

Columbia River Regional Forum
System Configuration Team Meeting
July 16, 2026
DRAFT Official Notes

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

Draft and final SCT notes are available on the COE's TMT website under the FPOM link. See the final page of these minutes for the list of attendees of today's meeting.

1. June Minutes Review – Royer

- All previous minutes have been finalized and posted to the website.
- Charles Morrill, WDFW, had provided edits for the June minutes.
- Approved with edits.

2. CRFM FY26 Update – Royer

- Royer had been working with her vertical team making fine tune adjustments with the primary objective being execution.
 - Cannot change the projects on the list.
 - They want to execute all the funds.
 - As they get updated costs and information about projects Royer is working to maximize the amount of funds that are able to be spent this year.
 - Royer has been working a vertical request to make adjustments, these are shown on the spreadsheet.
- Adjustments (highlighted in red):
 - JDA Mitigation Project
 - Team has worked to refine scope.
 - They are working to finish project and close the book on the CRFM portion.
 - The relative cost has been refined downward.

- IHR Post-Construction Evaluation.
 - Refined the cost.
 - Minor adjustment.
- Estuary Habitat Studies
 - The funds saved from those projects were put into the into the Estuary Study.
 - Added \$450K.
 - Allows the team to add sites in the estuary to the 2027 study.
 - Sites will provide information that will be useful for the scope of the study and will complement the survival study that is planned for the spill evaluation in 2027.
 - At SRWG Chanda would provide the site locations and information.
 - The reason that the Corps was able to do this was because of the adjustments.

3. FY27 Ranking – Royer

Averages of the scores will be added later; this meeting was to allow members to adjust scores if needed.

Line 3: Post Construction Performance Standard Evaluations

- PIT Trawl and includes going to East End Island and scanning for tags.
- They are both funded out of the one project but are different components so SCT can score them separately.
- This would be funded in FY27 for the 2028 Field Season.

Line 4: John Day Fish Turbine Pumps U1 & U2

- Long-term project, the short term is O&M funded.
- Continuing design in FY27.

Line 5: McNary PIT Detection Improvements

- Plan to award a construction contract in FY26.
- FY27 funding would include any oversight of the contract and any Engineering During Construction (EDC).
- The Corps considers this mandatory because it is contract oversight.

The was a question from Morrill if that meant that the work would begin in FY27, or if the work would begin in 2028. Royer said that the construction work would begin in FY27 because they would probably award it late into the 2026 Fiscal Year. She said that it was going to be tight. Morrill noted that it was disappointing to see it slip another year, but he understood. Royer said that they are working very hard and it is their very strong expectation that they would award the contract this fiscal year.

Line 6: McNary Fish Pump System Upgrade

- FY26 the Corps is working to award an AE design contract.
- FY27 will include the oversight of the AE design contract and to continue to move the design along.
- The Corps considers this mandatory because it is contract oversight.

Line 7: McNary South Fish Ladder and Collection Channel Rehab

- The rehab is tied to the fish pump upgrade. The team is working on both at the same time because the projects are complementary to each other and are part of the same system.
- The AE contract for design will be the same as the fish pumps.
- The Corps considers this mandatory because it is contract oversight.

Trevor Conder, NOAA, asked about when continuing the design of the McNary fish pump system it was considered mandatory for the Corps. He asked why the John Day fish turbine pumps, which is to continue design for a long-term solution, was not considered mandatory. He asked what dictates the mandatory score. Royer said that it was the contract oversight. The John Day design is being done in-house, whereas the design for McNary will be a AE contract. She said

that it would be awarded this year and the contract would be active next year. If the Corps was going to be doing the design in-house it would not be mandatory.

Line 8: Ice Harbor Turbine Post Construction Evaluation

- In FY26 the Corps is working to award an Economy Act Order for an implementation plan.
- In FY27 the Corps has some minimal dollars for contract oversight.
- The Corps considers this mandatory because it is contract oversight.

Line 9: Lower Monumental Adult Channel and North Entrance Diffuser Grating

- In FY26 the Corps is issuing a supply contract to purchase some of the materials.
- In FY27 the funds would be used for installation.

