## ATTACHMENT K

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Probability } \\ & \text { (P) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Impact } \\ \text { (I) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Weight } \\ (\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{I}) \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Overall Rating | $\begin{gathered} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { Status } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental \& Permitting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Environmental \& Permitting | Unanticipated Dam Safety Requirements Significant unanticipated Project requirements from dam safety agencies, FERC, or DSOD (including through BOC or PFMA processes) may cause delays to the project and increase costs. | Agency, FERC, DSOD, BOC, or PFMA reviews result in unanticipated requirements | Post-GMP | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Manage | Close coordination where possible with referenced agencies; Prepare technical assessments that can hold up to scrutiny. Proactive agency coordination and field studies are underway. | Owner | Open |
| 8 | Environmental \& Permitting | Unanticipated Other Permit Requirements Unanticipated permit requirements (outside of dam safety agencies) that increase contract price if not known at time of preparation of the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP). | Permitting agencies require offsite mitigation or any other requirements beyond anticipated requirements | Post-GMP | ${ }^{4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 Moderate | 12 | Med | Manage | Continued close consultation with agencies; Sound approach to restoration. Proactive agency coordination and field studies are underway. | Owner / LTC <br> Owner: Prior to permit finalization: Changes from expected permit conditions are Owner risks. A table of expected permit terms is attached to the contract and informs the GMP and the LTC has an obligation to negotaite an amendment in good faith. Any new permit previously not considered would be an Owner risk. <br> LTC: After permit finalization: if there is a change is to an existing permit, the LTC takes that risk. | Open |
| 15 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Environmental \& } \\ \text { Permitting } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | KRRC-Managed Permitting Delays Permit acquisition may take longer than anticipated, resulting in Project delay. Includes FERC transfer/surrender (including NEPA), USACE 404, ESA Section 7. CDFW/ODFW MOUs, County MOUs, etc. | Agency unable to process permit to allow for required construction start date | Post-GMP | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 Moderate | 12 | Med | Manage | Ongoing early consultation with agencies and early permit application submittal. Proactive agency coordination and field studies are underway. Proactive response to FERC requests and strict adherence to FERC standard protocol and processes. | Owner | Open |
| 75 | Environmental \& Permitting | Dredging Permit Unable to get a permit to dredge upstream of dams prior to drawdown. | Upstream dredging becomes infeasible due to access or permitting constraints | Post-GMP | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 6 | Med | Manage | Early coordination with PacifiCorp and applicable regulatory agencies. | Owner | Open |
| 93 | Environmental \& Permitting | Listed Species - Western Pond Turtle Western Pond TTurte becomes Federally listed during perinting process. This may result in additional cost. | Project effect on listed species | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 Moderate | 3 | Low | Manage | Proactive coordination with appropriate regulatory agencies on likely requirements and associated field work; Address contingency in consultations. Proactive agency coordination and field studies are underway. | Owner / LTC <br> Owner: If the western pond turtle is listed prior to permit finalization date, this may result in changes in obligations that would be the Owner's responsibility. <br> LTC: If there are any changes to obligations in respect of the western pond turtle after the permit finalization date. | Open |
| 88 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Environmental \& } \\ \text { Permitting } \end{gathered}$ | Flood Mitigation Delays Flood mitigation improvements delay reservoir drawdown. | Implementation of downstream flood improvements take longer than anticipated and are not completed prior to reservoir drawdown | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Manage | Complete early outreach to residents and owners in affected areas; Evaluate decision to proceed with drawdown even if some owners do not allow/desire flood improvements. | Owner | Open |
| 87 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Environmental \& } \\ \text { Permitting } \end{gathered}$ | JC Boyle LOW Expansion: Expanding of the permit boundaries to facilitate construction and provide access to make the work site safe (i.e. rock scaling, slope stabilization ,etc.) is not accepted. | Expanded Limit of Work required to complete the work, which needs to get incorporated into CEQA and permit processes, as needed | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 2 | Low | Manage | KP to prepare $60 \%$ Design to allow permitting and approvals to proceed, and to coordinate through compliance lead and KRRC legal to make sure expansion is covered | Owner | Open |
| 103 | Environmental \& Permitting | Copco No. 2 LOW Expansion: Copco 2 New permit area required for overflow spillway. This will include helicopter access to place galvanized steel bulkhead. Risk of not getting revised work boundary. | Expanded Limit of Work required to complete the work, which needs to get incorporated into CEQA and permit processes, as needed | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Manage | KP to prepare $60 \%$ Design to allow permitting and approvals to proceed, and to coordinate through compliance lead and KRRC legal to make sure expansion is covered. expansion | Owner | Open |
| Right-of-Way or Easements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Row | Easement Restrictions ROW/construction easements may be denied for modification of access roads or other improvements. | Insufficient communication and compromise with property owner | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Manage | Proactive communication with access road owners; Contingency planning for use of access roads without modification. | Owner | Open |
