

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
Missoula, MT
January 11-12, 2011

Minutes

Council Chair Bruce Measure called the meeting to order at 1:43 p.m. on January 11th and adjourned it at 10:35 a.m. on January 12th. All members were present, except Jim Yost, who participated by telephone. Measure welcomed new Council member Bill Bradbury of Oregon to his first Council meeting.

Reports from 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 received a progress report on the Research, Monitoring & Evaluation (RM&E)/Artificial Production (AP) categorical review. We also reviewed several F&W projects, and representatives of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department updated us on their activities and programs, he said.

Tom Karier reported that the Power Committee discussed a work plan and agenda for the coming year. We heard from a panel of Montana utility representatives about their energy efficiency activities and progress and problems in developing and integrating renewable resources, he said. We also had a report on energy markets and new models to exchange and trade reserves to increase the amount of wind energy that can be developed and integrated, Karier stated.

Rhonda Whiting reported that the Public Affairs Committee reviewed 2010 accomplishments and a work plan and priorities for 2011, reviewed a tentative schedule for the August Congressional trip, and talked about a schedule for Council trips to Washington, D.C., she said.

1. Update on Regional Technical Forum review and other comments:

Bill Drummond, Manager, Western Montana Electric G&T Cooperative, Inc.

Bill Drummond of the Western Montana Electric Generating and Transmission Cooperative told the Council that he and Karier have been chairing a review committee on the Regional Technical Forum (RTF). He said Congress authorized the RTF and charged the Council and BPA with creating it as an independent body to assess the savings from energy efficiency measures and programs.

The RTF has done good work through the years, and with energy efficiency requirements increasing, it is expected the RTF workload will increase, Drummond said. And going forward, there are questions to be answered, according to Drummond, including: Who are the RTF's stakeholders? Could its current structure be expanded? There are also funding uncertainties, he told the Council.

The Northwest Energy Efficiency Task Force recommended there be another review committee to look at the RTF, and in July, the Council approved Tom Karier, myself, and 18 other people, including representatives from utilities, regulatory commissions, BPA, and public interest groups, to make up that committee, Drummond explained.

In my opinion, there is agreement on the need for an advisory committee to make recommendations to the Council on policy issues involving the RTF, Drummond stated. Such a committee, he said, could address issues like a budget and work plan for the RTF, its policies, the funding allocation among utilities, the question of multiyear funding, and retrospective work plan reviews to determine if the RTF is accomplishing its goals. I'll bring a detailed proposal for an advisory committee to you next month, he told the Council.

2. Briefing by Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks on policy areas of mutual interest:

Brian Marotz.

Brian Marotz of the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department made a presentation to the Council on some of the work they are doing under the Libby and Hungry Horse mitigation programs. He said there had been reports of zebra or quagga mussels in Flathead Lake, but so far the tests have been inconclusive. Samples were taken, and they found the swimming phase of the mussels, replied Marotz. They sent samples to other labs, and one said yes and one said no, he added.

Marotz described restoration projects being done in the Flathead and Kootenai subbasins to protect "the best of the best" wildlife habitat. Over 181,000 acres of habitat have been permanently conserved since 2001, he said.

Preparations are beginning for a second spill test at Libby Dam this year, in accord with the white sturgeon settlement, Marotz reported. We are planning to do spill tests for three years, he said.

Marotz described a project in which 21 lakes are being restored and repopulated with pure westslope cutthroat trout. He told the Council about the appearance of a new threat to the fishery, a stalked diatom called *Didymosphenia geminata*, proliferating several miles downstream of Libby and Hungry Horse dams. No one knows how to control it, but we have started working on that, Marotz said. The diatom's dense mats, which look like masses of "goldenrod-colored tissue paper," go into the spaces between river gravels and eliminate insect life. Once the insects are gone, the fish populations change, and we are seeing fish populations reduced because of this below Libby Dam, Marotz said. We are wondering why this is happening and how to control it, if we can, he added.

3. Update on Blackfoot River Subbasin Plan:

Stan Bradshaw, Trout Unlimited, Montana Water Project.

Staffer John Shurts said the Council received the Blackfoot River Subbasin Plan in late 2009. The Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) reviewed it and asked for the planners to address some issues, and we recently received the revised version of the plan, he explained. Staff will bring you a recommendation at the February Council Meeting either to adopt the plan as part of the F&W program or a recommendation for more work that needs to be done, Shurts told the Council.

