

Richard Devlin
Chair
Oregon

Ted Ferrioli
Oregon

Guy Norman
Washington

Patrick Oshie
Washington



Northwest Power and Conservation Council

August 2020

Bo Downen
Vice Chair
Montana

Jennifer Anders
Montana

Jim Yost
Idaho

Jeffery C. Allen
Idaho

Council Meeting/Webinar Minutes

Wednesday, August 12, 2020

Council Chair Richard Devlin brought the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. Council Members Jeffery Allen, Jennifer Anders, Bo Downen, Ted Ferrioli, Guy Norman, Patrick Oshie and Jim Yost joined by phone. The meeting was held as a webinar due to the coronavirus health emergency. The next meeting also will be a webinar, scheduled for September 15 and 16, 2020.

Reports from Fish and Wildlife, Power and Public Affairs committee chairs

Fish and Wildlife Committee

Council Member Guy Norman, Fish and Wildlife Committee chair, reported on one public agenda item. The remaining time was spent in closed session.

- Member Norman reported on a presentation by Mark Fritsch of the Council staff and Kinsey Frick of NOAA Fisheries' Northwest Fisheries Science Center on efforts to improve upstream passage of adult Pacific lamprey in the Columbia River basin. For the past decade, fish and wildlife managers have been studying passage and developing lamprey-friendly modifications to the fishways. He described the conditions needed for lamprey passage, which are different from salmon. A 2019 PIT-tag study showed the average passage success is 50%. A lot of work is being done with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make passage friendlier. There are six projects for lamprey in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program.

Power Committee

Council Member Pat Oshie, Power Committee chair, covered the meeting agenda:

- Staff shared with the Committee the results from the stakeholder survey on the use of previous Power Plan content. The purpose of the survey was to ensure that the Council's Power Plan remains useful to the region. Over 100 responses were received from a broad spectrum of respondents. Public power and IOUs made up the majority, along with policy-makers, independent power producers, national labs and private citizens. The survey was a success and will continue to inform the development of the Power Plan, he said.
- New load methodology was reviewed by staff, and they discussed work to reconcile the new model with prior sets of load data. The model indicates increased loads during the summer and flatter loads during the winter.
- Staff presented an adequacy update for 2021 Power Plan. The Council uses a 5% loss-of-load probability (LOLP) as its reserve margin of adequacy. Staff is looking at coal closure impacts on adequacy. The presentation in the committee was about the model, not the results. Work will continue and the committee will report back to the Council with an updated LOLP number.
- There was an update on WECC-wide clean energy policies. It includes state policies, RPS, utility clean energy goals, and city and county government mandates. In the Northwest, by the end of the Power Plan horizon, 71% of the electricity provided in the region will be clean energy due to these policies.
- Staff presented preliminary electricity price forecast model runs for the 2021 Power Plan, as well as an avoided emissions rate study. The price forecasts have been updated to incorporate climate change and WECC-wide demand. The avoided emissions rate study includes additional resource retirements, clean energy policies and other impacts. The preliminary result shows some unexpected and inconsistent outcomes. Staff will rethink how and why the model is weighing system needs and clean energy policies, and they will refine the model, working with the Council's System Adequacy Advisory Committee.
- There was a presentation on the initial conservation target framework for the Power Plan. Jennifer Light, Regional Technical Forum manager, talked about considerations for developing the regional conservation target and what BPA's share of the target should be.

Public Affairs

Council Member Jeffery Allen, Public Affairs Committee chair, reported:

- The dates for the 2021 Congressional Tour are August 16–19, 2021 in Montana. They will use the funds allocated for this year’s cancelled tour. Idaho’s Congressional Tour is next week.
- The committee discussed a four-state avian predation letter from the Council. The Council played a role in getting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to consider expanding its avian predation control actions.
- The committee looked at changes to the Council’s home page to highlight the Power Plan and the Fish and Wildlife Program Addendum.
- Public Affairs is exploring sharing presentation guidelines for Council meetings.