| 83 | Row | Adjacent Properties Impacted Unforeseen impact to adjacent properties during construction. | Unanticipated impacts during roads work or downstream mitigations | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 6 | Med | Share | Contractor required to develop final design that considers adjacent properties; Early identification of property impacts. | Owner / PDB Owner: Responsible to the extent there are unanticipated, unavoidable impacts. PDB: To the extent their negligent performance causes damage to downstream properties. | Open |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New risks New risks | dentified since July dentified or chan | uly 29,2019 <br> ged probabilities/impacts since February 25, 2020 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Impact } \\ & \text { (I) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { Weight } \\ (\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{I}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall Rating | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{array}$ | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { Status } \end{gathered}$ |
| Post-GMP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Post-GMP | Increased development Increased development within the floodplain beyond mitigations already included requires additional flood mitigation beyond what is planned. | City/county allows construction permits to be issued to developers | Post-GMP |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 1 | Low | Accept | Coordination with appropriate agencies; Consider an early CLOMR application to Counties. | Owner | Open |
| 100 | Post-GMP | Irongate Flow Continuation FERC Req: The additional redundancy for a 3rd IFR release facility is still required. Currently not being designed by KP/Kiewit. Risk of being required in the future. | Flow continuation requirement results in constraint on design that increases cost or lengthens schedule | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 1 | Low | Manage | Pursue clarity on this requirement ASAP through discussions with PacifiCorp and FERC. | Owner | Open |
| Field Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Field Conditions | Field Conditions General changed field condition (geotechnical, existing utilities, hazardous materials, and biological resources) leads to redesign, project delays and/or cost overruns. | Field condition differs from documented findings | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very Likely } \\ & (60-100 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Very Low | 5 | Med | Manage | Comprehensive field investigation and documentation. | Owner /LTC <br> Owner: To the extent that items are not included in Existing Conditions Report (ECR); PDB: To the extent that they did not properly assess conditions. <br> LTC: To the extent that they did not properly assess conditions; LTC also takes liability for changing circumstances after dam removal leading to greater than anticipated work/changed permit conditions. | Open |
| 41 | Field Conditions | Non-burial Related Cultural Resource Discoveries Unanticipated non-burial related cultural resources (foundations, barns, etc.) discovered during reservoir drawdown or construction (beyond current allowance). Costs exceed allowances | Non-burial cultural resource not disclosed or already known about | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 4 | Low | Transfer | Identification of existing cultural resources to the extent feasible; Ongoing coordination with Native American groups-and local historical societies; Development of treatment measures that would implemented following drawdown or during construction. | Owner /LTC <br> Owner: Responsible for monitoring, delay, or transporation costs related to unknown site conditions; PDB: Responsible for not disrupting known site condition. <br> LTC: In respect of unknown site conditions that are discovered, subject to regulatory and permit language being finalized, LTC will be responsible for modifying design without compensation. Responsible for not disrupting known site conditions. | Open |
| 43 | Field Conditions | Burial Related Cultural Resource Discoveries Unanticipated burial related conditions may exist. Including sites, human remains, or funerary items discovered within reservoir areas during reservoir drawdown - requiring cessation of construction activities for a long duration. Discovery impacts ability to perform construction - primarily Yreka waterline, Fall Cr Hatchery, Iron Gate Hatchery, and bridges. | Burial site not disclosed or already known about | Construction | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 | Moderate | 12 | Med | Transfer | Identification of existing cultural resources to the extent feasible; Ongoing coordination with Native American groups and local historical societies; Development of an Inadvertent Discovery Plan, Monitoring Plan, and NAGPRA Plan of Action, and rapid response plan to address the possibility of burial sites becoming exposed during drawdown. | Owner/LTC <br> Owner: Responsible for monitoring, delay, or transporation costs related to unknown site conditions; PDB: Responsible for not disrupting known site conditions. <br> LTC: In respect of unknown site conditions that are discovered, subject to regulatory and permit language being finalized, LTC will be responsible for modifying design without compensation. Responsible for not disrupting known site conditions. | Open |
| 16b | Field Conditions | Cultural Resource Damage Damage to UNKNOWN sites. Would trigger an un-controlled circumstance. Delay to construction. |  | Construction | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very Likely } \\ & (60-100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 10 | Med | Manage |  | Owner | Open |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Construction | Cofferdam Failure <br> Failure of temporary cofferdams result in demolition delays. | Unconservative design of cofferdams; unanticipated foundation conditions | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 4 | Low | Transfer | Comprehensive field investigation, review of original construction, and design review. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: Responsible for unknown site conditions. PDB: Has design liability for known site conditions. | Open |
| 35 | Construction | Hazardous Material - Unforeseen Condition Discovery or release of unknown hazardous material (other than from construction activities) to river during construction (unforeseen condition) may lead to cost impacts. | Project results in unanticipated release of hazardous material into river | Construction |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 | Very Low | 1 | Low | Transfer | Completion of the Phase 1 hazardous material assessments and follow-up evaluations, appropriate heath and safety qualifications, experience and other requirements during the procurement process, implementation of BMPs to avoid or contain the release of hazardous material, as well as active overview and enforcement of the Contractor's Hazardous Material Management Plan. | Owner | Open |