Stan Bradshaw of Trout Unlimited described the revised subbasin plan. He said when they received funding to do the plan, there were other planning efforts under way in the subbasin, including from the Nature Conservancy. We tried to work with them in a hybrid process, and as a result, the format of our plan is somewhat different from other subbasin plans, Bradshaw noted. We made an effort to fill the gaps the ISRP identified, he added.

We added text to describe our restoration approach, a description of priorities, and site-specific habitat and fisheries information. Bradshaw said. We put more flesh on our description of monitoring and evaluation efforts in the subbasin, he noted. I hope you will accept this as part of your F&W program -- it's already being used by people working in the basin, Bradshaw said.

4. Presentation on the ISAB Food Web report:

Bob Naiman, and Bruce Rieman, ISAB members (comments by Dr. Jack Stanford).

Robert Naiman of the Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB) led off a panel presentation on the ISAB's Columbia River Food Webs report, which took two years and looks at aquatic food webs in the Columbia River Basin and their effects on native fish restoration efforts. Food webs are the foundation for fish production, he noted. Looking at food webs can reveal insights about fish productivity that cannot be obtained from an exclusive focus on the four H's, Naiman stated. Food webs reflect how ecosystem components act collectively, and sometimes synergistically, to underpin fish resilience and productivity, he said.

There are three critical issues related to food webs. The first is whether there is enough food to produce fish that can return to spawn; second is the proliferation of chemicals and contaminants; and the third involves having non-native species in the ecosystem that compete with and prey upon native species, Naiman explained.

Most anadromous salmonids in the basin originate from hatcheries, and surprisingly little is known about the impact of hatchery releases on natural food webs, he said. Yet evidence seems to be mounting that hatchery fish are having an effect, because the food that hatchery fish eat reduces the amount of food for native fish, plus non-native species like shad consume many metric tons of food. There may not be enough food in the river to feed everybody, Naiman stated.

There are about 182 pesticides in use annually in the basin, and there are 169 U.S. and 18 Canadian wastewater treatment plants, he said. Contributions from current and emerging contaminants like pharmaceuticals, flame retardants, and personal care products remain largely unknown, Naiman noted.

There are about 45 non-native fishes in the basin, and they can change the productivity of the waters of the ecosystem, he said. Another important issue is that of humans as fish predators, and the Council may want to examine that in the future, Naiman stated. People kill more large fish than any other predator in the basin, and this taking of fish reverberates through the food web, he said. Fisheries are responsible for about a 30-percent mortality rate for salmonids, both hatchery and wild, compared to a total predation mortality rate on salmonids by birds and mammals of 20 percent or less, according to Naiman.

We need better modeling to evaluate alternative policies, he said. One such evaluation could look at the effect on native fishes if we took hatchery fish out of the system in certain locations for a couple of years, Naiman stated.

We should have a good, comprehensive food web model and an action plan, he suggested. We estimate it would take a 12-year effort with an estimated total cost of \$20 million to \$25 million, Naiman said. The cost is only intended to give an initial sense of the scope and scale of the focus needed, and we are not proposing a new program, but rather improvements to existing activities, he added. A food web perspective would provide a necessary complement to ongoing emphases on the four H's, Naiman said.

We've talked for years about restoring ecosystem processes, but you are telling us that's overly simplistic due to the hybrid food web, said Wallace. What can we do? he asked. There are lots of things we do that may have been affecting the food webs, and "they may be biting us," replied Bruce Rieman of the ISAB, citing the release of hatchery fish as an example.

This makes us think differently about habitat projects than we have traditionally thought, said Booth. Before we consider spending \$20 million on new projects, maybe we could ask project sponsors different questions than we have in the past, he suggested.

You are convincing that the food web is important, and there are other critically important areas like genetics, ocean research, and climate change, said Karier. The challenge for the Council is priorities, he stated. If we spend more on research, we spend less on projects on the ground, Karier said.

Jack Stanford, head of the University of Montana's Flathead Lake Biological Station, said the ISAB had prepared "a remarkable report." It underscores that the food web is the currency of the ecosystem you are trying to manage, he said. Stanford complimented the ISAB for putting it all together and bringing "these cogent recommendations" to the Council. He distributed an article about the food web and problems that have occurred at Flathead Lake. What we've been is "way too fish-centric in the Columbia Basin," Stanford said. We need to find a way to deal with new contaminants and figure out the most robust monitoring system, as the ISAB recommends, he concluded.