1. ISRP presentation on Resident Fish and Sturgeon Project Review

Erik Merrill, independent science manager, introduced Dr. Stan Gregory, chair; and Dr. Desiree Tullos, vice chair, of the Independent Scientific Review Panel.

Merrill said there is a major transition of ISRP members – five leaving and five coming on. He thanked Eric Schrepel for his contributions. Also, Judi Hertz, executive assistant, and Kendra Coles, administrative assistant, were very helpful. Finally, he thanked retiring executive director Steve Crow for decades of leadership and support.

Gregory reported the findings of the annual resident fish and sturgeon review. There were 44 proposals reviewed in 2020, which covered a large portion of Basin’s fish communities and landscapes. A total of 10 native fish and 10 nonnative fish species are addressed by projects. The proposals cover an extensive geographic and biological area in all four states. They cover 10 large rivers, more than 100 streams and tributaries, five large lakes and more than 50 other smaller ponds and lakes. They also include reservoirs.

Gregory said 30 proposals met the scientific review criteria. Ten met criteria with conditions and two were not amenable to scientific review. Two others had some challenges and are pending final review. They will have to meet some conditions, he said.

The ISRP worked to make the review process as supportive as possible. They revised proposal forms and held workshops on how to prepare proposals. They extended the response deadline to accommodate COVID-19.

Exemplary proposals included:

- Evaluating the life history of native salmonids in the Malheur River Subbasin – submitted by the Burns Paiute Tribe.

- White sturgeon enhancement – submitted by the Colville Confederated Tribes
- Nonnative fish suppression – submitted by the Kalispel Tribe
- Genetic integrity and population and viability of Yellowstone cutthroat – submitted by Idaho Department of Fish & Game
- Kootenai River fish mitigation – submitted by the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho and Idaho Department of Fish & Game
- Secure and restore fish and wildlife habitat in Montana – submitted by the Salish and Kootenai Confederated Tribes

Tullos discussed nonnative fish in recreational fisheries. She said there are several projects to remove northern pike. Some projects are less effective, and those that are have to be continued into perpetuity. Northern pike invasion below Chief Joseph Dam is likely and a multistate task force is needed to address it. Northern pike can eat salmonids and smallmouth bass.

She also talked about river and lake fertilization efforts at Dworshak Reservoir, South Arm of Kootenay Lake, and Kootenai River. She said there are clear effects on phytoplankton, but the benefits to fish are not as clear. There are questions about the interpretation of the data, and she described some of the issues in evaluating the food web. Plus, it can be very expensive.

She said the ISRP would like to have better communication with the Council and BPA regarding the agency's decisions in implementing Council and ISRP recommendations. She described a situation where there was a lack of information exchanged.

Last, Tullos talked about the need to incorporate other cultural solutions, rather than just western scientific thought. Specifically, the relationships between adaptive management processes and tribal decision-making processes.

Member Norman expressed his appreciation for all the work put into reviewing the 44 projects. The good news is that there's an increase in projects meeting criteria. Credit also goes to the managers for drafting better proposals. He asked about the conflict between nonnative fisheries and protecting native salmonids.

Tullos described a project producing smallmouth bass for recreational fishing and food that raised complicated issues with native fish management goals. Gregory added that the ISRP is encouraging Council staff to have proponents directly address the issues they face with nonnative fisheries. They are valued, but at the same time, there are contradictions, sometimes between different managers. Colville and Spokane tribes require fisherman to release any unmarked redband trout, but Washington state doesn't require their release.

Another problem was bycatch in the suppression of northern pike. Frequently, the bycatch wasn't being identified. The Panel encourages the reporting of all species going forward.

Member Norman agreed that there should be greater cooperation among all jurisdictions.

Member Anders expressed interest in the new perspectives of cultural factors. Where are you drawing that input? Where can I learn more?

Tullos said they just started. As a group, ISRP would like to develop that conversation, starting with CRITFC and other tribes, such as the Upper Columbia United Tribes. We have emails exchanged, but would like to formally have those conversation and establish ways cultural knowledge could be shared, she said. They are open to recommendations from Member Anders and others, and don't want to approach this as siloed academics. Gregory said it has been addressed in scientific articles. One departing ISRP member experienced this in his work in Africa, where they used tribal knowledge in their adaptive management. They set thresholds where they would depend upon tribal processes to take care of the natural resource issues.