4. FY27 Additional Ranking/Requests

Royer said that the spreadsheet is a living document and SCT members could send or adjust scores at any time.

a. CTUIR Additions:

- Lamprey Funding

Tom Iverson, Yakama, shared that it was important that the region sends the message that we want to use CRFM funding for Pacific Lamprey. He said that it was a very important point that we want to keep in the Corps' attention and on their radar.

- JDA ladder cooling
 - Yakama: 5
 - Umatilla: 5
 - Washington: 5

- NOAA: 5

Conder said that he was not understanding why this was not in the funded portion for FY27. He said that he thought that we were moving forward currently on this. He asked if Royer could explain why they were not funding JDA Ladder Cooling and some of the other ladder cooling like Lower Monumental, McNary, and Ice Harbor but we are funding other things that seem to him will result in a lower survival improvement or a more ambiguous improvement or an improvement that we can wait for longer. This is pretty crucial to get done as soon as possible given some of the adult losses that we are seeing. He said to him and to NOAA this is one of the higher priority items and yet this is in the unfunded list and yet we have other things like trying to figure out how good the survival is through the Ice Harbor turbine is a higher priority. He asked if Royer could explain that to him.

Royer said that she thought that Conder may have missed the last SCT or two but effectively it is not in the President's Budget, ~~so—and~~ That is all she can really say about it. It is not in the President's Budget and at this point in time therefore it is not funded.

Conder asked if the Corps submitted this as a capability and something that they wanted to do and felt was necessary to happen over those other items and they came back and said no. Or did the Corps not submit.

Royer said that she would repeat their official talking point that the President's Budget is their capability at this time.

Lorz said the long and short is that the Corps can no longer share what they shared with the Presidents anymore because of some poppycock rule that some pinhead (for lack of a better term) came up with. So, this is the world that we are living in right now.

Conder asked Royer if we were currently designing these structures under FY26 dollars.

Royer said yes.

Conder asked if this was supposed to be a completion of that process or was it a continuation. He asked if the FY26 dollars would be sufficient to complete this project such that FY27 would not be necessary. He asked if she could answer that.

Royer said that the FY26 dollars are going to be used to complete the design of the project. That is the intent and that is all she can say about that.

Lorz said that the likelihood of doing a design build with the funds they have is about the same as France winning the World Cup right now.

Conder asked if the Corps planned to submit capability in the near future, say FY28, to construct some of those structures. He asked if Royer could share the plan for that. He asked if that was a FFDRWG topic or a SCT_ can we share the funding intent there.

Royer said no they cannot.

Chane said that he was going to offer, he knew that Conder had been out for a while, but if he wanted to give Chane a call to catch up offline he would be happy to talk to him about it. He said that he knew that the rest of the group was tracking and it was not the same as it used to be. It is frustrating for everybody in the region, and it does not make our work any easier. If Conder had any more questions he said to feel free to reach out.

Conder said that he understood where the Corps was going with the process and the limitations with the administration. He said that it just really starts to irk him when we are moving away from one of the most important mitigation process projects that we have identified in a long time and we are moving towards other stuff that are not as important. So that is a real impact and to just be told that we cannot talk about it is something he thought was worthy of elevation in a policy forum and we can discuss that.

Royer said that he was free to do that.

Chane said that he appreciated hearing that from Conder

Royer asked if anyone wanted to provide scores for the JDA Ladder cooling at this time.

Iverson said that Yakama would rank this as a 5. He said that they agree with Conder that there would be some immediate benefits here and it is something that we are fighting every year.

Conder said NOAA would give 5s for all the ladder cooling structures.

Morrill said that Washington agreed with Conder.

- MCN Avian Deterrence
 - Washington: 5
 - Umatilla: 5
 - Yakama: 5
 - NOAA: 4
- IHR Adult Ladder (north) Cooling Structure
 - NOAA: 5
 - Yakama: 4
 - Washington: 3
 - Idaho: 3
 - Umatilla: 4

Iverson said that Yakama gave this a 4 due to funding priorities, realizing that we cannot rank everything a 5, so their 4s are just acknowledging that we need a longer-term funding plan.

Morrill said that Iverson made a good point and Royer could put Washington down as a 4, but Ice Harbor is the first dam on the Snake, and he would like to see it as a 5.

