

**Bruce A. Measure**  
Chair  
Montana

**Rhonda Whiting**  
Montana

**W. Bill Booth**  
Idaho

**James A. Yost**  
Idaho



**Dick Wallace**  
Vice-Chair  
Washington

**Tom Karier**  
Washington

**Bill Bradbury**  
Oregon

**Joan M. Dukes**  
Oregon

## **Council Meeting Wenatchee, WA**

**April 12-13, 2011**

### **Minutes**

Council Chair Bruce Measure called the meeting to order at 1:42 p.m. on April 12 and adjourned it at 11:30 a.m. on April 13. All members were present, except Rhonda Whiting who participated by telephone.

Dick Wallace introduced Bud Hover, a county commissioner from Okanogan County, who welcomed the Council to Wenatchee. He said the presentations from the Columbia Basin fish recovery boards scheduled later that day would show Council members what has been accomplished with fish recovery.

### **Reports from Fish and Wildlife, Power and Public Affairs committee chairs:**

Bill Booth, chair, fish and wildlife committee; Tom Karier, chair, power committee; and Rhonda Whiting, chair, public affairs committee.

Bill Booth reported that the Fish and Wildlife (F&W) Committee met on April 5 to discuss the 100 projects on the A-list of the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation and Artificial Production (RME/AP) categorical review. We unanimously recommended moving the 100 projects forward for a Council decision at this meeting, he said. We also achieved \$2.8 million in savings in our review of the projects, Booth noted. Now we are working on the B-list of projects, he said. At today's meeting, the Committee discussed the quarterly review of within-year project funding adjustments and Biological Opinion (BiOp) projects, and we received an update on the Columbia River Treaty symposium.

Tom Karier reported that the Power Committee reviewed a proposed charter for the Regional Technical Forum (RTF) advisory committee and discussed BPA's post-2011 energy efficiency program. We also had a report on a potential new standard for resource adequacy, as well as on integrated resource plans in Washington and on pending legislation in Washington regarding the Centralia coal plant, he said. The committee had a good roundtable discussion with the managers of Grant, Chelan, and Douglas PUDs on various issues, including wind integration and the Columbia River Treaty, Karier added.

## **1. Council decision on project reviews:**

### **– *Hungry Horse Mitigation Program, Project #1991-019-03 - Sekokini Springs Isolation Facility***

Staffer Mark Fritsch presented funding requests for two projects. The first project, sponsored by Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, is a Step 3 review of the Sekokini Springs Westslope Cutthroat Trout Isolation Facility, he said. The facility is to aid in the recovery of genetically pure westslope cutthroat trout populations in the Flathead River drainage, Fritsch explained. The F&W Committee has approved the project, and the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) has said the revised master plan for the project is ready to move forward to implementation and construction, he reported.

Wallace moved that the Council recommend to BPA that the Sekokini Springs Westslope Cutthroat Trout Isolation Facility proceed to construction and operation, and that the Council also call for the project sponsor to provide the additional detail requested by the ISRP for review during the upcoming Resident Fish project review. Bill Bradbury seconded, and the motion passed.

### **– *Snake River Sockeye Captive Propagation, Project #2007-402-00 - Springfield Sockeye Hatchery Master Plan for the Snake River Sockeye Program***

Fritsch described another project, proposed by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), which is a Step 1 review of the Springfield Sockeye Hatchery Master Plan for the Snake River Sockeye Program. The project is aimed at preserving the remnants of this stock and increasing the number of adults spawning naturally in the basin, he said. The F&W Committee has approved the project, and the ISRP has also recommended the project move forward, Fritsch reported.

This is a great project, said Karier. He said his one concern is to make sure that in voting for this, the Council is not supporting funding additional to what was in the Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Idaho and the federal action agencies. We will try to work within our Accord budget, Paul Kline of IDFG responded, and we'll try to develop a formula for making this work.

Wallace moved that the Council approve the Springfield Sockeye Hatchery Master Plan for the Snake River Sockeye Program and authorize the project sponsor to proceed with Step 2 activities, with the condition that the Idaho Department of Fish and Game provide additional information to address the six issues raised by the ISRP for consideration during the Step 2 review. Joan Dukes seconded, and the motion passed.

## **2. Presentation by Snohomish PUD on Integrated Resource Planning Process and geothermal testing:**

Steve Klein, General Manager.