5. Presentation on ISRP RM&E/AP final report:

Rich Alldredge, Pete Bisson and Eric Loudenslager, ISRP members.

Pete Bisson of the ISRP led off a presentation on the ISRP's comments and recommendations on 99 proposals submitted for the 2010 Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) and Artificial Production (AP) categorical review. He explained the scientific criteria used to review the projects. We were most favorably impressed with this set of proposals, Bisson stated, adding

that nine out of 10 met scientific criteria. We found that the projects show improved data collection, analysis, and reporting, and we are seeing better use of data generated from monitoring being used in management decisions, he said. These are all signs to the good, according to Bisson.

He described supplemental questions the Council asked the ISRP to answer with respect to the proposals, adding, “some were hard to answer.” We found few proposals had duplicative or excessive RM&E efforts, but that better coordination and integration among the projects is needed, Bisson reported. The benefits from high-quality RM&E cannot be overemphasized, and in some cases, more may be beneficial, he added.

We also made some suggestions in our report, calling for more and better data sharing, replied Bisson.

We said in our report that excellent data is being collected, but it’s not being adequately analyzed, said Dennis Scarnecchia of the ISRP. The projects are better at collecting data, but not deriving the meaning of it, he added.

We are the link to policy, said Wallace. Maybe we will have to recommend that the sponsors of a project do more data evaluation, he stated. Maybe we need a more organized, centralized data base, said Bradbury. How can we make our data base more useful so we can compare one data evaluation to another? he asked. I’d distinguish between data and information, said Rich Alldredge of the ISRP. We have lots of data, but the next step is to make information out of it, he stated.

Bisson said toxic compounds are an emerging issue that deserves more attention, and that there weren’t many projects that addressed the issue. The “emerging contaminants” include pesticides, pharmaceuticals, personal care products, and flame retardants, and some of them have been shown to alter salmon behavior, he noted.

The use of statistics varied across the projects, and there is a need for more statistical rigor, according to Bisson. Budget information in the proposals was relatively easy to follow, and BPA’s Taurus system helped us in our review, he said.

I think the ISRP does a great job, but my disappointment relates to the accomplishments aspect of this review, stated Karier. We asked “what are the major accomplishments of these projects and are the data derived from the projects useful and relevant,” he noted. We have to show accomplishments that benefit fish and wildlife, Karier stated. Somewhere we are dropping the ball -- we asked the projects to summarize their accomplishments and for the ISRP to review them, he said, asking “how do we get to that?”

The 1996 amendment to the Power Act charges the ISRP to do a project retrospective, but we haven’t done those annually, said Loudenslager. That would be a good topic for a follow-up, he added.

With accomplishments, people tend to talk about what they monitor, but the question is: what is being done differently as a result of this work, said Bisson. And how have fish and wildlife benefited, said Karier. It’s time to make some progress on this, he added.

6. Progress report on RM&E/AP category review:

Lynn Palensky, Program Development.

Staffer Lynn Palensky gave an update on the process to develop recommendations for the project proposals submitted in the RM&E/AP categorical review. We have an enormous amount of work to do to develop these recommendations, she said. The ISRP's report on the categorical review is one piece of the puzzle, Palensky noted. Palensky reminded the members of the F&W Committee work session that will be held on January 19 to discuss issues related to the categorical review and approaches for moving forward with developing recommendations.

7. Council decision on project reviews: Accord Projects

– Project #2009-005-00, *Influence of Environment and Landscape on Salmonid Genetics*

Staffer Mark Fritsch presented funding requests for two Accord projects. The first is a project, sponsored by the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), with two objectives, he said. They are to determine the effects of watershed/landscape characteristics on the genetic structure of chinook and steelhead populations and to evaluate how environmental conditions influence certain traits as they relate to the recovery of salmonid populations, Fritsch noted. The ISRP reviewed the project and found it met scientific review criteria, and the F&W Committee approved it, he said. Shawn Narum from the Hagerman Genetics Laboratory explained the purposes of the project and how its results would contribute to fish recovery.

This project has been worked over significantly by the ISRP, and because of that, I feel much better about it, said Bradbury. They helped refine it so that it is more realistic with respect to its outcomes, he added.

