the beneficial effects of spill was not included by those that provided the PBud. He said that he was a little surprised by that.

Royer said yeah, that was not included. She said that it is \$12M so they needed to make some decisions.

Morrill said okay. He said that they, being the Northwest Division of the Corps, and what they would choose to fund and then submit that to this group for recommendations on how to rank that.

Royer said if Morrill was asking who they is, who sets the Presidents budget, that would be the Office of the White House.

Morrill said okay, but the money that we have coming, do we have the ability to pick and choose among the projects that were allowed, or the projects that were in the PBud but not carried forward?

Royer said that we have the ability to determine what the priorities are and request from the Administration to fund those things and change the funding allocation.

Morrill said okay, so just because it was not included in the PBud Royer thought we may have the ability to go back and say if we would like to prioritize this and shift funding to accomplish that. He asked if that was correct?

Royer said yes, we have the ability to request that.

Morrill said okay. He said that he did not know if he was ready to rank anything other than just state that there was a number of projects that he would think would be going forward but ranking them at this date by supporting Royer and her needs yeah, whatever we can do.

Jonathan Ebel, IDFG, said he thought that Royer and all the folks on the phone spent quite a bit of time yesterday looking at this thinking about this and trying to track this over time and came up with a couple of questions. He said that Royer can see that it is a little difficult for the region to figure out because there are some changes. He said one significant change on this that threw him off is right up at the top and that is the combining PIT tag recovery with the PIT trawl work under the same budget. He said that he went back through the spreadsheets and started to get confused because the terminology on these values is changing but as you move from FY21 through now, which happens to be the amount of time that he has been in this position. He went back into the Workplans on the FPOM SCT website, and these are different projects, and they have always had different IDs, for these specifically, the PIT Trawl, which was a different project title and then the bird colony PIT detections. He asked if Royer could provide a rationale of why those were combined. He said that he had an idea of why. He asked how

those could be viewed under the same amount money, as one of those projects is actually less money than it used to be in the past.

Royer said for the PIT recovery, it is really an administrative thing that is pretty small effort. The Fish Field Unit (FFU) goes out and scans for tags and it is a small dollar amount. She said she made that change for efficiency. We are really using that information to support our basin-wide survival estimates it felt appropriate to include the FFU PIT scanning in the PIT Trawl line item and we would fund that appropriately. But because we have not really funded the avian predation rate estimates recently, it just made more sense to include the things we were funding under the single line item since they were supporting that one overall goal. In this case, it is just an administrative thing, so she did not need a separate Project Manager for both efforts.

Ebel said he guessed as much looking as we are essentially in the near term, only using the detected tags in the bird colony to support the survival estimates, then that makes sense. He said it no longer lines up with the workplans in terms of the ones that are posted so that Royer was aware.

Royer said that she understood that. She said what she would do is move any of that funding into that one-line item. She said she apologized for the confusion, but she wanted to represent how we were doing the work and how we would end up spending it. It is really like \$30K and she did not want to have a whole project team to oversee that. She said that she would rather just do that herself as the Project Manager of the PIT Trawl. It is just a little easier.

Ebel said he thought that it makes a lot of sense, it just threw him off and put him down the rabbit hole.

Royer apologized.

Ebel said because of that, as soon as he looked at it, it threw him off. He said it may be a question for next time, but when Royer goes back through these worksheets in this Excel file that we are looking at, the titles of the dollar amount change. There is a PBud, but then there are other ones. Maybe next time or something we can try to standardize what it actually means. Because prioritizing is about dollar values in this case, in some ways, you have to take that into account. And so, when you look backwards when the title is not the same, it is about what these different names mean, or column titles mean as you go back through time and what these things are going to be called moving into the future because they have changes annually. He said that was what he had for now. He said he has his quasi-ranks, but he really needed to hear what she had to say today before he could do anything, because he is generally in a state of befuddlement.

Van Dyke said his question was just about how to interpret what the mandatory note is meaning to do for us.

Royer said the project management is always considered mandatory because that is frankly her labor and program manager support. She said we cannot not fund that and have the program go. So that is why those are mandatory because she is going to fund those line items. Other projects the Corps considers mandatory are projects under construction, which we do not have any of those in FY26, and then the only other mandatory one was the environmental compliance because that is NEPA for the system, so that is also considered mandatory by the Corps.