Steve Klein, general manager of Snohomish PUD, told the Council his utility is BPA's largest single customer, responsible for 11.3 percent of the agency's revenue requirement. We have

320,000 customers, a peak load of 1,600 megawatts, and are one of the fastest growing areas in the Northwest, he said.

We rely on conservation as the number-one tool in our tool chest, and we are also pursuing a diverse mix of renewables with an emphasis on our own backyard, Klein stated. We are trying to meet our needs without adding natural gas resources, which is a tremendous challenge, he said.

Wind generation makes up eight percent of our energy portfolio, and we were able to go from zero percent to eight percent wind in less than two years, Klein reported. We are adding low-impact small hydro run-of-the-river projects in areas without anadromous salmon or other Endangered Species Act (ESA) populations, he said. By installing a turbine to capture wasted energy from a City of Everett water supply pipe, our Rucker Hill hydro project now provides 700 kilowatts of clean renewable energy, Klein noted.

We are also generating power from biomass, landfill gas, and dairy-digester projects and are discussing adding other such facilities, he said. Snohomish PUD has put in place aggressive incentives for solar energy, Klein reported. We have a \$1 million a year program to encourage the installation of customer-owned solar photovoltaics and solar water heaters, he said.

Craig Collar, senior manager of energy resource development at Snohomish PUD, described the utility's exploration of tidal energy resources. The advantages of tidal energy include the fact it meets I-937 requirements, it is predictable and easier to integrate, and it is close to load, he said.

We are developing a small-scale, grid-connected tidal energy pilot project in Admiralty Inlet, Collar stated. Its purpose is to generate data, not energy, and help us evaluate the feasibility of tidal energy, he said. The project will be located one kilometer off Whidbey Island in a commercial waterway, Collar stated. We've had over 100 meetings with over 50 stakeholder groups during the past three years, and so far, we haven't found any "showstoppers" for the project, he reported.

The project will sit on the seabed and be completely submerged, Collar said. OpenHydro will construct it, and it will have two 10-meter turbines, he explained. We plan to work closely with the University of Washington on environmental studies for acoustics, fish effects, and water quality, according to Collar.

We are also looking into regulatory issues, which are complex since such a project has never been permitted in the Puget Sound, he said. At least 25 different regulatory agencies are involved in marine power deployment in the United States; in the United Kingdom, two agencies handle permitting, Collar noted.

We plan to submit a final license application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the project by the middle of this year, and we'll make a "go/no-go" decision next year, he said. We have received almost \$13 million in grants to advance this project, which we estimate will cost between \$20 million and \$25 million, Collar added.

Geothermal energy also has some compelling attributes, he told the Council. It meets I-937 requirements, is a source of baseload energy, and is potentially close to load, Collar explained.

There hasn't been much geothermal exploration in Washington, but the resource potential clearly exists, he said.

We started developing geothermal data in 2008, and last year, we drilled five wells to gather temperature and gradient information, Collar reported. We found that of the five sites, one has good potential, and we plan to drill a much deeper well at that site this year, he said. "That will really tell the tale," Collar stated. If it works out, the geothermal plant we would build would likely be a binary system, he added.

Our board and citizens are enthused that renewable energy investments are being made in our community, Klein pointed out. We are not "zealots" on any of this -- we have to prove each project makes environmental and economic sense, he said.

We are all beginning to see the challenges of wind energy, Klein continued. Wind is good, but "it can't all be wind," so we are looking at other types of renewables to diversify, he said.

If you take away the grants and taxpayer support, how close is solar energy to being economic? Bill Booth asked. With wind, once we transport and integrate it, the cost is about \$120 to \$150 per megawatt-hour, replied Klein. Our distributed energy solar rooftop program offsets the wind, and it also is a source of employment in our community, he noted. Solar is expensive, but individuals have to believe in it and accept the payback, according to Klein. We've been able to get the payback down to 10 years, he noted.

What is the comparable cost of solar? Booth asked. With solar thermal projects, it's generally about \$300 to \$500/MWh without any subsidies, Klein replied.

### **3. Presentation by chairs of Washington's four Columbia Basin fish recovery boards:**

Tom Linde, Skamania County Citizen Representative, and Chairman of the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board; Bud Hover, Okanogan County Commissioner, and Chairman of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board; Del Groat, Garfield County Citizen Representative, and Chairman of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board; and Nancy Lillquist, Ellensburg City Council Member, and Chairwoman of the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board.