Jonathan Ebel, IDFG, said that he had given this one a 4 as he had always been the one that tends to pre-prioritize. He asked for his score to be revised down to a 3. Ebel said it was because given all the discussion and where the Corps was at on these things that it would be the lowest magnitude of benefit at IHR. He said that this did not mean that he thought that there would not be any benefit, but that other ones should come first.

Morrill said to change Washington's score to a 4. He said that he agreed about the magnitude, but when we talk about Sockeye, the benefits at IHR could be more significant. He said that he was speaking up for Snake River Sockeye.

Ebel said that we are always balancing. Morrill agreed. Ebel said that the temperature differential and temperature blockage at John Day last year was catastrophic to conversion for Fall Chinook and he thought that impact_ Morrill agreed. Ebel said that there are Snake River Sockeye in danger and then whilst looking at or thinking about the social impacts and also impacts to Snake River Fall Chinook but also to fisheries across the basin. Not that fisheries are not limited by Snake River Sockeye, they definitely are in a regulatory sense. Morrill said that Ebel made good points.

Morrill said that Washington would go back to a 3 for Ice Harbor.

○ MCN Adult Ladder (South) Cooling Structure

- NOAA: 5
- Umatilla: 3
- Yakama: 3
- Washington: 5

○ LMN Adult Ladder (South) Cooling Structure

- NOAA: 5
- Yakama: 4
- Umatilla: 5
- Idaho: 5
- Washington: 5

Iverson said that he had a 4 on this one. He said seeing Ebel's score of a 5 made him think that he needed a better understanding of how it fits in the mix of dams because he agreed that we need to be hitting the most important projects that have the least likelihood of barrier. He said that he was giving it a 4, but he was willing to consider a 5 if it was more important.

Ebel said that his 5 could be a 4. He said that at this point he thought that if we were able to gain any benefit at John Day it should be there. He said that maybe that this should be a 4 for him because he knocked Ice Harbor

down to 3. He said that when we looked at this, and we have been talking about this for a few years, and maybe he was misremembering, but he thought what was concluded was that there was a little tiny bit higher of a difference between, when looking at the thermal gradient at Lower Monumental when you reach down with a pipe or snorkel you would get a little bit cooler water to even the temperature differential out than you would at Ice Harbor. He said that he was not sure if he was saying that correctly at all.

Conder said that he understood what Ebel was saying. He said that it was true that there is more water there to reduce that differential. He said that one thing that folks needed to consider was that the differential and its value was not the only issue. He said that he thought that just like with John Day you do not have a lot of cool water available but there is a lot of importance there of grabbing the relatively cool water and not just reducing the differential but also reducing the temperature that gets above 74°F, or 78°F sometimes at John Day. He said that he did not think that in some cases that it was the differential that was causing those blockages, it is the extreme maximums. While there may not be a lot of cool water available it is taking that extreme maximum and making it a couple of degrees cooler to where now they can pass. He said that was what we are going for at John Day and he thought same thing was true at Ice Harbor. He said that there was not a lot of super cold water to help there but it was relatively enough degrees cooler to edge that maximum down. Some of that was true at Lower Monumental too, but at Lower Monumental you have a little bit more cool water.

Ebel said that he agreed with Conder. He said that he was wondering in terms of prioritization. When fish, the Sockeye turning up towards Priest Rapids, we do not know if those fish are approaching Ice Harbor and approaching the ladder and are then turning around and leaving. Those individual fish have the opportunity to turn around and go back to the cooler water in the Columbia and go somewhere else. One of the things at Lower Monumental is if they get above Ice Harbor is they are trapped, unless they want to fall back over Ice Harbor. If they go up to Lower Monumental, if temperatures were a reason at Ice Harbor that they are going to reject the ladder, then where are they going to go. He said that he was trying to think like a fish. He said that was a thought that he had and would put out there into the record. From a *why fish do...* standpoint, why are they doing it and try to give them options to at least try to survive.

Lorz said that from Umatilla's priority he thought that the Corps probably could probably do two a year. The top two for them are Lower Monumental and John Day, so Lower Monumental gets the other 5. And then Ice Harbor and McNary are the next tier. That was the rationale for why some got 5s, 4s, or 3. He said that the most extreme differentials seemed to be at Lower Monumental and John Day and they also have some of the highest temperatures and that was what made the most sense to them and what they are sticking with. If the Corps could do more, awesome, please do more and please put them in a budget, get ignored, we are good at that.