Lorz said that was his question too. Two things: These scores are probably going to be evolving over time, because like Royer said, I cannot spend the \$3M on MCN cooling structures, so we are going to have to put that somewhere else, so our scores are kind of reflective on our current level of funding and our current project level. Just know that is probably going to be flexibility. He said he would probably get a little fussy if the Corps put a bunch of money into their NEPA legal fund because they put in \$12M last year and then the government walked away from RCBA. He said he did not know what the hell NEPA analysis the Corps is doing now, because they have totally upended their operational stuff. So, if he sees a bunch of money in there and we did not even know what the operations are going to be, how can the Corps do a NEPA analysis if you do not have operations. He said if he saw another \$12M, if he sees all the money go there, he was just going to? (*unintelligible*) He said they will have to explain to him a lot better on what this is doing. He said he got why the Corps felt they needed to do that and for some reason it is coming out of CRFM but now that the Corps has walked away from RCBA and we do not know what next year's operations are going to be, which is part of the reason why you probably cannot do a spill effect because we have no idea what the spill next year is going to be. So that is where, unfortunately, we are getting in front of operations and what is going on. And he was wondering how the Corps is going to ? (*unintelligible*) He asked if the Corps was just going to be constantly kind of like going through and updating these things as information comes in, which puts us in a weird spot because obviously we cannot be that agile and the Corps can only spend money, they know they have and it is going to be really hard to spend that money if, like at the moment they say that we are not making any changes or we are going back to the 2020 BiOp, which technically would have the NEPA coverage. He said that he was just saying that there is a lot of weirdness this year that is going to be really not very fun.

Royer said that she understood and those conversations are above her head, but she would pull people in. She said she can pull someone in for the next meeting to discuss that line item.

Lorz said he was just wondering how the Corps were trying to right this internally because they are in the same boat we are, not sure what is going to happen next year. He asked if they were just like as it comes, just try to adjust, adapt, overcome, go full Trevor, Semper Fi. He asked if that was what we are going to be kind of doing?

Conder said something that Lorz brought up about the \$12M of NEPA/RCBA getting pulled. He asked Royer what happens to the \$12M. He asked if she could respond to what happened to the FY25 \$12M and could it be forwarded to some of these important projects.

- NEPA/RCBA FY25
 - Royer said that the FY25 amount for the CRS Supplemental EIS (NEPA effort) is currently \$7M.
 - She thinks that there are decisions pending (way above her head), she had not heard anything yet.
 - Until she hears otherwise the Corps will be awarding contracts for that this year, if that does not happen, the Corps will be looking for other places to put that funding.

Morrill asked if the \$12M was for the BES study or the NEPA fund.

Royer said that the \$7M was for the Environmental Compliance line item in FY25.

Morrill said and we spent \$7M so there is \$5M that could be carried forward and that ? (unintelligible)

Royer said no. It was never \$12M, originally, she thought it was \$8M and she downgraded that to \$7M. So that is currently the total amount of funding that is being provided in FY25 is the \$7M and a chunk of that is for contracts.

Morrill said that contract for what works, that was his question.

Royer said for the Environmental Compliance, the NEPA.

Ebel said this had opened the box. His initial question, Trevor asked his initial question, but now it is what is available. That is for contracts for putting together NEPA documents and presumably the scoping that did not happen, maybe it did,

he lost track of it, because it keeps changing. He asked if any of those were awarded and is that available for carryover because if that gets kicked back to FY26 that is \$7M and Congress does not provide a budget that is different from the Administration's proposal and that is most of the budget. He asked if money was being spent in FY25 and if not, would it be available to be carried over?

Royer said it is currently the plan to spend it in FY25 on the contracts, if for whatever reason that falls through, it will depend on if the decision is to still do the work and we are not going to meet the schedule, then we would carry it over for FY26 and it would not impact FY26. If the decision is made to not do that work, she was telling Ebel she is having incredible pressure not to have any carryover. So, she would see what she could do, frankly it is almost August so she did not know she would be able to do anything with that money, so if she is not able to, it would be carryover.

Ebel said spending \$7M in two months is one hell of a party. He said he did not envy her at all.