The chairs of four Columbia Basin fish recovery boards gave a presentation to the Council on their activities. Nancy Lillquist, chair of the Yakima Basin F&W Recovery Board said the board works by consensus and has representatives from 22 local governments and the Yakama Nation. She said the Yakima Basin Subbasin plan, prepared for the Council, guides all the board's activities. It determines our priorities for on-the-ground habitat restoration projects, and we also have a citizens committee that helps rank projects, Lillquist noted.

Quite a few of our projects include BPA funding, as well as other funding, she said. We coordinate monitoring activities in the basin and measure those results against the recovery plan and identify gaps, Lillquist explained. We seek funding for high-priority gaps, she said. The strength of our board is that we are elected representatives -- that's what grounds us with the citizens, according to Lillquist, who is also a member of the Ellensburg City Council. We have

excellent technical staff support, and we are all committed to identifying opportunities to recover fish in the Yakima Basin, she said. We envision having a great sport fishery there, and we look forward to continuing to work with the Council, Lillquist concluded.

Del Groat, chair of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, said the board was part of one of the first model watershed programs in Washington. Our board is made up of both citizens and elected officials, and we represent five counties and one tribe, he stated. We are a united group, and it's rewarding to see citizens, landowners, and technical people come together to work on these issues, Groat said. We've put over \$20 million into recovery projects on the ground, he added.

We use a holistic approach, and we receive funding from BPA and the state Salmon Recovery Funding Board and try to "marry up" all the different dollars, Groat told the Council. I want to stress that the key to developing a recovery plan is collaboration, he said. Without it, we couldn't pull any of this off, Groat stated. Special interests have put themselves aside for the greater good, he said. Groat thanked the Council for its support.

Tom Linde, chair of the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, said the board was established in 1998. We have a 15-member board, with five counties involved, he noted. Our board members include elected officials, citizens, tribal representatives, hydro interests, and government agency officials, Linde said. Our main goal is to return fish listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to healthy, harvestable levels, he told the Council.

Bud Hover, chair of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board and an Okanogan County Commissioner, recounted how the board developed an approach to its work he calls "the Washington way." We have a five-member board that represents two tribes and three counties, he noted. Our area has a conservative outlook, and agriculture is the main driver there, Hover said. Without water, agriculture is dead, he stated.

We are seeing improved results in our fish returns now, we've established a multi-million-dollar sport fishing industry along the Columbia, and irrigation and agriculture are being protected, Hover said. What we have control over is habitat, and we are addressing those issues in our plan, he added. The "Washington way" has worked, Hover told the Council. He said he is also chair of the Washington Salmon Funding Recovery Board, a job that requires "thick skin and an open mind." The success we have had is because it's a bottom-up, grass-roots approach, he added.

#### **4. The Power of Partnership in the Upper Columbia:**

Julie Morgan, Executive Director, Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.

Julie Morgan and Derek Van Marter of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) showed a video about the board's work titled "The Power of Partnership." Van Marter explained how the UCSRB is organized and discussed some of its accomplishments. The three species their recovery plan covers are Upper Columbia spring chinook, Upper Columbia steelhead, and bull trout, he said. Van Marter talked about the board's adaptive management framework and salmon recovery implementation structure.

Morgan pointed out that the adaptive management framework has a lot of accountability built into it and discussed the role of science in what the board does and how their regional technical teams conduct monitoring.

Van Marter described how funding is coordinated for their projects, their targeted solicitation process, and progress at some of their projects. The fish runs are on the rise and appear to be responding to improving environmental conditions, he reported.

## **5. Council decision on “A list” subset of projects and associated programmatic issues in RM&E/AP category review:**

Tony Grover, director, fish and wildlife division; and Lynn Palensky, project development.

The F&W Committee has approved 100 projects as part of the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation and Artificial Production (RME/AP) categorical review, reported Booth. We think they are ready to be approved by the Council, he said.

All the projects have gone through ISRP review and public comments, and we’ve worked hard to bring you this list, Booth stated. I want to stress that having an “A-list” of projects does not mean projects on the B-list are not good projects, he said. The B-list projects need additional discussion, and the F&W Committee started working on those yesterday, Booth stated.

Jim Yost asked about zero-budget projects. Fritsch explained which projects were zeroed out and why. When you evaluated those, did you look at how long a project had been going and whether it was still a viable research project? Yost asked. Lynn Palensky said the projects were well vetted over the course of six months, and we worked with state staff and BPA staff to identify BiOp and Accord projects, she said.

Karier asked how many new projects there are. There are some brand-new starts, and many of those are on the B-list, replied Grover. The overall expenditure for RM&E has gone up, he said.