Member Ferrioli thanked Tullos for providing a specific example of blocked communication with BPA, and how it is negatively affecting project managers, the work of ISRP and outcomes approved by the program. BPA is aware of these blockages and it seems to be systematic, he said. The Council is frustrated about the lack of communication and it is almost like an information embargo. Whether it's on advice from counsel or some type of management strategy, it's unacceptable. He said he put this on the record because he wanted this issue addressed.

On the issue of cultural communication, Member Ferrioli said it might be difficult for those steeped in scientific method to listen to oral histories. They're cultural memories. He appreciated that the ISRP has embraced the challenge of embracing those perspectives in tandem with their scientific method. He's sure it's appreciated and speaks well of the ISRP's efforts to get more positive outcomes with those you're working with.

Member Devlin said the Council is well aware of communication issues with BPA regarding program performance. Staff is working on this with BPA and we are still hopeful it can be resolved in a collaborative fashion. BPA needs to understand there is not a "do not respond" option. I've spoken to many Members and this needs to be resolved, he said.

2. Annual update on Energy Trust of Oregon

Tina Jayaweera, power planning resources manager, introduced Michael Colgrove, executive director; and Henry Lorenzen, vice president, board of directors of Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO).

Lorenzen, who used to serve as the Council Chair, has been on the ETO board for two years. He said the difference between the Council and ETO is stark. To the Council, energy

efficiency programs had their effect through the wholesale power supplier while the energy efficiency implementation was done by retail utilities. The ETO works directly with consumer on behalf of the utilities.

He said the ETO delivers energy efficiency through small-scale programs for Oregon's five investor-owned utilities. It serves 75% of Oregon's electric customers and 99% of its natural gas customers (and some NW Natural customers in Southwest Washington). The ETO is funded through a surcharge on utility bills and is overseen by the Oregon Public Utility Commission. Its vision is clean and affordable energy for everyone, including communities of color, low-income and rural customers. He said in 2018, the ETO helped the Council surpass its regional energy savings goal.

The ETO has five focus areas:

1. Engage customers with programs and services.
2. Supporting utilities
3. Informing policymakers
4. Delivering multiple benefits
5. Adapting to change

Colgrove said the ETO developed and approved a strategic plan for the next five years. 2020 is the first year, building on a successful, high-savings year in 2019. The ETO met its electric savings goal by acquiring 53 aMW of electricity, almost met its natural gas savings goal by saving 5.9 million annual therms, and surpassed its renewable generation goal with 2.7 aMW, generated from solar and small-scale, low-impact hydro.

These savings were acquired through business lighting projects, residential lighting, custom gas and electric projects at industrial and commercial facilities, new construction in residential multifamily, offices and warehouses, and a very large three-year industrial project. The cost for these savings were 3¢ per kWh and 39¢ per therm, levelized. Renewable generation was helped with decreased costs and increased efficiency from solar panels.

With COVID, we're now delivering energy efficiency in a different world, Cosgrove said. Through June, 239,000 Oregonians have lost jobs and the unemployment rate reached 11 percent. With the pandemic, many customer businesses closed, with a notable exception of the construction industry, which has had a positive impact on ETO programs.

Residential customers have been impacted by job losses and disruptions over school closures and child care. Communities with the highest energy burdens (those spending more than 6% on utility costs) are low-income households, people of color and rural households.

He said business customers haven't all been impacted the same way. Some have been able to maintain their business processes. Location matters in rural areas, and communities that are reliant on tourism have been impacted most. They are also hearing about major challenges facing the contractors to install ETO's energy efficient equipment. To help residential customers, the ETO has increased its online offers, more low- and no-cost services, free energy-saver kits, and enhanced incentives for moderate and low-income customers. In May, ETO launched a website where community action agencies could order LEDs in bulk to distribute to the people they serve. This is a way to help get energy-saving bulbs into the homes of customers who have been underserved, he said.