I too would like to see how this project fits into our subbasin plans, as well as our research plan, Dukes said. Maslen said BPA is willing to work with the Accord sponsors and the Council on better integration of research priorities and information.

Wallace moved that the Council recommend to BPA the implementation of Project #2009-005-00, *Influence of Environment and Landscape on Salmonid Genetics*. Booth seconded, and the motion passed.

– Project #2008-903-00, *ESA Habitat Restoration*

Fritsch described another Accord project, a habitat restoration project sponsored by the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. The ISRP requested additional information, which was provided, and then the ISRP said the project met scientific review criteria, he said. The F&W Committee has approved it, Fritsch added.

Wallace moved that the Council recommend to BPA the implementation of Project #2008-903-00, *ESA Habitat Restoration*. Booth seconded, and the motion passed.

8. Update from Bonneville Power Administration on Post-2011 Energy Efficiency:

Michael Weedall, Bonneville Power Administration.

Mike Weedall of BPA described the agency's Phase 2 post-2011 energy efficiency proposal released January 11 for a comment period that ends on February 14. Phase 2, which began in July, gave us an opportunity to meet with customers and others to get recommendations on changes to make in our post-2011 energy efficiency programs, he said. Weedall described the five workgroups that participated in Phase 2 discussions and said BPA took their recommendations into consideration in creating the post-2011 proposal.

He summarized key aspects of the proposal, starting with the energy efficiency incentive. Most of the budget will be for incentives our customers can use, according to Weedall. Energy efficiency incentive dollars will be allocated based on how much Tier One power a customer takes from BPA, he explained. This mechanism allows the vast majority of the dollars to be allocated to individual utilities, and it means that BPA will have less flexibility going forward, Weedall stated.

The proposal would permit utilities to pool dollars for programs and includes the idea of an "unassigned account" from which funds would be distributed on a first-come, first-serve basis, he noted. We have some concerns about these elements, but we'll take comments on them and see what we get, Weedall said.

BPA's proposal "takes a hard line" on transition funding for existing projects, he stated. Unless a project was in BPA's tracking system by October 1, 2010 and exceeds 20 percent of a utility's energy efficiency incentive, we won't fund it, Weedall said. Everything else going forward will be funded by customers out of their incentives, he added.

BPA's proposal presents two options for large industrial conservation projects, according to Weedall. In the first, no capital budget funds would be set aside, and the second would create a large-project fund that could be accessed according to certain requirements, he said.

Can BPA achieve its conservation targets in the power plan without a large-project fund? Tom Karier asked. I don't know, replied Weedall. The goal should be to achieve all cost-effective conservation in BPA's territory, said Karier. If it looks like that won't be achieved, we need to figure out what to do about that, he stated. I hope we can come up with a solution because the states don't have the money to do such projects, Karier added.

Weedall explained how the provisions for small and rural utilities in the proposal differ from workgroup recommendations. Under the proposal, utilities would qualify for funds on a sliding scale based on Tier One allocations, and more smaller utilities could receive higher "performance payments" than is the case today, he said.

The proposal contains two options on whether BPA should develop standards for Conservation Potential Assessments, Weedall continued. The workgroup said BPA should not require them, and that's option one, he said. Under the second option, BPA would develop prescriptive standards and require customers to perform CPAs, Weedall noted.

In Washington, most utilities have to do Integrated Resource Plans that include conservation assessments, said Karier. Would those qualify? he asked, and Weedall replied “absolutely, yes.”

BPA’s proposal includes two implementation options for custom projects, Weedall explained. One is the standard pre-approval approach, similar to current policy, and the other is a “non-standard path,” in which projects would be reviewed after the fact, he said. These changes are another step in our trying to give our customers more flexibility to do energy efficiency programs the way they want to, according to Weedall.

Under the proposal, federal customers would have to go directly to the utilities that serve them to get funds for conservation programs, instead of to BPA, he pointed out. Directly served federal customers will get an incentive from BPA proportional to the amount of power they take from us, Weedall added.

The comment period will extend until February 14 so we’ll be looking to receive a lot of cards on that day, Weedall said. Does the Council want to send BPA a Valentine? staffer Charlie Grist inquired. Karier said the Power Committee would discuss making comments on the proposal and suggested staff come up with ideas on what those should be.

