1. Project Pairing Subcommittee Meeting—Flow Study Criteria Meeting (9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.)

Introductions given and no public comment presented.

Ken presented a power point outlining approach for determining Flow Study achievement after project implementation (achieve flow study goals and keep historic diversions whole).

Ken proposed using 2002 to 2016 as the water years to simulate which includes a full range of drought, average, wet, and climate indicator years.

Ralph, questioned how future water year volume resulting from climate change be considered

Dave, does snowpack correlation help inform selection of years? Something to think about moving forward.

Ken, spreadsheet model will be run for each year for 2002 to 2016 to the extent data is available.

Gary, likes continuation and expansion of original spreadsheet model. 15 years should indicate a reasonable picture.

Tim, Dry Creek sometimes flows better than Pine Creek. Dry Creek water should go into Pine Creek reservoir as well.

Brian, bypass flows (12 cfs) represents that portion that is not permanently committed to instream flow, but rather was voluntary bypass. 21 cfs was the total amount. The 12 cfs number would be made up by new project flows. Chris, the 12 cfs is variable with time and it is a schedule. Chris, also some complexity in priority dates.

Chris K. and Renee will document biweekly bypass flow that will return to the irrigators and not protected perpetually instream by end of the month. It will be distributed to the Steering Committee for review and for Jacobs to input into the model.

Mike will provide a summary of winter changes to historic diversions for the model to be used for the pump exchange alternative. Historic flows would still be used for the Pine Creek anchor project.

WWRID and HBID will validate winter diversion data from Walla Walla River based on power point Ken reviewed.

Ken, need to clarify how an efficiency of the Columbia River exchange will be characterized. It may not be 100% as a surface water expression. It may be 70 to 90% as a surface expression.

Mike I. and Gary, assume 100% bucket-for-bucket, with direct measurement of river, plus groundwater recharge, plus regulatory enforcement. Comparison based on no change in irrigation means no losses. However, minor evaporation losses and tracking / enforcement is a factor. Actual number will be dictated by seepage losses.

Mike L. Consider how federal and WA would act and whether some mitigation on the Columbia is necessary. Chris M. agree this needs to be discussed in the next phase of the Flow Study.
Ralph: how quantify secondary objectives around population growth or other new uses?
Chris Hyland will develop a 1-2 pager on types and quantities for new uses based on existing planning efforts for the next meeting.

Ken, multiple visions of the pump exchange have been done over the years by consultants. Need to reconcile into a common vision and cost estimate for the pump exchange.

Pump Exchange TWG will revisit IRZ pipeline alignment and delivery amounts and finalize for current study. Jacobs will produce a single standalone cost estimate relying on judgment and assumptions of studies done to-date.

2. Introductions, Opening Remarks, Minutes & Agenda Review, Public Comment (11:00 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)

3. Flow Study / Contractor Work Session (CH2M/Jacobs), (11:15 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.)
   a. Oregon Water Availability

   Mike L. and Chris K., If funding for an above grade water storage project (e.g. reservoir) is obtained from OWRD, then an SVF application process may be required...not an absolute. OWRD does not do an SVF before funding is provided by OWRD. ODFW would need to be the lead agency for an ecological flow analysis to establish seasonal-varied flow

   Gary presented a fish flow white paper for project criteria evaluations. He will circulate it following fisheries co-manager peer review.

   Chris M., distribute draft now for SC review, then if peer review and if sign off occurs, is this reasonable for this stage of the review by November 1.

   Chris K. will initiate a high level winter water rights impact analysis.

   Chris M./Gary/Brian will take on an assessment of Pine Creek ecological availability/impairment including seepage contributions from the dam for fill options to the reservoir by November 1.

b. Pinecreek Reservoir Seismic Assessment

   Jacobs provided a presentation on the active fault investigation for Pine Creek Reservoir.

   Jacobs will provide a scope amendment to consider a borrow site valuations, local soils testing at a site identified by Tim, a cost/borrow site curve to evaluate potential cost increases, and limited trenching supported by GFID equipment in a week with the SC to vote by email in approximately 10 days.

c. Bennington Reservoir Availability

   Jacobs meeting with the Corps today and will report back whether fish flows could be managed in a way that does not conflict with flood mitigation risk.

   Gary, can the Corps released the 3-ish cfs to coincide with fish needs? Can reservoir be expanded? Can Bennington feed PineCreek?

d. Project Pairing Subcommittee Work Session Update
Jacobs gave a presentation on Performance Criteria and new metrics for comparing projects and alternatives.

Jacobs to include a cost-to-benefit column that establishes unit cost of construction divided by percent of in-stream fish flow provided.

Project Pairing subcommittee will convene with consultants to make initial recommendation on project pairing exercise.

Aspect/Jacobs to establish dates for Project Pairing subcommittee teleconference meeting to finalize performance criteria.

4. Working Lunch Break (Pizza/Veggies Provided, or bring your own) (12:00 p.m. to 12:30 p.m.) This will fall somewhere in the previous agenda depending on the flow of the presentations and discussion.

5. SEPA / NEPA Update (1:30 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.) (Haller)
   a. Revised SEPA / NEPA timeline from OCR
   b. Draft MOA

   SEPA/NEPA deferred to first quarter 2019 at OCR workload request. Continued work to prepare will occur with the consultant team.

6. Interstate Compact White Paper (1:45 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.) (Ecology)

   Draft paper prepared by Eric Hartwig that lays out basic concepts. Additional policy level refinement will occur. OCR is hiring new staff that will help support the SC in the future. Chris K., indicated that WA and OR directors are meeting. Chris K./Melissa/Chris M. will provide an update next meeting.

7. OCR / Partnership / Steering Committee Coordination (Partnership Members), (1:30 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.)
   a. Update on recent discussions
   b. Takeaways and To-do’s

   Legislative report available starting today. 2 year legislative pilot being advanced. Goal is to transition to a WA/OR management entity. Audits will be included for each Partnership program. OCR creating

   Chris H. will circulate a copy of the Legislative Report to the Steering Committee.

   Chris M. Lot of future discussions about how the SC will integrate (procedurally and substantively with respect to Flow Study goals) into the next generation of the Partnership.

8. Roundtable Discussion on Pending Items, (2:00 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)
   a. Partnership Mission / Legislative Update (Hyland) See narrative above.
   b. Funding Update (Wolcott/Hyland) Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board funding application being advanced by WWBWC for Oregon water monitoring. WWBWC applying for additional funding to Ecology for operating Stiller MAR site by 10/31/18. Discussion on how to gear up with Oregon for 2021 to 2023 biennium for some matching investments to OCR.
c. PAWG Updates on Planning Tasks (Marks) **Waiting for Legislative Process to resolve.**
d. Monitoring TWG First Meeting (Haire)
e. Assessment of River Conditions Update (James, Wachtel) **See approach on Gary’s white paper above.**
f. O&M Funding Examples / Future Subcommittee Assignments? (Wolcott) **Discussed**
   Congressional Research paper looking at settlements of tribal reserve rights. Some of these projects have O&M funding associated with water projects. Gila River example. Required settlement of the water right. Chris M., this is not a settlement process, so not a great fit for Umatillas. Federal examples of O&M payments is a good sign however.

   Brian, could another example around long-term lease arrangements from water transaction programs be pitched to BPA?

   Chris, another option is a single year payout of a long-term O&M payment.

   Mike I. and Chris M., comfortable moving to a preferred alternative at this point with this still somewhat unknown.

g. ANTD Pilot (Hyland)

9. Roundtable, Next Steps, Closing Remarks, and Public Comment (3:15 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.).