For business customers, ETO is offering lighting incentive increases, targeted bonuses for rural small businesses and schools, and expanded direct installation of pipe insulation and repair of municipal water.

Early indications show a very positive response. The rapid shift in virtual customer engagement has resulted in higher-than-expected participation in some areas. For instance, attendance at new buildings training and education events this year to date has surpassed what we've actually seen in all of 2019, Colgrove said. The ETO's low- and no-cost offers has resulted in very high numbers of residential customers ordering energy saver kits. In one week during its marketing campaign, more than 5,300 orders were received, far more than 100 to 200 weekly orders that ETO used throughout the year.

ETO is now estimating achieving 90% of its goal set last year, up from 70% projected last May. We expect prolonged social distancing to impact the industry, he said. In the residential sector there will be limited in-person services. More of offers will have to be promoted online. Less spending and more savings will be emphasized. Many customers are facing unpaid utility bills. There are more layoffs and more restaurant closures. Expect companies to be cautious about capital investments.

As in the 2008 recession, the energy efficiency industry should play a role in sustaining economies, he said. Looking at long-term trends, the ETO is working to understand the impact of COVID-19 on utilities. Working from home can impact traditional loads, but there are indications of minimal impact early in the pandemic. COVID could create opportunities for some industries such as ultraviolet lighting as a disinfectant, thermal scanners, and HVAC technology and controls to increase outside air intake. There's also been a lot of buzz about automated food service innovations.

He expects current trends to continue in lighting savings and increases in building code baselines. Colgrove sees declining electric energy savings potential over the next 20 years as the large, cost-effective savings sources have been largely acquired. There will be cost-effective challenges for certain programs and measures going forward.

The gas savings forecast shows increased potential. But the resource in later years will be more expensive, he said. Energy efficiency will continue to have value and will always be a good investment, now more than ever. There's a question about the relative value of efficiency as loads fluctuate. Is efficiency more value in absolute terms or as a percentage of load? It's rhetorical, but an interesting question worth discussing with the Council.

ETO recognized the investments all customers have made as the result of our work, Colgrove said. Those paying into the public purpose charge should have equitable access to the benefits. He said that due to the disproportionate impacts of COVID, ETO is focused on supporting those customers hardest hit. ETO's board passed an equity and inclusion policy and added a diversity advisory council. To reach all customers, the ETO needs to build more relationships with community-based organizations, low-income agencies, local businesses and trade ally contractors. Through partnerships, we support them with a new source of revenue, and they help us reach customers. Colgrove talked about an ETO collaboration with the Community Energy Project, and later this year, a virtual do-it-yourself cooling workshop will be held.

The name of the game is to be flexible and creative, he said. The ETO working to leverage additional funding beyond the public purpose charge. The statewide carbon policy has not been achieved, so local communities are passing their own. We're also seeing efforts to create social equity and racial justice, as well as climate justice in Portland, he said. It also is working to understand the magnitude of COVID impacts on customers.

Colgrove praised Charlie Grist for his work with ETO.

Member Oshie thanked Colgrove and Lorenzen for their presentation, and for recognizing Grist and the relationship between ETO and the Council over the years. He asked about the administrative costs and delivery of conservation. I recall ETO being held out as a reasonable means of getting conservation, he said. Cosgrove said he didn't have a breakdown per unit. One way the OPUC conducts oversight is through metrics. Performance metrics include administration and staffing costs, and it hasn't changed for last few years. I believe it's 8% of annual expenditures, Colgrove said. It's capped and we have to manage administrative costs under that cap. He said he will provide the per-unit costs. The levelized cost of 3¢ per kWh and 39¢ per-therm represents an all-in cost.

Member Oshie asked what is the ETO's best-performing program, in light of COVID-19? Colgrove replied that energy saving kits with smart thermostats and LED bulbs are the bread and butter for residential. On the business side, the impact isn't uniform; there are fluctuations by business type. There is a lot of interest in strategic measures. There is online support for businesses and coaching. A lot of ETO's lighting measures have been very popular. ETO launched initiative in Klamath Falls around tubular LEDs. We've expanded the program into Central Oregon and the lighting upgrades have been popular, he said.