9. Panel on renewable development in Montana:

Chantel McCormick, Vice President, Grasslands Renewable Energy; Ted Williams, Head of Transmission, Gaelectric; and Ross Keough, Sagebrush Energy.

Ted Williams of Gaelectric North America, a wind power development company, refuted a claim he said was going around in the last election that wind energy costs for Montana consumers would be higher than costs from other energy sources. Even with integration costs, wind is a real bargain, he said.

Are you including subsidies in your cost data? Booth asked. Wind energy’s subsidy came from the fact there’s a subsidy from the federal government for all resources, including coal, natural gas, and oil, Williams replied. The Government Accounting Office did an analysis of those subsidies and the amount turned out to be \$1.50/MWh, he said. So the decision was made to give wind that amount, but unfortunately, the subsidy for wind is “bold and blatant,” while the subsidies for other resources are buried deeper, Williams stated.

In Montana, wind is creating jobs and generating tax revenues, he said. Wind projects in the state have created over \$28 million in economic benefits over five years, including jobs, royalties, and tax revenues, Williams pointed out.

The U.S. Department of Energy says that every 1,000 MW of wind generation in Montana translates to \$14.8 million in tax revenue, \$2.7 million in royalty payments, and 271 new long-term jobs, he said. Gaelectric’s annual payroll in Montana is \$1 million, and we haven’t built any projects yet, Williams noted. The project we plan to build in Harlowton would be a \$1 billion investment, he said, adding: “When was the last billion-dollar investment in Montana? Back in the time of Colstrip.”

Gaelectric has over 280,000 acres under long-term lease in Montana, with a potential for 3,000 MW of wind generation, Williams reported. We are planning to sell into the Pacific Northwest market, he said.

Montana wind has a different shape than Columbia Gorge wind, Williams continued. Gorge wind is the lowest in the winter and the highest during the spring runoff period, he said. Montana wind is the opposite -- it peaks in the winter and backs off in the summer, Williams noted.

Montana wind is a good complement to Gorge wind, and if you aren't buying both, you might say Montana wind is better suited to load than Gorge wind, he stated. Gorge wind drops off in the peak-load hours, but blows all night, while Montana wind is the opposite -- it blows when load is the highest, according to Williams.

There's a lot of interest in our product in the Pacific Northwest, but the market is pretty soft right now, he noted. BPA's open season can't provide all the transmission we need, and the reality is we will be lucky to move the output of our Harlowton project on the existing system, Williams stated. To sum up, little of what I've described is possible without new transmission, he said.

Ross Keogh of Sagebrush Energy said his company, based in Missoula, is focused on developing 300 MW of wind in Idaho and Montana. We have two 20-MW projects in late-stage development in Montana, we supported Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems (UAMPS) on a 100-MW wind farm near Idaho Falls, and we are part of a partnership with the Shoshone-Bannock and Southern Ute tribes on the 160-MW WheatGrass Ridge Wind Project near Pocatello, he noted.

While Oregon and Washington have added wind energy capacity consistently over the last several years, it's a different story in Montana and Idaho, where there has been fairly slow growth, Keogh observed. In 2011, Idaho will surpass Montana in installed wind, and by 2013, Idaho is on track to break 1,000 MW, he said.

The average wind energy penetration rate in Oregon and Washington is 11.1 percent, according to Keogh. Montana would need 200 MW in new wind projects to get to that rate, he said. The demand exists for that 200 MW, but development has stalled, Keogh added.

No new wind has been built in NorthWestern Energy's balancing authority since 2006, he noted. One of the barriers to wind energy development in Montana is the high cost of regulation resources, Keogh said. There's a highly inelastic supply of such resources in Montana, and prices have increased, he stated.

Costs for regulation resources are as high as \$15/MWh now, and I think they could go to \$20/MWh, Keogh stated. Outside of Montana, regulation resource costs are lower, he said, citing a PacifiCorp 2010 wind integration study that put the cost at \$8.85/MWh and a 2010 BPA rate case figure of \$5.70/MWh.

Another barrier in Montana is minimal political support, Keogh stated. There are two bills in the legislature to repeal Montana's renewable portfolio standard, and three other bills that would weaken it, he pointed out. I predict they will pass, and there may not be enough votes to override a veto by the governor, Keogh said.

