

Columbia River Regional Forum
System Configuration Team Meeting
September 18, 2025
DRAFT 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 Bonnie Hossack at Bonnie.Hossack@noaa.gov. See the final page of these minutes for the list of attendees of today’s meeting.

1. June and July Minutes

- Minutes approved

2. FY26 Budget Update

- Royer did not have any more information to share at this meeting.
- PBud is out.
 - PBud: \$30.05M
 - CRS Allocation: \$12M
 - Original Capability: \$144M
- Royer was seeking feedback about the region’s priorities for FY26.
- Royer said that she would be working within the vertical teams to seek reallocation to fund what was not identified in the PBud and was identified in the ranking spreadsheet.

Trevor Conder, NOAA, asked if that value had changed, or when the last time the CRS value had changed, the \$12M.

Royer said that it was out in PBud, and PBud does not change. As we start the year on October 1, if we are in a Continuing Resolution (CR), it depends on what the guidance is, they put out guidance every year for the budget levels and the CR. It is usually the PBud, the House markup, or the Senate markup whichever is less. She said that we will be held to the \$30M starting the year, if we are under a CR. Royer added that the Congress would theoretically act and pass a budget once they do that budget would be final. There is opportunity for Congress to add

earmarks if they so choose. She said that she thought there was a markup in the Senate that had not left the committee. She said essentially there is an earmark in the Senate but not the House and they have to conference and pass the budget for any of that to happen.

Charles Morrill, WDFW, asked if Congress does not do anything and we do the CR, can we really spend the \$30M. He asked if the Corps had that capability.

Royer said, yes, that would be the budget level that we would have.

Morrill said in that case, at what point in time would we be able to allocate funds for projects that we cannot plan for right now. He said that we are currently working on \$12M. He said if we get stuck with a CR then that is \$18M more to spend. He asked if he understood that correctly.

Royer said no, the \$18M goes to the Willamette.

Morrill asked to rephrase, he said that last year our Appropriation Authority (AA) was \$25M. He said that if we go to CR we are on what we had last year correct.

Royer said no, it's based on PBud.

Morrill asked what the PBud for FY25 was.

Royer said that FY25 was a weird year. We had the election and the Administration changed so we started with a PBud of \$75M but Congress did not pass a budget. It was like a yearlong CR, and they essentially set the CR levels lower and then they went through and parsed out how much the different programs were going to get.

Morrill said that we were at \$75 last year so the CR carrying forward, if they do not have a new budget, would still be last year's level. He asked if that was correct.

Royer said no.

Ben Hausmann, BPA, said if the Administration changed, they are not going that route because the Administration changed.

Morrill said because the Administration changed, we would only be left with the \$12M.

Royer said that they really do not want to give you more money than what you are going to end up with at the end of the year, which is what happened in FY25. She said that we do not want to have to give money back.

Morrill said that we could take it out of the fishways and the fish ladder because we did not get it.

Carolina Andes, BPA, said that they brought up a good point. In FY25, you had a budget that had three different numbers for the budget in FY25.

Royer said that the PBud in FY25 was \$75.2M. She said when we started the year, because it was a yearlong CR, when we started the year, we started at the \$75.2M and we also had Carry-In. So, we started the year with the assumption of a pretty fully funded budget. The CR extended until May when the budget passed. Congress ended up passing a year-long CR. It essentially set the budget at the FY24 level. It was a little different so the PBud ended up not being relevant. When they did the final Corps budget we ended with \$38.98M of FY25 funding, but we also had the Carry-In budget, so the final budget was \$63.5M total for FY25.

Andes asked if we would have by the end of the year, the expenses. To see how much had been implemented.

Royer said that she would share on the sheet once we close out the year where we landed on all of the projects.

Jonathan Ebel, IDFG, said that in prioritizing this, he put numbers down already but in thinking about it how_ He did not want to be prioritizing something, and he did not know whether it applies to start funding something if the availability in FY27 is not there, kind of like how the Spill Evaluations appears to be. Like it is started but now it appears to be dead after one year, after being planned for multiple years. It could potentially happen to a lot of these other projects if it is something that is new. He asked what the Corps impression for capability for out years and what is the probability that the funding will be there to at least continue a major project if it is started.

Royer said welcome to my world where you try to predict the future without any information and then submit a budget for it, it is very tricky. She said who knows for FY27, what can pan out. She said generally what she ends up having to do is make an assumption. She has to assume that we will carry things forward until she hears otherwise. She said what can be done is you can put in notes. Caveat things. Otherwise, it is just an awkward part of that process. And constantly evaluating as you move forward. This SCT sheet is a living document so maybe revisit it as you gain more information.