Member Oshie asked where Colgrove saw conservation moving in the next 10 years? Which measures will customers be interested in adapting at a rate that drives forward energy efficiency?

That sums up our planning process, Colgrove said. Declining potential is due to the success of lighting adoption. That's combined with the increasing construction code. There are still measures important to customers. We need to figure out how to deliver those measures. He mentioned being more deliberate and aggressive in finding complementary sources of funding (outside of ratepayer funding) to pay for measures that cost more than lighting. The healthcare industry has demonstrated some willingness to pay for measures to deal with asthma. Diversity and inclusion are designed to help customers who have not participated.

Member Downen said the Council creates a regional efficiency target. As a former Portland General customer, I used to pay into ETO. Does that budget drive your targets? How do you determine those targets? It's impressive you met your targets. How do you use the Council's targets in your target setting?

Colgrove said ETO gets its funding from the public purpose charge – 3% of utility revenues. We get 80% of that, he said. The funds are part of our electric efficiency work and all of our renewable program. The ETO has separate gas agreements through the OPUC. Utilities are mandated to get all cost-effective energy efficiency they can get. On an annual basis, we work with program delivery and others to identify what falls into the “all cost-effective opportunities” for the coming year, he said. Colgrove discussed the process of gathering that information and building their budget. In 2019, ETO hit it on the nose, he said, but prior there have been some fluctuations. They try to be within 5%. They have utility IRP forecasts they use as the starting point, he said, and the Power Plan is another resource they use as a benchmark.

Grist thanked Colgrove for his comments. It's been great to see the ETO blossom. It's a unique approach on how to implement efficiency and it's been astoundingly successful.

3. Council decision on adoption of Part I of the Fish and Wildlife Addendum

Member Devlin remarked how much time has been put into the Addendum process. After two years of work, we're now ready to adopt Part 1, he said. The Council has already adopted Part 2.

Member Norman said we've been looking forward to this day. This has been a two-year process, but the extra time has been worth it in terms of improving the value of the product. The Council did not overhaul the entire program. Fish and wildlife managers wanted more time to provide input into biological objectives and measurement. There have been valuable

exchanges between managers and staff, and that has provided greater joint ownership of the program.

Member Devlin asked if other Members had any remarks. There were none.

Patty O'Toole, Fish and Wildlife Division director, covered the timeline of the Addendum and said she hopes to have the findings and responses to comments in September.

Leslie Bach, senior program manager, went through the document, listing comments on the draft and proposed revisions.

John Shurts, general counsel, said the Council received comments on the five million anadromous fish goal with regard to the location at which the goal would be measured. When the Council adopted the goal in 1987, it was a total system goal but with the increases to come from above Bonneville Dam. The Council has tried to stay consistent with that, although in one program – the 2000 Program – the Council wrote it as a 5 million goal at Bonneville Dam. The Council has been careful ever since to be more precise and consistent with the original formulation, and is proposing to do so in Part I. Some of the fish and wildlife managers are not pleased with that resolution, but we've discussed it and will try to capture the issue and resolution carefully in the findings/response to comments.

Bach said that on page 11, the salmon and steelhead abundance targets from the MAFAC process were updated to the most recent information. The Upper Columbia United Tribes commented seeking a footnote about how the numbers were arrived at and that the numbers for the Upper Columbia cannot be met without counting fish reintroduced above Chief Joseph Dam. Bach responded that we're trying to use numbers and language developed in the MAFAC process and not add anything to what came from MAFAC. So, staff recommends not including the footnote. Bach also noted that there's still work being done in MAFAC and the numbers might still be revised, but that we were capturing in Part I the latest.