Conder asked if Lorz said Lower Monumental had the highest temperatures. Lorz said highest differentials. Conder said that he encouraged him to look at the maximum temperatures because it is extreme at Ice Harbor and that is part of the reason they are rejecting.

Lorz said that it is and honestly, he would like to do all of them if possible. He said that he was working his way down the System, we got Lower Granite and Little Goose done, and then he would not want a blockage at Lower Monumental even if we get them past Ice Harbor. He said that it sucks, we should do them all, we should have had them all done, but we are unfortunately in this weird new financial world where he does not even_ He said that this was a wish list really, our Santa Claus wish list we are putting here. So, he is not going to totally stress myself out on this because he did not know if this is even going to get noticed or yet considered in this strange world we are in. He said that he would encourage people to not lose too much sleep or too much blood pressure increases over this.

Conder said he guessed we hope that Jake's bubbler system works.

Morrill said that he agreed with Lorz' assessment so match his scores with Washingtons.

- Bonneville Spillway Rock Wall
 - Umatilla: 4
 - Yakama: 4
 - Washington: 4
 - NOAA: 3

Lorz said from a need's standpoint it is a 3, but from a Corps' standpoint he would think they would want this to be a 5 so they could stop having to spend O&M dollars on this. He said that it was kind of a weird one. He said that he would give it a 4.

Iverson said that he would give it a 4, for slightly different reasons, they just think that it needs to get done but as previously said they would give it a 4 but it was not that they do not want to get it done.

Morrill said Washington was the same.

Conder said that for this wish list at this point NOAA was just ranking the cooling. NOAA wants to emphasize those for the wish list so that was where they were going to leave it. Lorz asked if Conder thought that this was even worthy of a wish list, did he think that this should even be on the list. Conder said not for FY27, not given where we are at. He said that he thought it was a waste of time. Lorz said that was interesting, he was trying to save O&M dollars which seem to be critical.

Conder said that he would like to clarify his point there. He was not saying that it was not important but given the funding scenario that we are in and if we could get an additional item or two or three out of these dollars, he would like the focus to be on ladder cooling and not the other things. If we have an opportunity to get the other stuff than we could talk but he was just not seeing it.

Lorz asked Conder to remember that through lobbying last year we got a pretty good chunk put in and he would strongly encourage_ because we could probably get more than_ because the Corps cannot do all of these_ There is no way that they could get all of these done in one year. But if we have excess dollars Lorz thought it was important to give the Corps guidance of where those should go because last year they got extra money in and where some of those dollars went may not have been where most of us would want them to go. He said that he thought it would behoove us to

give the Corps guidance that if extra dollars come, say people are successful in lobbying, he would like that down on paper that people are saying that this was where the money should go. He said that he would encourage that and if you do not think that was important, that is your decision, but he thought having it down on paper of what is important has some relevance.

Conder said okay, he guessed he would rank a few more of these. We would go 4 with McNary avian and 3 with rock wall. He said that he would leave it at that.

Iverson shared a note for the Corps. He said that we really need to have a five- or ten-year work plan here. With certainty for the next year. He said that he understands why we work with FY27, because that was what was coming up. But to see the payout on all of these projects and what the Corps was thinking would be really helpful to see that we can_ He said that it would be better for us to be lining up projects to say okay if we cannot get something done this year, than this is a priority for next year. Whereas another project may be a priority for two or three years down the line. He said that was the value of this prioritization process, but in a one year context, he agreed with Conder, it was like are we undermining our argument we have priority projects because the list is so long that one of the statements from the Power Planning Council is that “if everything is a priority than nothing is a priority.” Well everything is a priority because it all needs to get done if we could lay it out on a longer timeframe, we could make it clear what needs to be done first and that is a real frustration. He said that he did not know how we would go about getting on a ten-year CRFM sort-of budget projection, but he would sure like the Corps staff to be thinking about that.

Erick Van Dyke, ODFW, asked to add something there. He said that from his perspective, urgency is why these are still here. The lack of it. They have been on the list for five to ten years. So, when the Council asks him that it would be helpful to say that we have been working diligently and providing input for decades and these things are continuing to either not be addressed or be addressed but pushed off. So, there is a lot more to it than giving a number.