Ebel said that with \$12M, which is a small amount. The Corps cannot turn around without spending half a million. He asked if it were possible or would it be

helpful to go through this list because the uncertainty of the future be focused on finishing stuff started in prior years, like what is almost over the finish line. He said this would be a strategy from his perspective as a representative of Idaho, he knows how to prioritize this stuff in this situation. He said that was one strategy, with so much uncertainty and the stuff that is close to getting done and then FY27 everything is new but at least the money is all there.

Ian Chane, Corps, said that there is so many unknowns and they would not even get a sniff of what FY27 would be until the PBud comes out next Spring, and that is just the President's Budget. He said that they are not going to get their final Work Plan until... Looking at this year, we were under a CR for the whole year we did not get Work Plan, that was the Work Plan, a yearlong CR.

Royer said that we got our final Work Plan in June.

Chane, said yeah June, so there are so many unknowns, so your priorities are your priorities. The reality that Ebel was talking about was that we are in the unknown until we get into the fiscal year of what is going to happen then we can talk about how we can manage that. He said like what Ebel was talking about was like an active construction project. We cannot leave an active construction project pending. So there are certain things that will need to just happen because of results of the budget but until we get to that point we will not know. He said to him, he felt like it should be business as usual, let's line up the priorities, and then manage the situation as it happens. That is the best that we can do.

Ebel said okay, because he does not track all of these to know exactly where they are in the process.

Royer said that we can run through and talk about the projects.

Ebel asked if it was possible to point out. He said that he knew that cooling structures, are not in effect going to be_ but that is a very high priority for the Fish Managers, but that is pretty early on. He asked if we want to give money to that, the design, the construction. He said that it may be helpful to other folks. He said that he did not want to waste time here, if it was just him.

Royer said that we could run through the list of projects and she could_ and luckily she had some experts to help her, and give an update on where things are at.

Ebel asked what if possible if provided the funding would be functionally completed in FY26.

Royer said to do a quick rundown. She said that they had the sheet open in the room and she sent it out to folks and she is sharing her screen.

3. FY26 Update and Ranking

- Line 3: Post Construction Performance Standard Evaluations
 - PIT Trawl
 - Yearly and funded annually.
 - For FY26, this is for the 2027 field season.
 - Scan for PIT tags at East Sand Island
 - Included because it supports the survival estimate.
- Line 4: Avian Island PIT Detection
 - See above

Tom Lorz, Umatilla/CRITFC, asked if Royer, as requested at the last SCT meeting, had been able to coordinate with BPA because BPA has their own contractors collecting PIT tags on the Megler-Astoria Bridge and it seems like there could be a reduction of effort or a money savings if you have one do both instead of paying two contractors to collect PIT Tags basically within 3 km of each other. He asked if that had been able to go anywhere or if it had BPA said no. He said that he was guessing that, because he thought that the Corps would love to have BPA do it, and BPA probably said no.

Royer said that BPA was not taking on new scope right now. She said that the short answer is that BPA is not taking on changes in scope right now,

Lorz said that is unfortunate, because we are spending more than we need to right now and in these conditions of ridiculously reducing budgets, saving money should be a priority but he guessed he would have to go to yell at BPA.

Erick Van Dyke, ODFW, added that this was a topic that we had been talking about for quite a long time and it is something that the Fish Managers had indicated that they believed was mandatory. He said that he did not think that there had been any movement towards that notion. He said that he wanted to say it again, and it seemed appropriate given the importance of this activity, whether it was contracted with 12 people or 1. He said that Lorz' points were good ones and he agreed with them. He said that he knew that Royer could not do anything about that, he just wanted her to hear it.

- Line 5: CRS Spill Evaluation
 - Funding a Year 2 study.
 - There is an economy act order and we have to order tags.
 - Often this would be funded and the study would happen the next year. It would be a 2027 study.

Ebel asked if funding was allocated through CRFM it would not go into tags.

Royer said no, it is for the full study but the tags have a lead time to them to manufacture.

Ebel said for the data that was collected this year, he asked if obtaining the model results was included in the contract for the end of FY25. Like would we see what those results are because it said in the notes that the Corps put down, “lower priority in FY26 due to time for data review and recalibrating study objectives based on results”. He asked who was getting paid to review the data, and what data are they reviewing. He asked if that was the raw data, the survival model output. He asked what was that and who is doing it.