The ISRP reviews of these projects contain a number of qualifications, Karier noted. I’d like to know as soon as possible why we aren’t endorsing some of the ISRP’s recommendations, Karier said.

Karier asked about the duration of some of the projects, pointing out that while most of the research projects are supposed to be three years long, some of the A-list projects would last longer. I’m not challenging the value of the projects, he said. Karier asked about specific projects on the list that have been funded for longer than three years and wondered if the staff is being consistent in its project recommendations.

Grover said in certain cases, there were exceptions to the three-year rule, particularly with projects that are “fundamental to the BiOp.” The document should indicate there were exceptions and identify them, Karier suggested. It’s also hard to distinguish between research projects and M&E projects, he said. Research projects should have an end date, but maybe M&E projects should be handled differently, Karier stated. In the document, the projects seem to be “blurred together,” he added. Grover and Booth agreed the issues could be handled through editing.

Wallace moved that the Council recommend to BPA the implementation of a subset of projects in the RME/AP category review known as the “A-list,” with appropriate conditions and comments noted in the comment field on the spreadsheet containing the “A-list” projects, and as conditioned by the recommendations on an associated set of programmatic issues for artificial production and tagging projects also approved by the Council. Bill Bradbury seconded.

There’s a lot of good work here, but we would have benefited from a public comment period on this document, Karier stated. I plan to abstain on the vote, he said. Some of these projects represent significant changes not reflected in the recommendations; in some cases, there are projects without results, and there are some projects here that I couldn’t explain why I support them, he stated.

In addition, there is a recommendation for a new process to evaluate the effects of artificial production, Karier continued. Before we do another such process, we need to examine what we learned from the previous three or four reviews and explain why we need to do it again, he said. I don’t support another artificial production process at this time, and I think we should determine who’s interested in implementing the results this time around, Karier added.

“It’s difficult for a poor Idaho farm boy to figure out what you are trying to do here,” said Yost. I think we should put more dollars into on-the-ground projects and less into research, but the BiOp and the Accords are driving us to do specific research, he stated. “They’d research potatoes forever and never plant one,” Yost added. I’ll support this, but I have concerns about spending too much on research and evaluation, rather than on-the-ground projects, he said.

An incredible amount of staff work has gone into this, said Wallace. He noted that the Council’s Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Reporting (MERR) report will complement this effort.

Rhonda Whiting said she agrees with Jim Yost and she recounted what has happened with the Council’s F&W program since the Gorton amendment passed. It raised the bar for projects, and project sponsors were able to raise the level of their work to meet the challenge, she said. The ISRP has done an outstanding job raising the levels of the R&D work being done in the region, and we’ve matured enough in the F&W program to make things more cost-effective, according to Whiting.

Now we are dealing with BiOp and Accord projects, she said. The Council was “locked out” on Accord projects, and some of us “threw a fit” to make the point those projects needed scientific review, Whiting stated. I think our A-list projects are those we know have to be funded, with some of the “tweaks” Tom Karier suggested, she said. With the B-list projects, there is more work to be done, Whiting added.

I’m disappointed Tom still has some issues at this late date, but I think they can be resolved in the editing of the document, Booth said. We are making progress -- we’ve found \$2.8 million in savings, and it’s not easy to cut project funding, he stated.

We’ll sharpen our pencils for the B-list projects, and it would be helpful if everyone on the Council and the staff would assist us in identifying specific places where we can cut, Booth said. You each need to look in your own state, he told his colleagues. The motion to approve the projects passed, with Karier abstaining.

## **6. Presentation on Selective Harvest in the Lower Columbia and Estuary:**

Guy Norman, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Guy Norman of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) gave a presentation on WDFW's commercial fishing selective harvest gear evaluation project. He described how the project fits in with various policies and directives, such as the BiOp and *U.S. v. Oregon*. We want to ensure our fisheries are sustainable and that our management is consistent with All-H efforts, Norman stated.

WDFW received \$1.9 million from the National Marine Fisheries Service to conduct alternative gear testing, he said. In 2010, we expanded our earlier efforts and employed five purse seines, six beach seines, and two trap nets, Norman explained. The project's test fisheries for chinook and coho took place from August to October, he said.

We are encouraged by the results of the project, Norman told the Council. We found trap nets were not effective, but purse and beach seines had good results, he said.