Shurts said CRITFC and its member tribes expressed concerns that including the MAFAC numbers in the program would be seen as an allocation of either the program's anadromous fish goal or of what should be the mitigation effort, reducing the goal or the effort in the central part of the Columbia/Snake basin above Bonneville. That is not the intent – the MAFAC process did not assign hydrosystem responsibility to the abundance targets, and so the numbers should not be seen as an allocation of the program's hydrosystem goal or the protection and mitigation effort under the program. Staff is comfortable that the Part I language is sufficient to cover this point, and we're working to capture this issue and emphasize this explanation in the findings and response to comments..

Member Norman said the numbers came from MAFAC process, and there has been understandable concern about how the numbers would be used when included in the program and the resources associated with that. What John describes would be satisfactory. The quality of products leading to MAFAC targets is unprecedented.

Bach moved to comments on page 12 about improving juvenile passage survival. The comments sought quantitative juvenile survival standards, she said. We found the 2019 and 2020 BiOps no longer identify specific juvenile survival standards, per dam or for the entire system. The dam-specific passage survival standards from the past were considered by the workshop participants to be no longer informative, and a good set of quantitative system survival standards do not exist. We agreed we want to see improvement and specific quantitative targets in the future. There was a lot of discussion with the managers around this. We kept a running list of data gaps and needs, and this is something we have on that list.

Shurts discussed page 13: Objective S5 – achieving anadromous fish distribution above all the blocked areas. The Upper Snake Tribes developed a version of this objective and then commented in support of it in comments on the revised draft of Part I.. Oregon supported the Upper Snake Tribes’ version during the workshops, although did not comment on this issue in the comments on the draft.. Staff developed the version in S5 where the program does not commit to reintroduction in every blocked area. Rather, we recognize that it is a tool that can be used where appropriate and under certain conditions. It’s an issue that needs careful writing in the findings that we’ll be bringing back before the Council. The Upper Columbia United Tribes also commented on the S5 footnote that they did not believe a particular sentence in the footnote applied to their efforts at reintroduction above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee. Staff did not propose to change the sentence in response.

Turning to the “all other native aquatic species” section of Part I, Bach noted that the Council received comments from Bonneville and the Public Power Council concerned that many of the objectives in Part I seem to exceed the Northwest Power Act’s mandate to protect and mitigate for hydrosystem losses. Staff replies that we believe these objectives are consistent with our mandate. Shurts said that while these comments applied to Part I generally, we paused at Part I’s white sturgeon objective as a good example. We know sturgeon are adversely affected by hydrosystem development and operations. There’s never been an effort to quantify the hydrosystem loss effects on sturgeon and corresponding hydrosystem-loss based quantitative program objectives. So, as a legal standard, the program goal and objective is the qualitative one to protect and mitigate effects of the hydrosystem on white sturgeon. But, the state and tribal managers of sturgeon have specific management objectives that are quantitative, and they wanted those reflected in the document. Staff agrees, but we did so by recognizing that the protection and mitigation efforts under the program will “contribute” to achieving these objectives. The quantitative objectives for white sturgeon in Part I are not a new or different obligation on

the hydrosystem program. We have to address this carefully in the findings.

Bach talked about page 20 of the wildlife section. She said they have a table to address the level of mitigation needed and accomplished. There are comments from the Coeur d'Alene and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes on how we address those losses. O'Toole said that wildlife is an area where the program has adopted quantitative assessments of wildlife losses due to dam construction and inundations. We have had them since 1989. We switched in the revised draft of Part I to a color chart to try to display progress in mitigating those losses. Some commenters said the chart did not reflect how they saw progress. She explained the color-coding scheme. She detailed some of the tribes' objections to showing mitigation has been achieved or mostly achieved for certain dam impacts through settlements they have been part of. She said mitigation isn't owed to a particular entity; it's owed to species impacted by the federal hydrosystem. But the program has relationships with specific agencies and tribes to define the mitigation needs in specific areas, and the program needs to recognize mitigation efforts that some consider unmet or mitigation issues that linger and have not yet been resolved. Shurts said we agreed with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes that we would address this in the findings for the Hungry Horse and Libby areas, and we will do for the other issues, too.

Bach discussed page 22 – comment that the program should include quantified ecosystem objectives, not qualitative objectives. She said the staff acknowledges the concerns around that issue, but we still have some objectives that are qualitative since they can't otherwise be captured in quantitative terms.