Van Dyke said the sentiment that Ebel offered Royer has been felt for a long time. He said he knows we get in this room when we start talking about the things we are identifying and trying to make sense of it out loud as we go and sometimes bleeds into being ultra critical of the folks sharing the message. He said they are trying to avoid that, but he guessed they are starting to ask Royer questions she cannot answer, which is pretty common, at least he felt that is over the past, many decades or many years of doing this. Lorz has been the guy here for decades, multiple decades. Van Dyke said that he was hearing Royer's effort and rationale for why she cannot spend some of those items that are currently containing a dollar amount in the column for the FY26 PBud as being not implementable in the FY. He said what he was not hearing was which of those are identifying as implementable. And then he was curious what factors make it the ones that currently have a dollar amount in them not implementable. He said he was assuming it was because the Corps does not have the staff to call on to do the study or develop the concept, but he was not sure. He asked Royer to help with that.

Royer said she wanted to clarify; all of the projects are implementable. What she meant was the scope has changed. Originally, we were planning to get to construction this year for some projects, and we are just not going to make that schedule, so the construction is going to be pushed out. So, the amount of funding needed to do a project will sometimes go down. Sometimes the amount of funding needed to do a project goes up because costs escalate, things change essentially over time. So that was why she was just pointing out that some of the funding

levels maybe are not matching the scope that we currently have for the projects but anything on the FY26 list is something that we could potentially do if we had funding. She said that she wanted to clarify and asked if there was another part that she missed.

Van Dyke said he thought she was right and that was what he needed. Because she put it in the budget, it is assumed that when it arrives to the folks that are making the allocation recommendation in the President's Office that you can do it, but over the many years he has been here, there have been a lot of these that have not been completed or the Corps was not able to get to the contracting phase or get through the construction components and knowing what those are his thoughts help him figure out if that can help us prioritize it. And that is why he asked the question the way he did and thought Royer did answer his second question with that response, that all of these in her eyes can be implemented, but which of them are least likely to be delayed in the way that she was describing, the ones that currently have a dollar amount in them are trying to figure out if that can help us prioritize if we know that information.

Royer said the only thing that she could offer, so the ones that were funded in PBud reflect the Administration's priorities, and so if the priorities of this group do not match that it would be the ranking that kind of helps illustrate that. And then that would fold into how we might request a change in that allocation.

Van Dyke said yeah, that will be a hard lift, in his opinion, but that is helpful to hear. But it is not really getting to what he was hoping to try to figure out better. He said that he would think about it a little more and try to characterize it in more consumable terms, he guessed. He thanked Royer for trying, and he appreciated it.

Conder said Royer has a value provided for the cooling structures and it says it is for MCN, but it was his understanding that it was not just for MCN, it could be others. But then she said that there was not the capability to construct in FY26. He asked if we were behind schedule, were we planning to construct in FY26, hence the value provided there with that line item. And then why are we not on schedule given that we have been working on those plans for a while.

Royer said the schedules were submitted from Walla Walla, that was a very aggressive schedule and likely not realistic. So, for MCN PIT detection, for example, the Corps is just wrapping up the EDR, so the thought that we would ?? (*unintelligible*) Royer said she thought originally there was some thought that we might do a design build contract or something but that is not the plan. So, the Corps would be moving into the next phase in FY26 where we are doing the DDR and potentially DDR/plans and specs concurrently, Royer was not sure what the

current plan is for all the Projects but there is no way we would get to construction. So, the schedule was just overly optimistic and frankly not realistic.

Conder said he was just seeing values then currently not being realistic, maybe we can get a better update on the actual values there based on what we can achieve.

Ebel said that he agreed with Conder, but he was going to? (*unintelligible*) So the cooling structures are something that are, well as all of this is in the BiOp in certain ways, but the cooling structures are explicitly in the BiOp. We are now five years into that BiOp. He asked what was the timeline expected by NOAA Fisheries for the implementation of these things. He asked if Conder could help him understand what his agency's expectation is in writing in the BiOp, as to how quickly the Corps would move on it.

Conder said they were expecting within the lifespan of the biological opinion. There was no you *shall* do this specifically, but it was described that if it met these criteria for differentials and for these evaluations that were conducted through the BiOps, those kind of things take time to gather the information and say yes, this actually does meet the criteria that you have expressed that we should do this. He said they are essentially following a path that NOAA expected but if we start to see substantial delays in process then that could be a concern that we have to address, but right now, he said that he felt like they are sort of on schedule providing that we do not have successive years of delay.

Ebel said yeah, okay, that he would write down that interpretation because he asked if that was a 15-year BiOp.

