Change Request Number: 11LMN008_Forebay Debris Removal
Date: October 28, 2010
Proposed by: Doug Baus, Corps, NWD
Location of Change: Section "5. Forebay Debris Removal" revise this section for all NWW projects: Lower Granite (LWG-24), Little Goose (LGS-28), Lower Monumental (LMN-26), Ice Harbor (IHR-24), and McNary (MCN-23).
Proposed Change: 5. Forebay Debris Removal. Debris at projects can impact fish passage conditions. Debris can plug or block trashracks, VBSs, gatewell orifices, dewatering screens, separators, and facility piping resulting in impingement, injuries, and descaling of fish. Removing debris at its source in the forebay is sometimes necessary to maintain safe and efficient fish passage conditions, navigation, and other project activities. Debris can be removed from the forebay by: physically encircling the debris with log booms and pulling it to shore with boats where it can be removed with a crane, removing the debris from the top of the dam using a crane and scoop, or passing the debris through the spillway with special powerhouse operations and spill. The preferred option is to remove debris at each project when possible to avoid passing a debris problem on to the next project downstream. This is not always possible at each project, as some projects do not have forebay debris removal capability. In this case, the only viable alternative is to spill to pass the debris. Normally, the project shall contact CENWW-OD-T at least two workdays prior to the day the special operation is required. Using information provided by the project, CENWW-OD-T will notify FPOM and RCC will issue a teletype detailing the special operations.

Reason for Change: CENWD-PDW-RC provides guidance to projects to handle debris spills. NWW and NWP handle debris spills differently in the FPP. The Corps proposes to change NWW project language regarding debris spills so it is consistent with NWP debris spill language (coordination "as appropriate" and not requiring "approval"). The Corps proposal to implement this change is based on the following: 1) Debris spill are short in duration (approximately 1 hour); 2) seasonally they are predictable in timing, generally during the freshet or high flow events, and; 3) the operation is routine and predictable on the Snake River, a debris spill occurs at LWG and approximately two to three days later at LGS. If a debris spill operation fell outside the scope of the routine debris spill operation then CENWP-OD or CENWW-OD-T would coordinate with FPOM as appropriate.

Comments from others: 10 June 2010 FPOM Meeting
Debris spill. Dykstra requested some tightening of inconsistencies in the FPP. LWG has debris spill language, but LGS and LMN require FPOM coordination. Dykstra would like to know if all the debris spills need to be coordinated or if NWW could just report out at FPOM that a debris spill occurred. Hevlin stated he likes the coordination. Baus clarified that the inconsistency is that LWG has permission in the FPP. He would like to see "approval" removed from the other two projects. He has no issue coordinating, but waiting for approval could be problematic, due to the time sensitivity in getting debris through the spillway. Lorz suggested sending out a message and suggesting that if there are no responses then the Project proceeds. Mackey stressed that lack of response is not an approval. Fredricks agreed that would be a slippery slope to start down.

From: Baus, Douglas M NWD
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 8:25 AM
To: 'Bill Hevlin'

Cc: Moody, Gregory P NWW; Dykstra, Timothy A NWW; 'Kiefer,Russell'; Paul Wagner; Bailey,John C NWW; 'Ballinger, Dean'; Barton, Steven B NWD; Dave Benner; BPA Scott Bettin;heib_critf.org; 'Bob Rose (brose@yakama.com)'; Buchholz, Robert J NWP; 'Chris Caudill(caudill@uidaho.edu)'; Clugston, David A NWD; Cordie, Robert P NWP; Eby, Brad W NWW;Eppard, Matthew B NWP; Faulkner, Donald L NWD; Feil, Dan H NWD; 'Fredricks, Gary';Fryer, Derek S NWW; 'Haeseker, Steve'; Halter, Mike J NWW; Hausmann, Ben J NWP;'Hevlin, Bill'; 'Jerry McCann'; 'Kiefer,Russell'; Klatte, Bernard A NWP; 'Kovalchuk, Greg';'Kruger, Rick'; Langeslay, Mike J NWP; Lee, Randall T NWP; 'lgrsmolt@hughes.net'; 'Lorz,Tom'; Mackey, Tammy M NWP; 'Martinson, Rick'; McCune, Kyle C NWP; Melanson, GeorgeW NWW; 'Meyer, Ed'; 'Morrill, Charles'; Ocker, Paul A NWD; Plummer, Mark F NWW;Rerecich, Jonathan G NWP; Richards, Natalie A NWP; 'Richards, Steve'; 'Richards, Steven P(DFW)'; 'Rosanna Tudor'; Schwartz, Dennis E NWP; 'Scott, Shane'; Setter, Ann L NWW;Shutters, Marvin K NWW; Spurgeon, William F NWW; Stansell, Robert J NWP; 'Stephenson,Ann'; 'Sweet, Jason'; 'Swenson, Larry'; Tackley, Sean C NWP; 'Volkman, Eric'; 'Whiteaker,John'; 'Wills, David'; Zyndol, Miroslaw A NWP; Mackey, Tammy M NWP; Weis, Richard W NWW

Subject: Details Regarding the 10 June Little Goose Dam Debris Spill Operation
Signed By: douglas.m.baus@us.army.mil
Bill,
As we discussed at yesterday's FPOM meeting, here are some additional details regarding the forebay debris removal operation at Little Goose Dam (LGS). At 1350 hours the operator started adjusting gates for the debris spill operation. The operation concluded at 1515 and LGS reverted back to normal operation. Spill occurred out of bay 4. LGS spilled approximately 2 acres of debris.