Bach then discussed different strategy performance Indicators. These are not being adopted as part of the program, but are included in the addendum as a first set of indicators for display. These will change over time as new information comes available. The Council received comments about the purpose of the indicators, criticizing some for not being informative, and also asking how the indicators might change over time. She discussed some of the comments and indicators, noting that staff wanted to keep the indicators more broad than specific. Shurts said the Upper Columbia United Tribes wanted specific indicators for reintroduction above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee. These would make excellent indicators for that effort, but we are trying to make the indicators more general to the strategies in the program as a whole, so staff revised what we received from the Upper Columbia Tribes. Again, this can be revisited as we begin using and reporting on the indicators.

Bach talked about Section B on assessing, monitoring and reporting. The Council received requests to be more specific about how the program performance workgroup established in Part I would be organized and function, and also comments requesting additional workgroups. These are useful comments, but we do not want to be too prescriptive and

detailed about the workgroup in the program itself, and we'll leave it to later when we form the workgroup for those specifics, she said.

Shurts said they received comments that didn't challenge or fit a specific part of Part I. Some of them were outside of the scope of Part I. Staff is not recommending changes to Part I in response. But we wanted to capture them here as well as brief staff responses. He referred to a few of them.

O'Toole said she appreciates everyone who participated in the workshops. Staff is done and we turn it over to the Council for deliberations.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council Motion to Adopt Part I of the 2020 Addendum to the Council's 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program

Vice Chair Downen moved that the Council adopt the Addendum Introduction and Part I of the 2020 Addendum to the Council's 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, as presented by staff and recommended by the Fish and Wildlife Committee.

Member Ferrioli second.

Member Devlin said there will be a roll call vote and it needs a supermajority to pass. Any discussion? There was none.

O'Toole called the roll:

Member Oshie: aye

Member Anders: aye

Member Ferrioli: aye

Member Norman: aye

Member Allen: aye

Member Downen: aye

Member Yost: aye

Member Devlin: aye

The motion passed.

Member Ferrioli said there has been such profuse praise for staff, but I want to thank Member Norman for his leadership in producing this quality product. He has encyclopedic knowledge of fish and wildlife, is patient with members and staff, and produced a great product.

Member Norman thanked the work of staff and the dedication of committee members.

O'Toole expressed her thanks on behalf of staff. She recognized Leslie Bach for getting the needed input, and Andrea Godwin and John Shurts. She thanked Mark Fritsch, Kendra Coles and Eric Schrepel. She thanked former Council staff members Laura Robinson, Nancy Leonard and Lynn Palensky.

Steve Crow recognition on his retirement

Member Devlin said Steve Crow, retiring executive director, has been with the Council for a third of a century and its executive director a quarter of a century.

Vice Chair Downen moved that the council adopt a resolution honoring Steve Crow for his long, distinguished excellent service to the Council and the region.

Member Allen second

Member Yost read the resolution:

Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Resolution
August 12, 2020

Whereas Steve Crow served admirably and loyally on the staff of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council from 1988 to 2020;

Whereas Steve Crow was named executive director of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council in 1995 and served with distinction for 25 years;

Whereas Steve Crow is the longest serving executive director in Council history;

Whereas Steve Crow spent 15 years in service to the United States Congress working for the Honorable Wendell Wyatt and the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield;

Whereas Steve Crow served the people of the State of Oregon and the people of the Pacific Northwest for his entire professional career;

Whereas Steve Crow has been an exemplary executive director who managed the Council through turbulent times and under the scrutiny of 40 Council members from the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington;

Whereas Steve Crow has consistently displayed and practiced a managerial style of calm reserve and firm commitment to a culture of respect and courtesy;

Whereas the hallmarks of Steve Crow's public service are bipartisanship, civility, and working for the common good;

Whereas Steve Crow is departing the Council on the best of terms and with the acknowledgement that his service has enhanced the Council's reputation throughout the region;

Whereas by this resolution the Council gives fair warning to rainbow trout in the Deschutes River that Steve Crow is likely to visit with much more frequency; Now, therefore, be it **Resolved**, That the Northwest Power and Conservation Council recognizes and thanks Steve Crow for his numerous professional achievements and wishes him well in his much-deserved retirement and other future endeavors he may pursue.