Conder said yeah, generally.

Lorz said that is if the 2020 BiOp and this gets down a rabbit hole that he did not know they wanted to go down.

Ebel said that Lorz was right, it is just part that he just had to make sure that everybody is? (*unintelligible*) He said that he guessed that we do not even know what guidance to hold entities accountable to at this point, but Lorz was right that is a nasty rabbit hole. He said that he was just wondering for his personal knowledge, Conder answered that well, it was not envisioned, but it is a 15-year BiOp as well so that when these things are coming up in the future potential BiOps then from his understanding that these can be maybe kind of implemented at some point during the whole thing.

Van Dyke said that he appreciated this conversation. It is important that we really understand what was meant by over-expectation. He said that Royer mentioned it

and because we commonly move between topics between what the SCT is here to do and what the rules of the basin are driven by. He asked if Royer was trying to imply that the over-expectation is applied to the SCT process or the BiOp decision making process that was agreed to regardless of the term or any other agreement that was agreed to that may not be at play the same way it was not so long ago. He asked Royer to help him with that. He said that he was just trying to figure out if we should be thinking about that more in how we rank these.

Royer said that she was not sure that she understood Van Dyke's question. She said that she thought he was asking about if you should be thinking about BiOp compliance or other requirement when you are scoring.

Van Dyke said yeah, he was asking her what level her response to the problem was. If it is direct to the SCT process, the one we are ranking, or if it is beyond or way outside that scope. If the optimism was over applied in a different space that we have no ability to really provide a recommendation for here is SCT.

Royer said that all the projects listed in the CRFM list on the sheet are BiOp requirements, so she was not sure how to answer that.

Van Dyke said that he was just trying to figure out where the overall optimistic label fits to know if we have any ability to do anything to inform that and he thought that the box had been open but understand that folks may not be able to do much about that here even if it is coming.

Next meeting: August 21, 2025 (Cancelled)

Agenda Topics: Trevor Conder

- Updates to FY26 Spreadsheet to get more realistic values, provide additional scores to Royer.
- Approve Minutes from June, July minutes will be provided ahead of time for the August meeting.

Morrill asked if the agencies and Tribes should have a meeting to talk about what they think their priorities should be if we have to go down that road before we have our next SCT.

Lorz said that we can bring that up at FPAC too. He said yeah, lets bring it up next week at FPAC. He said that at the next meeting we should maybe go through people's scores so people can talk and banter back and forth and get clarity we

might want to set aside some time because he was going to give Conder grief about some of his scores because that is his job.

Morrill said thank you Lorz, and that he is fortunate because he had not provided any scores and the spreadsheet that he got this morning does not have scores on it do he did not know if we, anybody provided scores or not but the one that he was look at that he opened this morning did not have scores on it.

Lorz said that Royer sent an email cracking down this morning and that one had scores for him so Morrill might check to make sure that he is opening the right one or that the computer is not deferring to an old one.

Morrill thanked Lorz.

Conder said that we can go and argue about scores he would love to do that. He said that his were his first take, and he expected that we would bend a little bit on some of those.

Lorz said that he is in the same boat. So, we might want to set aside some time for that either next SCT or in a separate meeting.

Conder said that their scores were definitely considering the not budgeted zero lined out all of the very low budget so there is more difference between scores then they typically have in a well-funded year because of that.

Lorz said that he did the same thing and that is why you see a few more 2s and not just on the estuary projects.

Ebel sent his, so Royer has his now.

Morrill said that he would wait for the latest one out and he would not get to that until sometime next week and then he would share that with others.

Today’s Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Ben Hausmann	BPA
Trevor Conder (host)	NOAA
Ida Royer	Corps
Christopher Yane	Corps
Kate Self	NPCC
Erick Van Dyke	ODFW
Tom Lorz	Umatilla/CRITFC
Charles Barnes	Corps
Charles Morrill	WFWS
Ryan Ashcroft	Corps
Jonathan Ebel	IDFG
Christine Peterson	BPA
Sean Tackley	Corps
David Trachtenbarg	Corps
Andrea Ausmus	BPA Notetaker

Minutes by Andrea Ausmus, CorSource Technology Group LLC, Contractor for Bonneville, amausmus@bpa.gov (503-230-4439).

Please send any requested edits to Bonnie Hossack, NOAA, Bonnie.Hossack@noaa.gov