- JDA MOP study
 - Yakama: 4
 - Umatilla: 4
 - Washington: 4

Lorz said that the biggest impact for travel time is John Day and this is how address it so for Umatilla it is a 4. He would love to have it as a 5 but everything cannot be a 5, even though most of these should be 5s.

Morrill said that he agreed with Lorz.

- Piscivorous Predation Controls
 - Yakama: 3
 - Washington: 3
 - Idaho: 4
 - Umatilla: 4
- IHR Shad Deterrence
 - Umatilla: 2
 - Yakama: 2
 - Washington: 2

Lorz said that we are not exactly having banger results at Lower Granite right now, so he thought a 2 was fine.

Conder said that it was probably not the right forum but that he had a thought on Shad deterrence give the recent results. And maybe we did not quite get it right in that acoustic deterrent could be adjusted and be more effective. The initial run did not look very promising but seeing the Mid-C projects and how they deter Shad and the fact that we run Shad criteria at a lot of our project to pass Shad more effectively. He thought that there are some adjustments in ladder operations we could do that have no effect on Salmon, like maintain Salmon criteria throughout the Shad season, and then work our way down on those project could be an essentially free cost-

effective way to study Shad deterrence. That would be something to think about, and he thought that would obviously be for a different forum but as looking at this ranking there is a potential other solution there to limit Shad movement through the system which would help with the pelican issue. But there is also some problems with that, there are less free nutrients getting into the ecosystem. Some animals are feeding on those, Sturgeon, so we would have to consider that. So, we could potentially look into that too.

Lorz said that it sounded like Conder wanted to set up a FPOM task group.

Conder said yeah, it kind of sounded that way, we need a few more.

Lorz said a couple. He said that he and Conder had talked about this and there could be some discussions in FPOM about maybe we start at Lower Granite and no do Shad mode at Lower Granite and then_ Because you are still going to get some Shad passing but then to figure out what is the happy number and work our way down the system and try to reduce Shad that way and he does not disagree. He said that we should have some thoughts about it and get some smarter people about it.

Royer asked if Chris Peery caught that.

Peery said oh yeah, he was listening to that and he totally agreed.

Morrill said that he agree with Conder and Lorz and Iverson. He said that it was a 2 for now and it did seem that would merit a discussion in FPOM and maybe a task group.

- Jetty Piling to replace rock jetty
 - Yakama: 3
 - Umatilla: 3
 - Washington: 3

Iverson said that he gave this a 4 but he did not know this project and did not know fish benefits versus structural benefits.

Lorz said that he could give Iverson the quick rundown. He said that they used to have a rock jetty there and it was used to help guide fish to the North entrance on Little Goose. It has been washed out twice due to high

flow events. The Corps did some modeling on if instead of doing a rock structure, doing a cylinder, similar to what was done at Ice Harbor, that would actually provide similar benefits, maybe better, without the chance of a rock wall getting washed out. It would mostly help with adult guidance to the Northshore on Little Goose. This one has floundered in O&M for quite some time because it is not inexpensive. He said that we thought it might be something because it was totally new. The cylinders are wildly different than the rock wall so maybe CRFM could be the means to get at it funded or do something different. He said that was why he added it here and Conder could speak more to it too because he had been noticing the modeling and seeing the level. The idea being that it might take some of the pressure of the importance of the South ladder. The South ladder is really what passes the bulk of the fish at Little Goose.

Iverson said that he would change his rank to a 3.

Morrill said that when they were at ERDC the cylinder approach did appear to provide a better flow pattern for guidance to the North ladder.

Lorz said that he was a 3 as well. He would like this to get done sooner than later but again unless Elon Musk is going to start investing into the Columbia Basin, he did not think that the Corps had enough funding to do all of this. He asked if Conder had anything to add because he was also a champion of this for a while.

Conder said if we are in gas cap spill it is pretty important. With the 8-hour flex spill its importance goes down. If we do go uncontrolled spill with high flows its importance goes back up. But we have not gone into that mode for a while now. He said that he thought that 2018 was the last time that we had a really high flow like that. It is helpful in those scenarios to get through fish a bit faster. He said that it is in the proposed action, he would like to remind folks about that.