Chuck Barnes said that for the 2025 study the Corps funded the entire study, from data collection to data analysis and reporting. He said USGS’ activities in FY26 are reporting on this year’s results. He said what is on the sheet for FY26 is the second year of a lamprey study or the spill study.

Royer said the spill study, the lamprey is separate.

Barnes said that what was on the sheet would be the second year of data collection, analysis, and reporting.

- Line 6: CRS Environmental Compliance
 - NEPA effort
 - The Corps considers this mandatory.
 - Continues FY26

It was noted that this was not anticipated in FY24 so it was not budgeted for at that time.

There was a question about the sheet having a value of \$7M, Royer said that was for FY25.

There was a question about if it was mandatory why there was not a line item there. Royer said that even though they are able to show the capability for the line

items, it was not budgeted so they do not have a capability listed. It was described as a “need” in FY26.

There was a question about continuing into FY27. The idea would be to initiate the contract and keep the process moving. There are discussions happening at high levels. When the RCBA was rescinded it had them work with CEQ to rescind but then there was some sort of NEPA and that is what is being worked out right now.

Van Dyke said on the mandatory point, it seemed like we tried to draw it out the last time we talked. He asked if there was any way to get an indication of how the mandatory items are playing in. He said that it seemed like this one in particular, the Program Management_ somewhere in there, it is basically the same kind of content. Needing to pay for things that are going on with the CRS environment of compliance that fell in and out of these worksheets from his memory depending on what year we are talking about. He said that it seems like there was some inter-discussion going on but when that is decided he asked Royer to tell them what the Corps is using mandatory for. He thought it might be helpful.

Royer said that she thought that mandatory is the Corps’ way of sharing and being transparent about the things they feel are “must funds” and that they are going to prioritize regardless of ranking. So their Program Management account funds their administrative costs for Royer to talk to SCT today and for the Corps’ Budget folks to actually manage the money. Royer said that she considers that mandatory. If we are going to have a program, we are going to need people to administer the program. She considers that mandatory because without that we do not have a program. She said that she is going to fund that and it is not up for debate. That is what the Program Management accounts are for. The Environmental Compliance, Royer is being told “thou must fund”, so she is being transparent that whether or not we fund that is off the table, that decision has been made. The mandatory helps her share that in SCT that we are going to fund that and then they also consider construction oversight, so if we fund a construction effort in one year, and that construction is happening the next winter maintenance season, legally we have to oversee that contract and so that is also mandatory because that is also a legal requirement. We are not going to not fund that, so that is also considered mandatory. Those are the bins that are considered mandatory.

Conder said that he gets that, there are things that have to be done, so they are considered mandatory. But what he does not get it that we have a total of \$12M for CRS, and then the items selected to be funded, which he agrees there are a lot of good ones that the Corps chose, but that total is \$12M, so that does not leave any funding for the mandatory line items.

Royer asked if he was talking about the PBud.

Conder said yeah, which is what we are going to go with maybe.

Royer said that the PBud is what the Administration has identified for funding. They are basing that off the budget submission that we submitted two years ago. She said in those two years, understanding of costs change, and we are also expecting to execute the entire \$12M. When we submitted the budget 2 years ago we thought we would potentially be constructing ladder cooling structures, we are not there yet we just completed the EDR, so we are not going to be able to execute the \$3M on MCN ladder cooling. So we are working to have conversations about whether or not we can potentially put that money on other things to execute that money. That is why this ranking process is important but we want to understand where the priorities are if we are able to shift the money around.

Conder said that what he gathered from Royer there, is that the design of MCN ladder cooling is not really \$3M, that would have been the construction. So the design might be like half a million or something. So some of those funds would get shifted.

Royer said exactly.

Conder said that it makes sense.

Van Dyke said what was difficult to understand right now is what the mandatory percentages of cost will be associated with what was available with the capabilities, not providing us any information on that it is hard to understand what we are working with. He asked if that was because Royer does not know what some of the empty cells, or the not budgeted/mandatory items would cost or was that because they were asked to not include it.