Snake River projects prefer to pass debris as soon as possible since debris at projects can adversely impact fish passage conditions. Debris can plug or block trashracks, VBSs, gatewell orifices, dewatering screens, separators, and facility piping resulting in impingement, injuries, and descaling of fish.

The current process for implementing debris removal operations for the Corps is overly time consuming because it requires "FPOM approval." I would like to see if we could remove the "approval" language from the FPP, but still keep FPOM informed of these actions via another mechanism (e.g. update at the subsequent FPOM meeting, or any other notification recommendations you may have) to expedite this process for the Corps.

Currently, the FPP states:

Pg. LGS-29 . 5.1. All special spills (other than normal spill patterns for

ongoing spill operations) and project operations for passing debris will be coordinated prior to the operations taking place. Each project shall contact CENWW-OD-T at least two workdays prior to the day they want the special project operations for spilling to pass debris CENWW-OD-T shall coordinate the special operations with RCC, NOAA Fisheries, and other FPOM participants. Project personnel shall provide CENWW-OD-T the reason for the debris spill request including an explanation of project facilities being impacted by the debris, the date and time of the requested spill, and any special powerhouse or other operations required to move the debris to the spillway. When a debris spill is coordinated and approved, RCC shall issue a teletype detailing the specifics of the special operations.

I would propose section 5.1 so it reads as follows:
5.1 Prior to the operation taking place, Little Goose Dam will coordinate all special spills (other than normal spill patterns for ongoing spill operations) and project operations for passing debris with CENWW-OD-T, and RCC. LGS shall contact CENWW-OD-T, and RCC, at least two workdays prior to the day they want the special project operations for spilling to pass debris. Project personnel shall provide CENWW-OD-T, and RCC, the reason for the debris spill request including an explanation of project facilities being impacted by the debris, the date and time of the requested spill, and any special powerhouse or other operations required to move the debris to the spillway. RCC will issue a teletype for the special spill operation. At the subsequent FPOM meeting following the operation CENWW-OD-T and RCC will provide FPOM with an update on the operation. I propose this change for the following reasons: 1) Debris removal operations are short in duration (approximately 1.5 hours), 2) passing debris quickly prevents other debris related problems at the project, 3) these operations are predictable with high flow events and the amount of time needed to coordinate and acquire FPOM approval as currently worded in the FPP is not commensurate with the scope of the impact, and; 4) the Corps plans on coordinating these actions with FPOM but considers a verbal notification at FPOM as sufficient.

I would like to hear any comments you may have on this issue so we could potentially modify to the FPP. Thank you for your consideration.

doug

Doug Baus
US Army Corps of Engineers
Northwestern Division
Phone: (503) 808-3995
Douglas.M.Baus@usace.army.mil

From: Bill.Hevlin@noaa.gov
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 8:53 AM
To: Baus, Douglas M NWD

Cc: Moody, Gregory P NWW; Dykstra, Timothy A NWW; Kiefer,Russell; Paul Wagner; Bailey,John C NWW; Ballinger, Dean; Barton, Steven B NWD; Dave Benner; BPA Scott Bettin;heib_critf.org; brose@yakama.com; Buchholz, Robert J NWP; caudill@uidaho.edu; Clugston,David A NWD; Cordie, Robert P NWP; Eby, Brad W NWW; Eppard, Matthew B NWP;Faulkner, Donald L NWD; Feil, Dan H NWD; Fredricks, Gary; Fryer, Derek S NWW;Haeseker, Steve; Halter, Mike J NWW; Hausmann, Ben J NWP; Jerry McCann; Klatte,Bernard A NWP; Kovalchuk, Greg; Kruger, Rick; Langeslay, Mike J NWP; Lee, Randall TNWP; lgrsmolt@hughes.net; Lorz, Tom; Mackey, Tammy M NWP; Martinson, Rick; McCune,Kyle C NWP; Melanson, George W NWW; Meyer, Ed; Morrill, Charles; Ocker, Paul A NWD;Plummer, Mark F NWW; Rerecich, Jonathan G NWP; Richards, Natalie A NWP; Richards,Steve; Richards, Steven P (DFW); Rosanna Tudor; Schwartz, Dennis E NWP; Scott, Shane;Setter, Ann L NWW; Shutters, Marvin K NWW; Spurgeon, William F NWW; Stansell, Robert JNWP; Stephenson, Ann; Sweet, Jason; Swenson, Larry; Tackley, Sean C NWP; Volkman,Eric; Whiteaker, John; Wills, David; Zyndol, Miroslaw A NWP; Weis, Richard W NWW
Subject: Re: Details Regarding the 10 June Little Goose Dam Debris Spill Operation
Attachments: ATT856071.txt
Thanks Doug,
There seemed to be nothing wrong with the process we have used for years to plan and implement debris spills at the Lower Snake dams. But I don't have a problem with seeing if the process can be steamlined as long as it does not increase the potential risk to migrants. IN the past, I was familiar with a Walla Walla District biologist coordinating the request
through FPAC and NOAA a day or two before needed, through e-mail or the phone, approval was never an issue because we always reached agreement on the plan. It did take me by surprise yesterday at the FPOM meeting being first informed about the immediate need for the debris spill and then launching into arguments to change the FPP process.
bill hevlin

NOAA- Hevlin wants two days advance notice. He doesn’t need to approve it but he wants to know about it and have an opportunity to comment.

USFWS- support
Record of Final Action: approved 21 January 2011.