Lorz asked if Conder wanted to make a bet if it would get done before the BiOp is completed in 2035. He said that he would put a fine bottle of bourbon about its completion before then.

Conder said that it does have some importance.

- Cold Water Refugee
 - Yakama: 4
 - Umatilla: 4
 - Washington: 4
 - Idaho: 1

Ebel said that IDFG was in the place where this needs to be funded elsewhere. He said that he did not know how. He said that he did not say that in his comments.

Lorz said that if Ebel could find funding elsewhere we would gladly take it off this list. We are rapidly running out of locations to find funding for things.

Ebel said with that in mind he guessed maybe put a 1 on it so that Idaho was on the record. He said that it was not an importance thing. It is a quagmire issue.

Sean Tackley, Corps, said that he was ~~kind of~~ wondering if this one ~~even~~ fits with the purpose and intent of CRFM. He said that he understood the interest in the topic but asked for Royer's thoughts on this. ~~He said he was wondering what her thoughts were on that.~~

Lorz said that it is adult migration which he thought was what CRFM is supposed to help with.

Royer said that CRFM is anadromous fish passage.

Iverson said that it is passage through the reservoir that is created by the project.

Ebel said that is where it gets weird. What Iverson just said, CRFM is always focused on the dams and infrastructure on the dams, but projects include the reservoirs so that is why it gets funky. Oh the ghosts of past decisions.

Iverson said an essential element of fish passage through the hydroelectric system. He said that he thought that it needs to be on there.

- Critical Non-Routine Maintenance
 - Umatilla: 3
 - Yakama: 4
 - Washington: 4

Lorz said not that_ it should be higher, but we are not going to have money to do anything else, so the chance that there is going to be money to do this is minute.

Iverson said that he struggled a little bit about why are the projects not on the list in the first place. He said that he was giving it a 4 because we are not funding O&M at an adequate level to keep these non-routine_ to shrink or at least stop the growing list of non-routine maintenance. So to highlight the need for more O&M funding he wanted to give this a 4.

Morrill said that he liked Iverson's comments. He said that he would bite with a 4.

- ERDC modeling
 - Washington: 4
 - Yakama: 4
 - Umatilla: 3

Morrill said that this was another one of those things that we should be doing and each time that they destroy a model we lose the ability to look at real time adjustments and learn from it. He said that he would stick a 4 on it.

Lorz said that he would go 3 from a standpoint, especially when Peery is scheduling these trips in August.

Peery said that he moved it to September.

Lorz said that he gave them two weeks later. He said two weeks in the South.

b. IDFG Additions:

- Efficacy of truck transportation of subyearling Chinook Salmon in the Snake River
 - Umatilla: 2
 - Yakama: 3
 - Washington: 3

Ebel said that truck transport has occurred for a really long time in the Summer and there were Subyearling Fall Chinook that were transported by truck that were incorporated, but not in high proportion, into the consensus study that occurred ending in 2012. To his knowledge that proportion of tags were not taken out and looked at. He said that someone could point it out if he had missed it but he did not know if there had ever been a focused and statistically powerful evaluation of whether fish transport is effective as a management action. And also, in terms of tags, and this is the other part, because at least since 2012, all subyearling PIT tags that are going through the dams are all 'return to river'. So there are no PIT tags going on trucks, there are no PIT tagged fish, or very few PIT tagged fish, going on trucks. So basically, there is a management or mitigation action that has been going on for a very long time that has never been assessed to his knowledge. He asked if that explained the need.

Morrill said that he did not believe that, yeah, during the Summer he thought that was true but NOAA/NMFS did PIT tag Subyearling Falls in September and October prior to Tiffany's retirement, when McEntire and Ken were there. Morrill said that he did recall, but he would have to go back and look for it but they did see a positive benefit to trucking in September and October and higher return rates for those fish at that point in time. He said that he would have to go back and find it but he did recall that being done and he did recall that there actually was a benefit. He said that those were his recollections and he may be wrong but that was what he remembered. He said that maybe somebody else does.