Chane said what the sheet showed was the PBud so like Royer said there are some things on there, this was developed two years ago, the \$3M is a good example, that the world has changed since then and we are obviously are not going to be able to use that funding for that project. So our process is that if we have to reallocate the funds to the different projects we have to get approval for that so what he will be doing is working with the reallocation that is based on the priorities that we have here, and that is why it is really important, like Royer said, to get the priorities to come up with a reallocation plan for this. But they have to get it approved all the way up the chain vertically. Once that happens then Royer can come back and say these are our capabilities but we cannot share that externally until we get approval for that. And so they are working on that and it is

why this meeting is important because they are trying to assess the priorities of what people want them to get the work done and then they will combine that with what we can actually do, because like Royer said, we have to execute. We have to make sure that we can execute the funding that we put on there as well. That takes some time to figure out what for workload, workforce. He said that if people are aware we definitely lost staff so there is a lot to consider on this. Bottom line they cannot share any changes in FY26 until they get that vertically aligned. And then it is critical that at this point that we have that alignment. If we do not have that it starts causing problems with the program.

Van Dyke said that this is fiscal year, correct, so we are talking about FY26. He asked how many days do we have left until that changes.

Chane said two weeks.

Royer said that they are having a lot meetings.

Chane said that they are having a lot of meetings and a lot of data calls. They are working a lot as they go into the fiscal year. So they are trying to get it lined up before October 1.

Van Dyke said he knows that for them it is painful, he was sure. He said that he had no doubt about that. He said it was not fully informed for us is part of the problem and that is just the way it is.

Royer said that she understood.

Chane said that it was problematic for them too. They have had a change in the Administration. They just had a change in the ASA they just put into office, or put into the position. He is brand new as of two or three weeks ago. We have had some delays just because of the Administration change and waiting for an Assistant Secretary of the Army to be put in place as well. So that is why_ He hears Van Dyke on that but it has been just as wonky for us.

Royer said that she hoped that next month the curtain could be revealed.

There was more discussion about scope and the difficulty to get contracts out so close to the end of the fiscal year. The decision on the RCBA also slower things down. The Corps is currently trying to reconfigure and get alignment. The plan is still to execute but there is a lot of uncertainty.

- Line 11: Estuary Habitat Studies
 - Estuary Habitat Studies – Acoustic Monitoring

- Some of the studies that SRWG would like to do if there was some acoustic monitoring, piggy-backing on the spill evaluation so the timing needs to match.
 - Estuary Habitat Studies – Prey Studies
 - Estuary program is funded each year.
- Line 12: BON PIT Detection
 - Awarding a contract this year to finish the prototype – hopefully today (09/18).
 - Next year once they finish fabricating the shielding component they can install.
 - Would be a good one to prioritize to finish.

Royer was asked if we know how much the install would cost. Royer said that she would have that next month as part of the Corps' capabilities.

- Line 13: The Dalles East Fish Ladder Emergency Auxiliary Water Supply
 - The team is wrapping the design and are going to pause before construction.
 - For FY26 the next increment of work would be to award construction contract.

Morrill asked if the AWS was a two part deal. He said that we talked about how they needed to be separated to do part one and then the major rebuild as part two.

Royer said no, this was the debris removal system for the AWS at TDA.

Morrill said that he thought that he might be getting the different projects confused.

Royer asked if he was maybe thinking JDA Fish Passage.

Conder said that he did not know of one that was separated.

Morrill said that they had to separate them to do both parts. The initial correction to fix the initial problem and then they were going to go in and do the rebuild. It was separated.

Through additional discussion they thought that was the fish pumps. Royer said that the AWS was just the one contract. The fish units cannot be done more than one at a time but the AWS work needs to be done even before any of the fish unit

work can be done. First part was to put the AWS in place to begin with. Then they needed to screen for debris and then the fish unit.

Lorz asked if they would report back to FFDRWG because some members submitted comments a year ago on the final design. Anthony McCain reached out and then he retired and Lorz guessed that they are moving forward but he had not gotten a response back through FFDRWG. He asked if there were still people working on that or was it down to one person.

Royer said that there was still a PDT and they are working to wrap up and put it on a shelf. She said that Jacob MacDonald was there and they would put it on the next FFDRWG agenda.

McDonald said regardless of what the PDT has been up to Lorz does deserve responses to his comments so he would find the comments and make sure that he is responded to.

Lorz said that they are going down the road of an amazingly large oversized Atlas polar that has not been used anywhere else in the world so he is a little leary that we are going to be highly dependent on unproven technology.

McDonald said that he did remember Lorz' comments and he did remember forwarding them on to the PDT but he did not remember responding to the comments so he said that he would make sure that it gets done.

