

**TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT TEAM
MEETING NOTES
January 31, 2001
CORPS OF ENGINEERS NORTHWESTERN DIVISION OFFICES – CUSTOM HOUSE
PORTLAND, OREGON**

TMT Internet Homepage: <http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/TMT/index.html>

1. Greetings and Introductions.

Trish McCarty, the facilitator for today's conference call, welcomed everyone to the call, held January 31, 2001. The call was chaired by Cindy Henriksen of the Corps.

2. Discussion of Current Power System Emergency.

McCarty reported that the current power system emergency has been extended to February 5. That will run through the next TMT meeting, said Scott Bettin; basically, we wanted to update you about what has been going on. The federal executives are still meeting each week, and the emergency is expected to continue awhile, he said. In terms of current storage project outflow, Bettin said Libby continues to release 10 Kcfs; Dworshak is releasing 6 Kcfs, and Hungry Horse is releasing 2.5 Kcfs.

The current flow at Bonneville is about 135 Kcfs, said Robyn MacKay; BPA is interested in having some discussion of alternatives to drafting Dworshak so heavily at this point in the year. In response to a question, Bettin said one option under consideration is drafting Libby more heavily and reducing the draft at Dworshak. If we back off Dworshak, we may need to bring up both Libby and Hungry Horse, said MacKay. Basically, we would need to make up about 5 Kcfs if we reduce Dworshak outflow to minimum, Bettin said.

The executives would like to develop a longer-term plan, so that they're not having to set reservoir operations week to week, Bettin said. Are the Canadian projects being considered, in terms of our options? Jim Nielsen asked. We're already releasing non-Treaty storage from the Canadian projects, MacKay replied; they have been in proportional draft mode, so we are getting some additional water by essentially front-loading that release.

If we increase flows by even 1 Kcfs from Hungry Horse, we're not going to refill that project this year, said Pat McGrane. What we've been discussing with the Corps is what kind of priorities we want to set for this year – is it even a consideration if Libby and Hungry Horse don't refill to within the top 10 or 20 feet in 2001? McGrane asked.

I think the BiOp calls for a sliding scale of minimum summer flows from those projects, Paul Wagner replied – from 400 cfs to 1 Kcfs from Hungry Horse, and somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 Kcfs from Libby. I think we have some more work to do on those concepts, he said; it's probably not something we can resolve today. Obviously, Dworshak has the most immediate impact on flows and temperatures for summer migrants; for that reason, Dworshak is

a higher refill priority than Libby or Hungry Horse, from a BiOp perspective.

Is Dworshak any better off, currently, than Libby or Hungry Horse, from a refill probability standpoint? Nielsen asked. We have been looking at the probability of refill on June 30 for the headwater projects, Henriksen replied; currently, we're estimating that Dworshak has a 60%-65% probability of getting full by June 30 if we reduce outflow to minimum beginning February 1; the current estimate of June 30 refill probability at Libby is 50%-55%; at Hungry Horse, 20%-25%. That assumes none of those projects will be asked to contribute to spring flow augmentation? Nielsen asked. Correct, Henriksen replied.

Will we have an opportunity to go over these refill probabilities in more detail? Litchfield asked. We should be able to have some discussion on that topic at our meeting next Wednesday, Henriksen replied; I'm not sure how much additional modeling information we'll have to discuss at that point. I would like a better understanding of the tradeoffs involved here, said Litchfield – it's not clear in my mind how much of an impact power system reliability and the chum operation are having on Bonneville outflows at the moment. At the moment, the power operation and the chum operation are pretty much going hand in hand, said MacKay. As we noted before, the operating agencies are under some pressure to reduce Dworshak discharge; if that is done, we'll need to pick up generation somewhere else, she said.

I need to be able to explain to the folks in Montana why Hungry Horse is likely to be dry this summer, said Litchfield – I need to understand the tradeoffs involved before I can explain them. I don't think we have had the necessary discussion on this refill probability information needed to get to that understanding, said Wagner – this is the first time we've seen it.

I would encourage everyone to think about this and come to next Wednesday's TMT meeting ready to have that conversation, said McCarty. I think we're all trying to digest it and put it into a form that is easier to summarize and understand, said MacKay. At this point, though, we just wanted to be sure everyone understood the current status of the emergency situation, she said.

Henriksen said she will check to see what kinds of modeling information will be available by next Wednesday. Litchfield asked whether PNCA energy content curves are available for individual projects; Henriksen replied this is likely somewhat moot, at this point, because actual operations are so different from the expected operations used to develop those curves. What I'm looking for is refill elevation curves for the headwater storage projects, by month, for, say, 50%, 75%, 95% refill probability at each project, said Litchfield – that might give us a better feel for the tradeoffs involved in hitting one reservoir over another. I see what you're getting at, said Henriksen, but I'm not sure we can develop such a family of rule curves by next Wednesday.

I think you can see how the power emergency fits into this, said MacKay; if we get out of the power emergency, flows below Bonneville will likely fall well below the level needed to maintain the 11.7-foot minimum tailwater elevation at Bonneville. That's part of what the executives are wrestling with, she said. If you have strong feelings on that issue, rather than

waiting for the executives to issue a proclamation, it would probably be a good idea to give the executives your views, said MacKay – they don't want to make that decision absent feedback from the other parties involved. Perhaps we can discuss a TMT recommendation on this issue at next Wednesday's meeting, she said – we need to have some discussion about how we share the pain.

Basically, I need a better understanding of what we'll gain if we hit Hungry Horse and Libby harder than expected, so that I can explain that to the folks in Montana, Litchfield said. You want to know what we get in return for turning the knob, in other words, said MacKay. That's correct, Litchfield replied. I think such a discussion would be timely, said Henriksen, and would fit nicely into the discussions we need to have on the 2001 Water Management Plan.

Is there potential for provisional draft at the Canadian projects? Ross asked. We've already taken that provisional draft in November and December, MacKay replied.

McCarty suggested that any official communication from the federal executives be distributed to the TMT membership prior to next week's meeting. We will do so, MacKay replied. It was agreed that, if the executives' decision requires substantive discussion, it may make sense to convene a TMT conference call next week; otherwise, an email should suffice.

On the call:

Tricia McCarty
Cindy Henriksen
Scott Bettin
Pat McGrane
Jim Neilsen
Margaret Filardo
Steve Pettit
Dick Wells
Scott Boyd
Jim Litchfield
Paul Wagner
Robyn MacKay
Rudd Turner
Eric Barker