Ebel said if someone knew that and could provide it today, he would like to see it. He said that he recently looked at all_ or he recently pulled a started a quagmire_ He said that he got tackled by a tar-baby of a PIT tag dataset for natural origin Fall Chinook. He said that he looked around because there used to be some barging in July and then that ended, and now there is no transport in July. And he went in to see September and

October tags per transportation but he is using only tags upstream of Lower Granite so he would not have found tags that were implanted at Lower Granite, however he would still have concerns about tags that were implanted at Lower Granite. He said that if someone had that study he would love to see it because he had not seen it but he still thought that if operations are _ since operations are now different in September and October, since there is surface passage now, where there did not used to be, he thought that this should be a priority.

Morrill said that Ebel should give Steve Smith a call. He may recall that work and may be able to provide some guidance on where to find it.

Conder said that he just sent him an email so Conder would send Ebel what he sends back. He said that he was pretty sure that Morrill was right, he thought there was some information and not to Ebel's point that it is a different September operation so it would be worthy of a new look.

Lorz said that he was going to pull the Idaho. He said that he thought this needs to be funded somewhere else because we actually fund the transport research through O&M and it seems like we could pare back some of that current transport seasonal stuff to cover this.

Ebel said yes and shift it to this. Lorz said that is what he would do.

Ebel said that he is deep in some transportation data right now so he has come to the strong conclusion that continuing to assess or compare transport to bypassed fish at Lower Granite Dam is not necessarily for Spring Fish is going to gain us any better understanding than we already have and in that context that money could be shifted to this one where he thought is, it may be not a complete hole in our understanding once we find out from Steve Smith, but we have a much less of an understanding of what is going on. He said that was his pitch, and he did not know how to do that in terms of going with the O&M route and switching. He asked to let him finish his .CSS chapter on some transportation stuff and go from there. He said that was his priority for the next month.

Lorz said that he was giving this 2 but think it is important and he thought that Peery or Chuck Barnes, Corps, when we get the chance to talk, the transport, with the TP Transport Study this should come up at that point and should be added as an objective. He said that fortunately does not have to resubmit his comments because he had not submitted his comments, but he would add this to his comments. He said that they were right that Steve Smith did do a transport study with trucks, it was when we

PIT tagged a boatload of Fall Chinook back in the day, and it was when there was some information on truck but not a lot and it was because not many fish are transported via truck so the confidence intervals if his memory serves but we do not really get reports from NOAA on these kinds of things so it is hard to remember (yes that was a shot). He said that he just remembered that the confidence levels were not teeny.

Morrill said that if his memory was correct, they managed to tag somewhere around 10,000 fish, but he may be wrong on that.

Conder asked if that was part of the surrogate study.

Morrill said no. It was a separate look at the fall migrants.

Lorz said that it would be nice if we actually had a report. Morrill agreed.

Conder said that he asked for a report or pertinent results on the subject. He said that we would see what Smith comes back with and he would send out what he gets.

Lorz said that he did not know, maybe the people that give the contracts out might actually ask the people that they give the contracts to, to actually give the reports to them.

Conder said that he did request this year for SRWG to require a report.

Lorz said that would be delightful. He said that he had not seen one since 2023.

Morrill ranked it a 3 and said that he thought that Lorz' idea of addressing it at SRWG and Conder's of getting the reports out are both spot on.

Barnes said that he wanted to let them know that he was listening and we would be discussing this one again in SWRG seasonal effects.

Peery said that he was not listening at all. He said that he was kidding. He was listening.

Royer said that was the list and thanked all for going through and discussing. She said that she would send it out. She said that if anyone had any adjustments or changes send them to her and she would continue to tweak the sheet.

Morrill said looking at the extended list he would still put the PIT-tag efforts at McNary followed by the cooling waters at the top of his list. He said that was an overall comment to the whole group. He said that they are all important and they all play a role but if he had to chose from that list for one that he would like to see additional funding for those would be the ones that would be at the top of his list.

Next meeting: August 20, 2026

Agenda Topics:

-

Today's Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Ryan Ashcroft	C
Charles Barnes	C
Ian Chane	C
Charles Morrill	WDFW
Kate Self	NPCC
Christopher Peery	C
Samuel Popenoe	C
Ida Royer	C
Sean Tackley	C
Ben Hausmann	B
Tom Iverson	Y
Trevor Conder	NOAA
Tom Lorz	
Jonathan Ebel	IDFG
Erick Van Dyke	ODFW
Christine Peterson	BPA
Andrea Ausmus	BPA Notetaker (<i>recording only</i>)

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