Ebel said this is one of those that is a step in the larger process. [unintelligible]

Royer said that they are scheduled to go out. The fish pump redo is funded under a different program but she thought that the timeline was pushed to 2030-something so she thought that we have a couple years of float in the schedule. She said that the concern is that if you wait too long, you get a whole new team and there is a little bit of rework that ends up happening. She said that she gets nervous when you push things out too far but we do have a little bit of room here.

- Lines 17, 21, 28, 29: Ladder Cooling
 - Bundled in the design phase initiated in FY25.
 - Wrapping up the EDR.
 - FY26 would be to continue the design for the Ladder Cooling structures and starting the design phase of the selected alternative.

[Notes from this point on are mostly summary as the acoustics of the room made it difficult to hear]

Conder asked why some projects had a value (LMN and MCN) but JDA and IHR do not. Royer said that was what they chose to fund in the PBud. Conder said it seemed to him that the values that they have on MCN and LMN are high, so why could not the values be lowered and include all four Projects since it is a design phase. Royer said that they can, when we submitted the project they were all very high because we were going to construct all of them. Because they had \$12M this was how they decided to parse it out. So when we look at what things are actually going to cost next year and how we might spread the \$12M Royer thought we would do that. Conder asked if she was not allowed to show that at this point in time. Royer said no. Conder asked when would we see a breakout. Royer said that they should be able to show it next month. Chane said that they have meetings next week. They have been working these numbers for a while. Conder said that he was getting a better picture of what they were doing.

There was a discussion about whether the next step in the process was an in-house design.

There was also a discussion about the prioritization of Walla Walla District over Portland District. Ebel said not to prioritize all of them is to prioritize none.

Ebel asked if we were to put all of the money into one, would it be possible to get one of them done. Royer said it depends on how much work a team could do in a year. There is a point where you could put all the money in the world, and you are not going to be able to move faster. The prioritization discussion continued. Someone said that it would be like choosing your favorite child. They were told to prioritize when setting the priorities and it would show whether they should focus on one versus another. It would help the Corps. There was a discussion about some wanting MCN over LMN, but the group wanted them all. Looking to see if there was a broad design that fits everywhere would save money and time. There was conversation about nuances at each of the Projects that might make that difficult. Where the prioritization will really come down to will be when we start construction and if we do not still have the resources to do all of them at once, we will need to decide which we are going to do.

Van Dyke said that this was a difficult topic because there was two designed and implemented so the conversation over the last decade turned on the notion that we can design it so that it works at each of these different places but the details that were problematic were specific to each of the places. So why are we designing something that has already been implemented if you are not identifying and designing it specific to work at the place that you are talking to. Conder said that he thought that we can improve upon some of the current designs, which was one reason. There was some additional discussion about how they are looking for a

better solution and that they were always on the look for alternatives as we evaluate. It was why they do EDR.

Van Dyke asked if the new designs were moving to some different structure. He asked if the foundational idea was changing from what was applied elsewhere. He said that it had not been shared elsewhere. Conder said that they had considered all sorts of stuff in there, like bubblers, like totally different concepts. The group shared that the drafts could be found on the FFDRWG website. Van Dyke said that he was unable to look at that yet. He asked if the draft DDR was at 30%, 90%, or what percent was it. Royer said that it was at 90%. The room agreed and said it was at Draft – Final. They were looking at it on the FFDRWG website. Van Dyke asked if the Draft – Final was using exploratory ideas to implement at the different places. He said that he would look at it closer.

Ebel said that it said continue design, so basically Draft-Final engineer's Design Report, what was the final 'D' in DDR. Royer said it was the Design Documentation Report, and it is when you take the alternative and start to design it. Ebel asked if it were more accurate for FY26, that this would drop out the EDR and have the DDR be the focus. The \$4M being allocated to that, he said that he was not sure how much that would cost. Royer said that the \$4M was intended for construction and we are nowhere near that.

Conder asked for FFDRWG if we could go back over those, since we are at 90% he asked if it were appropriate to go back over the designs and get regional feedback. He was told that they should have a final report out in the next few weeks and they would share that and go over that. Royer said that she thought that we should also talk about the bubbler system. There was a discussion about how they were looking at other options that were not even covered in the EDR and Brian Lawry was involved.