Attest
Richard Devlin, Chair

Each Council Member praised Steve Crow.

Roll call vote:
Member Allen voted aye
Member Yost voted aye
Member Anders voted aye
Member Downen voted aye
Member Oshie voted aye
Member Norman voted aye
Member Ferrioli voted aye
Member Devlin voted aye

Motion passes.

Member Devlin said Steve is receiving a nice plaque and gift cards from the Council, and there will be a story on him in the Council's Spotlight. Mark Walker and Judi Hertz worked to make sure all this came together.

Steve Crow expressed his appreciation. "I will miss the Council, the intellectual challenges and some of the management challenges", he said. "I will miss implementing the mission of the Council. I'll mostly miss the personal connections with the Members and staff. The last 10 years in particular have been great years for me and for the Council. Next April is the Council's 40th anniversary. That probably calls for a celebration. We're working in the public interest and public service. Our mission is a strong one and I hope it continues for years and years."

4. Council Business

Northwest Power and Conservation Council Motion to Adopt the Minutes of the July 15, 2020, Council Meeting

Vice Chair Downen moved that the Council approve for the signature of the Vice-Chair the minutes of the July 15, 2020, Council Meeting held in Portland, Oregon, via webinar, as presented by staff.

Member Anders second
Motion passes

Northwest Power and Conservation Council Motion to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Revised Fiscal Year 2021 Budget

Sandra Hirotsu, Administrative Division director, introduced the budget. The Council received comments from BPA to find more savings and keep the budget flat. BPA is going into its rate case and will look internally for savings. BPA recognized that Council's budget has increased at less than inflation. Staff identified additional cost savings that reduced the proposed Fiscal Year budget by an additional \$100,000. The Council will continue to look for savings going forward.

Vice Chair Downen moved that the Council adopt a Fiscal Year 2021 Revised Budget of \$11,744,000; adopt a Fiscal Year 2022 Budget of \$11,942,000; and authorize reprogramming of available Fiscal Year 2020 funds for unanticipated Fiscal Year 2020 costs, all as presented by staff.

Member Anders second.
Motion passes.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council Motion to Authorize Staff to Contract with QW Consulting in an Amount not to Exceed \$50,000 for the Development of an Artificial Production Interactive Web Tool

Mark Fritsch, project implementation manager, introduced the motion, which is work for the Council's new hatchery story map.

Vice Chair Downen moved that the Council authorize staff to contract with QW Consulting, LLC, in an amount not to exceed \$50,000 for the development of an artificial production interactive web tool, with the first component to be completed in FY2020 and the second component to be initiated, completed and billed in FY 2021, as presented by staff.

Member Yost second.
Motion passed.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council Motion to Authorize Staff to Amend the Existing Contract with Systematic Solutions, Inc., to Add \$16,000 to the Budget for a

Total Amended Contract Budget Not to Exceed \$120,016, for the Continued Support and Enhancement of the Energy 2020 Model for Use in the Development of the 2021 Power Plan

Massoud Jourabchi, economic analysis manager, said the contract is for the deep decarbonization scenario modeling in the 2021 Power Plan.

Vice Chair Downen moved that the Council authorize staff to amend the existing contract with Systematic Solutions, Inc., to add \$16,000 to the budget for a total amended contract budget not to exceed \$120,016, for the continued support and enhancement of the Energy 2020 model for use in the development of the 2021 Power Plan, as presented by staff.

Member Yost second
Motion passed.

Public comment

Scott Levy had comments about a model discussed in the Power Committee meeting. He said the model in GENESYS is constrained by policy, rather than by facts.

Member Devlin announced that all meetings through the rest of the year will be by webinar, with a lot of emphasis on the Power Plan.

Member Devlin adjourned the meeting at 1:12 p.m.

Approved September ____, 2020

Vice-Chair