This year, we will continue the test fishery with purse and beach seines, and we also plan to begin a long-term mortality study of fish released from the seines, Norman reported. We will submit a proposal for this work to the ISRP next month, he said. Our plans for 2012 are to continue the gear testing and the mortality study and to increase industry participation, Norman added. Eventually, we hope to have data sufficient for all the species and to implement an alternative gear fishery by 2013, he said. Our goal is to have this gear as one of the tools.

Bradbury asked about the investments fishers would have to make in this type of gear. I've heard estimates for commercial fishers that range from \$10,000 to \$30,000, and that depends on whether they are buying a seine or a whole new boat, said Norman. Using the seines requires more people, he added.

Among the advantages of this program are that commercial fishers could keep more fish and could fish longer periods, and fewer hatchery fish could escape onto the spawning grounds, said Karier. The program could provide larger economic returns for the fishery and ensure conservation levels are met, added Norman. The new gear would help keep us within the levels that are needed for recovery, he said.

Are you looking for BPA funding? asked Booth. Yes, we'll submit the project to the ISRP by next month, replied Norman.

## **7. Briefing on Pumped Hydro potential at Banks Lake:**

Mark Jones, Manager of Federal Hydro Projects and Wayne Todd, Hydro Technologies Program, Bonneville Power Administration.

We have started seeing the need for additional flexibility to manage intermittent renewables, like wind, that are coming on line, and pumped storage has good characteristics to support wind, Mark Jones of BPA told the Council. The amount of wind power in the region is growing, and that has prompted BPA and the Bureau of Reclamation to explore the feasibility and potential of using pumped storage to provide more flexibility, he said.



We are working with Reclamation to analyze the potential to use the John W. Keys III Pump-Generating Plant at Banks Lake for pumped storage and system flexibility, he said. Our studies have shown that pumped storage has significant potential in the Northwest and that grid-scale energy storage would be a valuable asset for the levels of wind development expected in the future, Jones reported. The Keys plant is underused, and with potential upgrades, it could be a near-term resource for wind integration.

There are potential synergies with the energy we need and water storage for other purposes, according to Jones. We are pursuing opportunities for equipment modernization and upgrades at the Keys plant, and we are also looking at developing a new greenfield pumped-storage project, he said.

Wayne Todd of BPA described the Keys plant, which was originally installed in 1951. The plant pumps water uphill 280 feet from Roosevelt Lake to Banks Lake, and the water is used to irrigate about 670,000 acres of farmland in the Columbia Basin Project, he said. The plant's current pumping capacity is 614 MW, and its generating capacity is 314 MW, Todd added.

Modernizing the Keys plant would cost between \$85 million and \$145 million, he said. And upgrading the plant to increase the operating head range of the units is estimated to cost between \$80 million and \$140 million, according to Todd. We think we can start modernization work by the middle of next year, he said.

We are talking about providing within-hour balancing reserves at the Keys plant to enhance system flexibility, Todd stated. Our take-away message is that we can gain a significant amount of balancing reserves at Keys by doing this work, and the plant will still be able to meet irrigation needs, he said.

Karier asked if there has been a cost analysis to see if pumped storage can compete with other integration resources. Our analysis shows it's competitive with BPA's current integration charges, replied Todd. Karier asked if BPA has considered using a higher reservoir. We looked at that option, but it would mean a new project at a cost of about \$2 billion, Todd said.

Does this qualify as renewable energy? Yost asked. Some people think energy storage to support wind should have renewable energy credits, Jones said. Currently, there is discussion about whether there ought to be some kind of credit associated with pumped storage, he added.

Certain turbine upgrades do qualify as renewable, Yost noted. The question is, if pumped storage were eligible for credits, would it make a difference on the bottom line? he asked. We do get credits for projects like replacing runners, but for this project, the value we need is on the flexibility side, said Jones. This one wouldn't qualify under the current rules, he added.

## **8. Council decision on formation of a RTF Policy Advisory Committee and approval of its Charter:**

Terry Morlan, director, power division; and Tom Eckman, conservation resources manager.

Staffer Terry Morlan presented a proposed charter for an advisory committee for the Regional Technical Forum (RTF). He said establishing the committee would give more visibility and accountability to the RTF and help put the RTF on a more solid financial footing.

The Council's Power Committee unanimously approved this, stated Karier. The members of the advisory committee will represent a broad cross-section of the energy community, he said. Jim Yost asked about the committee's co-chair arrangement. The chair would be appointed by the Council, and the co-chair elected by the committee, Morlan said.