Lorz said that as he understood it the 90% Report was out but the Corps was looking at alternatives that were not really in there so it was more of a living document. Chane said that they were in the report, in the alternatives but tweaking the specific_. Royer said essentially they want to take_ the bubbler systems are really cheap, so they want to put one in and test it a little bit while they continue the normal process. She said that was what was being discussed and they will talk about it at FFDRWG. Lorz said that was news to them and when they are at 90% to have something like this pop up it may be an indication that our coordination is not as it should be. He said that it should be at a 50% or 60% discussion, 90% is getting a little late in the game. Royer said that this was a recent development, the team was excited about potentially having a cheap alternative. She said that they will talk about it more at FFDRWG.

Van Dyke said he was looking at the site for FFDRWG reports that were available, and he was not seeing one on the JDA cooling structure. Someone told him that Jake would send him_. Van Dyke said to say that he could get to it is not just quite the same thing. They sent him that location right away via chat. Van Dyke said it was just that we [Fish Managers] have been running downhill and they get told that this thing had been available and has been it is hard for all of us to reconcile. He said that he was with Lorz on this. He said that there is a lot of detail that seems to be happening without regional coordination, or at least the region is not aware of it well enough for us to stay on top of it. He said that it might be the Fish Managers' fault, it is true, he was not going to argue that point to whoever was having issues in the room, but the reality is that _ time and we are trying to do our best as well, and he hoped that they could understand that.

There was more discussion in the room about funding for CRS. There was a comment about the Critical Maintenance List, there was an item for new barges. There was the understanding that the Corps had requested funding through WRDA. They were told that the Corps does not typically receive funding from WRDA. It was possible that there was a misunderstanding. An example given was Chris Peery with the acoustic shad deterrent.

Conder said that one way to look at it is that it was that we found out about this late, pass the 90%, but what if it is the best idea ever for passing fish, we do not want to ignore it. He said that he did not think that this was it, he felt concerned about a bubble curtain because they have been used to deter fish, but maybe. We will take a look, he just wanted to make sure that it is thoroughly evaluated and not just selected because it is cheap and it kind of gets to it. We want to make sure that it goes through the same process.

Royer said that she thought that the topic needed more FFDRWG discussion. Chane said that he would make sure that Ryan came to the next FFDRWG to be able to share what was going on there.

- Line 18: John Day Mitigation
 - Report; Planning study for alternatives
 - Continued effort
- Line 19: John Day Fish Turbine Pump U1 & U2
 - This was not budgeted because we started planning the fish asset projects in FY25.
 - This is a long-term solution for the fish turbines, there is a separate O&M short-term solution.

- For continued design.

Andes said that she was concerned about the JDA Fish Turbine Pump, Unit 1 and 2. She said that Royer said that it was not budgeted. Andes asked if it would be budgeted for FY26.

Royer said yes that the Corps was tracking that as a high priority need.

Andes said that she was wondering if they would bring it in front of the large capital group.

Royer said no that it was not a BPA project anymore.

Andes asked her for clarification.

Royer said that once the Corps brings a project into CRFM, they would not flip flop and that was a line that they were holding. Under fiscal law, you cannot chase money for what is convenient, you budget for what is needed for each account. Until the decision was made that it was appropriate for CRFM to fund fish assets the negative side is if CRFM does not get funded, the projects do not get funded. They are in the program now and there is no flip flopping, the Corps' Resource Management was very clear.

Ebel said with everything surrounding the fish pumps, and they are designed. The fish pumps are in bad shape, and he sees the memos go by saying that one is out here and there. He asked how close the Corps were to having a full, failure resulting in a long-term outage. He asked which project that risk is the highest at.

Royer said that she would not be able to speak to that.

Ebel said again from a prioritization standpoint, where are the risks the highest, wherever it is most likely to fail in a way that completely blocks fish passage is absolutely Idaho's priority. He said that it would rise to the top. It would be a 7 or a 10 if he had an understanding of how close some of them might be.

Royer said they are both in pretty bad shape, so she thought that they are trying to push both pretty hard.

Chane said that they also base it on how old each system is. The older ones will likely need attention first.

Ebel said that it depends on the design.

Chane said that they are doing maintenance, there is a like an O&M to maintain them until we can replace them.

Ebel asked which one, again low budget, which one is the worst or which one is most likely to _ He said that he could tell them that he _ Because if one of these fails and fish get stopped at like JDA, there are people in Idaho that would lose their minds. There would be struck up at the Capitol. He said that is absolutely a priority. He asked if the region could get some information on the lifespan. He said that it was probably out there but he relies on Lorz and Conder for these things because he is engineering inept.