Another barrier we face in this state is "the ghosts of deregulation," he told the Council. NorthWestern Energy was not allowed to own generation assets until 2007, Keogh said. With no resources, NWE was stranded for capacity to regulate wind and load, and BPA-supported

cooperatives abandoned NWE for load regulation in 2009, he added. The resource planning process in Montana is weak, and most large industrial loads purchase energy from PPL Energy Plus, Keogh stated.

Going forward, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) proposed rule on integrating variable energy resources is significant, and 15-minute scheduling will be critical to minimizing the need for regulation resources, he said. The Council could help us have a dialogue on wind-energy issues in Montana, Keogh suggested. Balancing area consolidation and Regional Transmission Organization formation could solve cost allocation and regulation issues, and the Council could help us address those topics at a regional level, he said.

Karier raised the question of who pays for additional transmission to bring wind out of Montana. BPA, he said, is approaching that issue through its open-season process. Is that the right way to do it? Karier asked. BPA's process is currently the best model for looking at transmission expansion, Williams replied. Most other transmission owners in the region are IOUs subject to FERC, he noted. BPA's open season looks at the entire region as one piece and can make judgments about what is going to benefit the region, Williams added.

We in Montana are still in recovery from the "deregulation debacle," observed Measure. It creates some special problems at a time when there is a lot of industry interest in wind energy development in our state, he said.

10. Council Business

– Approval of minutes

Wallace moved that the Council approve the minutes of the December 14-15, 2010 Council meeting held in Portland, Oregon. Booth seconded, and the motion passed.

– Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Columbia Basin Trust

Shurts described the cooperative relationship the Council has developed with the Columbia Basin Trust (CBT). Last year, Council representatives met with the CBT, and there was a mutual desire to reaffirm that cooperation going forward and to formalize it into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), he said. The CBT will meet January 28 to consider approving the MOU, Shurts noted.

Wallace moved that the Council approve the Memorandum of Understanding and Cooperation with the Columbia Basin Trust, as presented by staff, conditioned on reciprocal approval by the Board of Directors of the Columbia Basin Trust. Bradbury seconded, and the motion passed.

– Election of officers

Measure asked for nominations for Council officers for the coming year. Booth nominated Wallace to be vice-chair. He has served well as vice-chair this past year, notably in his cross-border liaison work with the CBT, Booth said. Dukes seconded, and the motion for Wallace to be vice-chair passed unanimously.

Karier nominated Measure to be Council chair. In the past year, there have been some great accomplishments under his leadership, including the adoption of the Sixth Power Plan, Karier said. Bruce has helped energize the Council and helped us to innovate in our use of technology and outreach to the public, Karier stated.

Bradbury seconded Karier's motion to elect Measure as chair. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Mitch Pond, a CRITFC commissioner, gave the Council a report on some of the activities CRITFC is doing this year. He described meetings related to the Columbia River Treaty, efforts to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service on sea lion predation control, Condit Dam removal, and updating the CRITFC mission statement.

Pond noted that CRITFC is working on a lamprey restoration plan. He said that Pacific lamprey or "eels" are an important source of food, medicine, and culture for many Northwest tribes and that lamprey are imperiled and disappearing from the region. Adult counts at Bonneville Dam were about 20,000 in 2010, compared to over 100,000 eight years ago, Pond reported. A major concern is the loss of juvenile lamprey to entrainment within water withdrawal facilities, he said. While many systems have been retrofitted to prevent the loss of juvenile salmon, the screens were not designed to prevent the entrainment of juvenile lamprey, Pond explained.

CRITFC has asked the Council to postpone approval of funding for salmon screen construction until the screens can be designed and installed with lamprey-friendly criteria, he noted. Failure to do so will prolong the entrainment and loss of juvenile lamprey and require future, expensive modifications in order to better protect these fish, according to Pond. The tribes met with the Bureau of Reclamation January 10 about improving screens for lamprey protection, he said. We look forward to working with the Council on lamprey restoration actions throughout the basin, Pond added.

Bruce Jim of CRITFC made a statement to the Council about the need to take care of natural resources and the need for cooperation to do that. He described some of the tribes' concerns and traditions and how the tribes look at the world. Jim urged the Council and others present to listen to each other's problems. By working together, we can accomplish a lot, he said.

Approved February 9, 2011.

/s/ Richard Wallace

Vice-Chair

x:\jh\ww\minutes\janaury 2011 short version.docx