

Columbia River TDG AMT Meeting  
11/01/07  
Oregon DEQ Headquarters

Attendance: See list at end.

Action Items for the next meeting (listed in bold in the meeting notes):

- Notify Ecology/ODEQ of studies that the literature review missed (send by December 4, one week before the next meeting)
- Notify Ecology/ODEQ of literature review summaries that are missing key information (send by December 4, one week before the next meeting)
- Bring to the next meeting information on how much more water would be spilled (at which dams) if 115% was eliminated (send by December 4 if possible).
- Bring to the next meeting the methodologies to calculate how many more fish would go over the spillway if the 115% was eliminated (send by December 4 if possible).
- Bring to the next meeting the methodologies to calculate the resulting increase in fish survival (send by December 4 if possible).

Meeting Notes:

Introductions

Overview of AMT

Role of AMT members

Deadlines for technical input: One week prior to next meeting

Goal is to have one proposal between OR & WA, but this may not be possible due each States unique legal requirements.

Two main issues with the AMT, in sequence:

1. 115% forebay TDG monitoring req
2. Location of tailrace monitors

Sequence of Events

Overview of CWA and state regulations

TMDLs identified dams as primary source of TDG in system

Beneficial uses for Columbia River are designed to protect most sensitive beneficial use – fish & aquatic life

The TDG TMDL allows for the EQC to issue TDG waiver for modified water quality standard.

OR TDG waiver

In future, one waiver will be issued to feds

New waiver does not include Camas-Washougal

OR & WA measure TDG slightly differently

OR: 12 highest hours in a day

WA: 12 highest consecutive hours in a day

12 highest consecutive hourly readings – change for WA next year

Discussion on how WA defines a day - Andrew will provide more information on this at upcoming meeting.

Explanation of TMDLs

115% and 120% are not in OR water quality standards, they are a modification granted by the ECQ to the Federal Government

Why do we have to use 110% during the whole year?

ACOE wanted to know: Why can't we use 115%-120% during fish passage season and 110% the rest of the year?

110% is defined by EPA

Oregon does not anticipate reviewing the TDG standard in the near future

ACOE said they would meet ESA and CWA –

Oregon wanted to know if ACOE will still do transect studies?

ACOE: Yes, probably. ACOE is working towards lowering TDG, but with current systems that will be difficult.

States will be flexible with dates on when to meet TDG standards – goal is 2020, but it is flexible...maybe 2030 may be more appropriate

States want improvement over time and a commitment from ACOE

Issue #1 – Need and location of 115% forebay TDG monitoring – see document on website

Literature Review – biological impacts of eliminating 115%

**States want to know if there are studies that were missed – BEFORE NEXT MEETING**

**States want summaries to be reviewed for missing information – BEFORE NEXT MEETING**

States are concerned with All species: anadromous, resident, macro-invertebrates, etc...

Mark Schneider – Summaries miss info in articles, need to add interpretation of articles or conclusions that studies draw

The Literature review identifies the Top 5 studies in blue, next important in green  
WDFW and ODFW are providing input on lit review

How many more fish will pass thru if we eliminated 115%? What type of fish? Want info on fish that pass thru and survive.

A risk assessment seems to be the most appropriate method of determination

Margaret will look at numbers of fish that will pass w/out the 115% to lay groundwork

Need info on how much more spill (and where) would there be if 115% was eliminated?

Are current forebay gauges appropriate?

Margaret – wants to discuss history of 115% and what it really means because there seems to be some misinterpretation

Important to get Tribal perspective, Bob should be part of that – get ACOE's perspective as well

What about the concern over Loss of water quantity over time considering Oregon's Oasis project and Washington's Initiative.

Two different issues here:

Spill over dam vs. thru turbine

Other initiatives to take water out and use on farms – this is outside scope of AMT, but if folks have insights, let us know

Agnes wants to know how this would affect management of system

Bob- If you don't have info on macroinverts, for example – how can you make decisions with data gaps?

Andrew – use best info available

Gary – effects with small % of TDG change will be small

Mark Schneider – wants to find original info used in setting standard – need to look at how standard was set and potentially use the same type of info for determining the need for the 115% limit.

Margaret agreed, and does not want to reevaluate 110%, but can look at info used in setting standard

Agnes – want to know how 115% and 120% were set

ACOE is a DMA – Agnes wants to know what have they done to reduce TDG in the system since the 2002 Lower River TMDL

Give perspective on 2010 short term and 2020 long term

ACOE said that the Info is in bi-op

DEQ wants to see commitment from ACOE to implement TDG reduction strategy –

DEQ has asked ACE to provide info to EQC at end of year on TDG –

Will show what TDG changes will occur depending on various projects

AMT is to evaluate past and future TMDL implementation –

Dave wants clarity on what priorities are.

Margaret – thinks we can get agreement on fish numbers, but beyond that there will be differences

Bob – risk assessment – formal documents exist – 1995 doc submitted to DEQ, 2000, and 2004 –

Mark will help Agnes acquire docs

Risk assessment didn't exactly address 115% issue

How were TDG limits discussed in drafting of bi-op? What if we eliminate the 115% limit in the forebay will Bi-Op need to be redrafted?

Gary – assumed that was the upper limit of spill based on state WQ waivers.

Important to know why 115%/120% originally chosen?

Would change preclude biop from being implemented? Don't know..

Gary thinks biop was done assuming we would meet certain levels

**OR and WA want to know how much more water would be spilled if 115% was eliminated (by next meeting).**

Margaret – will put together volumes and volumes by type of spillway (?) Hourly flow

Various ways of looking at volume – ACE use SISTDG (?) to look at volumes

Fish center can find out how many fish pass thru

Gary – depends on dams, efficiency curves, more variables than just where fish go – NOAA will work with ACE to find out numbers of fish passing thru

**Bring methodologies to calculate on how many fish pass thru to next meeting**

**Bring methodologies on increase in survival to next meeting**

Potential Topics for upcoming meeting:

December – lit review, flow issues

Jan - # fish and survival

Feb – OR/WA synthesize

Mar – feedback from AMT

Next meeting: December 13 @ NOAA building – 9 AM

January 8 9 AM @ NOAA

Meetings will be 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of month

Margaret and Gary provided the History of 115%/120% –

115% was to look at chronic exposure of gas on fish, 120% was to look at acute exposure

Info gathered from bioassay from tanks, didn't have much stream data

115% @ tailrace would be best, but it was more impt for chronic vs. acute

So, decided on 115% (acute) for forebay and 120% (chronic) and tailrace

Risk assessment in 95 – felt good that 125 would be ok for salmon, but went back to

120% to be conservative

Didn't know much about depth compensation at that time

Risk assessment based on residents, invertebrates, and salmonids

Attendees:

	Name	Organization
1	Agnes Lut	ODEP
2	Andrew Kolosseus	Ecology
3	Shane Scott	NW River Partners
4	Dan Feil	BPA
5	Rudd Turner	COE
6	Dave Gonsimis	COE
7	Margaret Filardo	FPC
8	David Wilk	USFWS
9	R. Lott Lawrence	Save Our Wild Salmon
10	Bob Heinrich	CRITFC
11	Gary Fredricks	NOAA
12	Waialele Hampton	Chelan County PUD
13	Richelle Beck	D. Rohr & Assoc.
14	Denny Rohr	D Rohr & Assoc.
15	Brandon Chockley	FPC
16	Mark Schneider	NMFS/NOAA
17	John Piccininni	BPA
18	On phone	
19	Ross Hendricks	