Conder said that they are generally redundant, there are two _

Ebel said that at one point he had talked to Ken Fone about the pumps at IHR were shot.

Conder said that is where you start to really risk it.

Ebel said that he knows that in his mind he cannot track it. He said that one of them are not like the others and he felt like the obvious should be addressed first, but he just did not know

Conder said that we need to catch up on a lot of them.

Morrill said after listening to Ebel and Conder, the what if's if we do have a catastrophic issue with fish passage, what happens with the process, how quickly can we move to address the issue. He asked if there was a fall back plan of what we could do or what we would try to do.

He was told that there was emergency operations in the Fish Passage Plan, or at least portions, but if you lose the whole system.

Chane said that it was highly unlikely that you would lose the whole system, you would lose pieces at a time. He said that the part that was valid, was you lose a piece but you have a back up to put in place quick.

Ebel said at what point_ you know you are losing a piece here, a piece there, at what point is the whole thing compromised. He said where it truly breaks is where passage is compromised.

Conder said that he was trying to avoid that.

All agreed.

Conder said that it worried him, with what Royer had said, that we had gone with CRFM so now we are stuck with CRFM for the pumps. If CRFM gets down funded for the next ten to eight years then we are stuck there and we really start to

have a problem. He said that would be when we would elevate to whoever made that decision and say we should reconsider that idea.

Chane said that the flip side of that is that it is not standard O&M, that is non-routine O&M, and non-routine O&M is hard to get funding for. We struggle to get our standard O&M funding in place, so there is a risk on both sides to get funding. He said regardless if it is CRFM or O&M same risk.

Morrill said that he appreciated that but when it comes to down to it, if we have that issue, how do we address it and how quickly can we address it because the region is not going to be happy if we cannot get fish past The Dalles Dam.

Chane said right, that they would do their best to get an emergency repair in place, they would do their best to get things running again. He said that he would follow up on this to see if they have any information from their OCA, their condition assessments on pumps and see if they are_ But his opinion is that they take this information from a group that works their fish assets. They are the ones that identify when these things need to be dealt with, and they are pushing these projects forward. He said that he was trusting them, in the sense, that these are the ones that you really need to do. Because they are the ones tracking, and the Corps is not going to express capability for something to replace, unless we really need to. That is what it comes down to with them. He said that it tells him that these are critical, that they were the two primary ones to be looking at. He said that he would follow up.

Ebel said that he trusts that Chane_ He just wanted to know that from him putting numbers on a spreadsheet that from Idaho's perspective that would be information that he would like to know so that he can say from IDFG's standpoint, this is something that should be prioritized. He said that he trusted that the Corps had that information and will make good decisions_

Van Dyke said that on that detail, it was not that folks were not being in their evaluations of what to request and why. It was more that region has come to realize that it was just a request. He said how it was prioritized later, he was not sure that it fell into this group's ability to actually motivate or change when the group that is being trusted, and is on the ground can request something at it too can be put off or not invested in. He said that was the realization. He said that they were trying to get some ideas on how to help actually influence what is going on there so that there is some reinforcement, and he was not sure that had been worked out either. He said that it was not trust about what folks are recommending, it was about all the different players that are involved in trying to recommend and provide some support for the importance of investing in these

details. He said that nobody here should be able to change that so it should not derail what we are talking about.

- Line 22: MCN Avian Deterrence
 - One of the many that were in EDR or design phase, in FY26 we are continuing that process.
 - Includes the avian deterrence at MCN.
- Line 23: MCN PIT Detection Improvements
 - Finishing the EDR now, and for the DDR in FY26
- Line 24: MCN Spillway Modeling
 - Did much of the work in FY25
 - FY26 should be mostly closeout, wrapping up reporting.

Andes asked if Royer knew where all the videos associated with the projects, or if they could share it. She was told that Chris Peery had a lot of that on the website.

- Line 25: MCN Fish Pump System Upgrade
 - See Line 19
- Line 26: MCN South Fish Ladder and Collection Channel Rehab
 - Connected to the fish pumps; components in the collection channel part of the water system tied to the fish pumps.
 - New fish asset project
- Line 2*: IHR Turbine Post-Construction Evaluation
 - Evaluating the new IHR Turbine for how they are performing for fish passage and survival.
 - New Study.
- Line 30: LMN Adult Channel and North Entrance Diffuser Grating
 - Includes replacement and the adult collection channel on the entrance.
- Line 32: Lower Granite Turn Pool Gate
 - In FY25 they purchased materials.
 - FY26 would be the installation.