Would the committee solicit funds? Yost asked. The idea is that its members would be people who can commit funding from their organizations, replied Morlan. Committee members would also review the RTF work plan and see if it meets their needs, added staffer Tom Eckman.

Looking at this "from the 30,000-foot level," it appears the Council advises BPA on conservation, the Power Committee advises the Council on conservation, the staff advises the Power Committee on conservation, and the RTF advises all those people, said Booth. Now we are proposing another level of bureaucracy, he stated.

Why is the current organization not working? What's the difference this new committee will make? Won't it just add more expense and more work? Booth asked.

We were approached by the Northwest Energy Efficiency Taskforce (NEET) about having more oversight on what the RTF is doing, replied Eckman. In the staff's view, this is a test, he stated. We need to try this, but if it doesn't result in putting the RTF on a better financial footing and getting a commitment to pursue the RTF's work plan, then all it will have done is add work and cost more money, according to Eckman.

How much will it cost? Booth asked. We estimate about \$15,000 a year, replied Eckman. Will that come from ratepayers? Booth asked, and Eckman said yes.

If we have this committee, do we still need the RTF? Booth asked. The advisory committee is non-technical -- it's a policy committee made up of people who represent entities that fund the RTF and make use of the RTF's work, Eckman replied.

I'm interested in making sure there is a firewall to maintain the integrity and independence of the RTF, said Wallace. "With policy interests at play, that could erode independence," he added. We need to keep a close eye on this -- a firewall is critical, Wallace stated.

Is there a sunset date in this charter? asked Joan Dukes. Two years, Morlan replied. "I've tried to get there on this, but I share Bill's concerns, and I'll vote no," Dukes said.

Maybe this should be done on a trial basis of three or six months, suggested Booth. At the end of the trial, there could be a report, and if it's not working, we wouldn't wait for the sunset date, he said. The Council can terminate any advisory committee whenever it wants, Morlan noted.

As for a first report, we'll hear something from the committee in six months or at least within a year, stated Karier. We could fix any problems at that point, he said.

Couldn't we hear back in three months? Booth asked. Council chair Bruce Measure suggested that Booth could make a point to check the progress himself after three months.

Wallace moved the Council approve creation of an RTF Policy Advisory Committee and adopt the charter for it. Karier seconded, and the motion passed. Dukes voted no.

## **9. Briefing on Columbia River Symposium:**

Matt Morrison, Pacific Northwest Economic Region.

Matt Morrison of the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region (PNWER) group gave a presentation on the Columbia River Treaty Symposium that will take place July 21 in Portland. There is a need to get legislators up to speed on Treaty issues, he said. PNWER is a forum for bi-national planning and involves the public and private sectors in addressing issues that affect the regional economy, Morrison explained. We are expecting over 100 legislators from around the region and from Canada at the Columbia River Symposium, he noted. Morrison encouraged members of the Council to attend the meeting.

## **10. Council Business:**

### **– Approval of Minutes**

Wallace moved that the Council approve the minutes of the March 8-9, 2011 Council meeting held in Boise, Idaho. Booth seconded, and the motion passed.

### **– Decision on the Northwest Hydro Site Database agreement with Bonneville**

Staffer Peter Paquet presented a request for funding for the Northwest Hydro Site database. He said the database tracks all hydro development in the region. The database was created in the 1980s, and today it is outdated, Paquet noted. We are proposing funding for a contractor to maintain the database until the end of the year, he said. That will give us time to develop a strategy on what we need to do in terms of a better system, Paquet stated.

Wallace moved that the Council approve entering into a contract in an amount not to exceed \$100,830 with BPA for the purpose of providing the funding for a Council contract with Synergy Consulting to maintain the Northwest Hydro Site database until December 31, 2011. Dukes seconded, and the motion passed.

### **– Council decision on one ISRP appointment; and update on ISRP and ISAB appointment process**

Staffer Jim Ruff said that Greg Ruggerone, a current member of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board, has been recommended as a new member of the ISRP. Ruff also noted that the Council will soon ask the region to suggest new nominees that could serve on both the science panels that advise the Council.

Booth moved that the Council appoint Greg Ruggerone to the ISRP, effective immediately, for a four-year term that extends through September 2015. Dukes seconded, and the motion passed. Wallace abstained from the vote because of a personal friendship with the nominee.

Approved May11, 2011.

/s/ Richard Wallace  
Vice-Chair

---

x:\jh\ww\minutes\april 11 wenatchee short version.docx