Royer was asked if they were going to do that. She said that they were planning on it. She was asked if the installation was CRFM funds. She said yes.

- Line 33: Lower Granite Shad Deterrence
 - FY25: They did a little work

Royer said that she was not tracking it very closely. She said that they had done a little work in FY25.

She was told yes, and with exciting and promising results. The Ops folks would have to talk more about it because they were not able to speak any more to it themselves.

Royer said that it would be to finish off that task.

Ebel asked if it was still prioritized, he said that turn pool gate was also a shad deterrent in a way but walleye. We need to stop walleye.

4. Future Steps

- Royer said that if people want to tweak their rankings at any point to send them to her and she would update the spreadsheet. She said that she would send it out each month before the meeting.
- She said next month she would have more information to share and we would be able to get into the details.

Royer was asked a question. They said that some of the projects were linked so would it be worth making notes in the spreadsheet. They said that if money were to come available then the prioritization could be to link projects. The spillway evaluation is linked to the estuary acoustics monitoring for example. They asked if it were worth noting that some of these projects were worth noting that some of the projects are working hand in hand.

Royer said that she tried to put that in the Corps' notes.

They said that they thought that it was worth noting the synced projects. When looking at the short list versus the expanded list, when money becomes available

what gets prioritization, do you use the ranking that SCT created, or is there a new list that _.

5. Other

Ebel asked if anyone knew if there were status reports on the fish pumps available to be shared, or was the knowledge of failing parts only exist in the heads of projects.

Royer said that they have project delivery teams assigned. She said that she was not familiar with what reports they have or what was available. She said that she suspected that since the fish assets are kind of a new part of the program, she felt like they had not figured out a very good process. She said that they should be able to share reports with FDDRWG, they are still going through that design process. She said that she was not sure _

Ebel said there had been design but what he was asking was what was the current state of the field, or status, or the health of the pump. He said that he was not familiar enough with the history. He said that the fish pumps have been on this list since he started. They have been on there for like 5 – 6 years. He was asking questions because did not know where to look to inform himself regarding the questions.

Someone said that it was kind of in a gray area between FPOM and FDDRWG.

Royer said that we need to decide where it belongs because it is CRFM funded, does that make it automatically FDDRWG. She said that is a design.

Someone asked if that was what FPOM was for, where the Corps reports on the status of the systems.

Ebel asked if it existed in writing or not.

Someone said that for the condition of pumps, the chief of ops is going to have, they do annual PMs and three-year PMs. They write down what they note on those, so the chief of ops is going to have that information. Whether or not they will distribute to anyone they were not sure. They said that Ebel might be able to get some kind of qualitative assessment or something like that but they may not give the data.

They are looking to see whether they have three years left on the pumps or ten years left on the pumps kind of information. Ebel said or this pumps has five parts that are projected to fail in two years, or that one had three parts, or that pump is

going to fail. He said that it goes back to which one is going to cause mayhem in the region because if adult fish get blocked at a dam, already the operations displace possibly due to spill. He said to imagine if ladders fail, heads are going to explode and others will roll. He said that he was worried about the optics. He said that the Corps would hear from Idaho's Governor's office within hours. He said that he wanted to absolutely avoid something like that. He said that was why he was asking something like that.

Royer said that she thought that someone at the projects, like David Miller maybe.

Ebel asked who had the skill to look across projects. He said that he did not.

McDonald said that it is also something across two districts, so it is difficult. He said that Ebel to take it to FPOM and get Chris Peery to get something. He said that he thought that everyone was aware of that concern. They are not smoking right now as we speak, they are kept in a condition that they are operating. They want to keep the condition at a high standard.

Van Dyke asked if McDonald could ask to include if it is non-routine or routine O&M.

Morrill said that he thought they had this discussion at FPOM in the past where Tammy was working on putting together a list of critical parts and spare parts. He asked if anyone else remembered.

Conder said that there was the critical unfunded list.

Morrill asked if it included parts and equipment.

Ebel said that it was at a cooling pump, for having parts on hand. HE said that kind of died. He said that he knew what Morrill was talking about.

Morrill said that we have something started and it can be sort of a starting point.

Van Dyke said that he felt like that happened around the time that MCN had to use the emergency bypass and we had concerns. It included the notion of having parts on [hand](#).

Next meeting: October 16, 2025

Agenda Topics:

-