| 51 | Construction | Diversion Blockage Rapid-drawdown causes slope instability leading to rock slope failure, blocking the diversion intake. This failure will lead to schedule delays and significant cost impacts. | Design analyses unable to cover all geologic conditions and slope geometries; insufficient data | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 4 | Low | Share | Comprehensive field investigation and design <br> review; Develop slope monitoring plan for <br> implementation during drawdown; Stockpile riprap <br> for repairs of slope if local failures occur. | Owner /PDB <br> Owner: Responsible for unknown site conditions. PDB: Has design liability for known site conditions. | Open |

Attachment A Risk Register (KRRC-Owned Risks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New risks | entified or chang | ed probabilities /impacts since February 25, 2020 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) |  | Impact | Risk Weight (P x I) | Overall Rating | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{array}$ | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ |
| 192 | Construction | Dredging upstream results in unforeseen conditions that increase cost and delay schedule. | If exploratory dredging is completed upstream of Copco No. 1 and significant debris is identified, it may result in increased costs to remove prior to drawdown | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 4 | High | 12 | Med | Manage | PDB to attempt to complete 2020 dredging. | Owner | Open |
| 85 | Construction | JC Boyle Power Canal Scaling: Power Canal Concrete Removal (Full), requires extensive scaling, slope stabilization, worker safety mitigation. | Unanticipated safety related slope scaling/stabilization is necessary to maintain worker safety | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 4 | Low | Manage | Kiewit to compare cost of alternatives (Partial versus Full Removal). KRRC decision. | Owner | Open |
| 86 | Construction | JC Boyle Scour Hole: Scour Hole filling from the top as proposed by Kiewit is not accepted, will require more extensive laying back of the slopes to facilitate safe access from the bottom, as proposed in the Definite Plan. | BLM does not agree to current design approach to filling the scour hole. | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 6 | Med | Manage | KP to prepare $60 \%$ Design to allow permitting and approvals to proceed. KRRC BLM lead to coordinate with BLM on acceptance of proposed approach. | Owner | Open |
| 184 | Construction | PacifiCorp Early Exit: PacifiCorp walks away from site early, cannot manage water thru powerhouses during pre-drawdown year, dams just spilling and unable to appropriately control during dam modification work. | PacificCorp negotiates an early exist from the site, hhereb during drawdown | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 4 | Low | Manage | Update O\&M agreement with needed new items. | Owner | Open |
| 202 | Construction | Builders Risk Deductibles | Kiewit excluded a certain number of builders risk incidents. IF these are required, costs may increase | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 3 | Low | Manage | Kiewit excluded a certain number of builders risk incidents. Would be $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ per incident. Assuming overall risk is 2-3 instances. | Owner | Open |
| 180 | Construction | Process Water Treatment: Water treatment needed for process water | If regulatory process results in a <br> requirement to treat process and <br> dewatering water, it could increase cost | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 6 | Med | Manage | Proative discussion/negotiation with applicable regulatory agencies. | Owner | Open |
| 196 | Construction | Unanticipated Debris Loads: More garbage than expected after drawdown. | Significant amount of unanticipated trash and debris remains postdrawdown and requires removal | Construction | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 4 | Med | Manage | Consider allowance for debris removal. | Owner | Open |
| 210 | Construction | Jenny Creek Stability Analysis: not accepted by Siskiyou County. | Siskiyou Co. reviewers do not agree with assessment, requiring additional work and cost | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 2 | Low | Manage | KP developed report provides options of creek stabilization based on differing flow analysis. Original Jenny Creek Bridge design based off old hydraulic data, risk of requiring new stabilization with updated analysis. | Owner | Open |
| Reservoir Drawdown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46 | Drawdown | Unanticipated Erosion Reservoir drawdown and subsequent operations results in a greater than anticipated level of erosion at bridges or along channel creating passage barrier. This is likely to lead to additional cost. | Local hydrodynamics result in greater than modeled erosion or scour | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 3 | Low | Manage | Comprehensive design review; Design additional scour protection for bridges if determined to be needed; Develop monitoring and mitigation plan for during and post reservoir drawdown. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: Responsible for unknown site conditions PDB: Has design liability for known site conditions. | Open |
| 47 | Drawdown | Unanticipated Effects on Diversion <br> Intakes <br> Reservoir dewatering and subsequent <br> operations have greater than anticipated <br> effects on diversion intakes for <br> irrigation/livestock. This may lead to <br> additional cost. | Greater than predicted suspended sediment and bedload movement | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 3 | Low | Share | Comprehensive field investigation and design review; Develop plan for monitoring/mitigating intakes during reservoir drawdown. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: Responsible for unknown site conditions. PDB: Has design liability for complying with plans and approach. | Open |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New risks New risks | entified since July entified or chang | uly 29,2019 <br> Iged probabilities/impacts since February 25, 2020 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Impact } \\ & \text { (I) } \end{aligned}$ | Risk Weight ( $\mathrm{P} \times 1$ ) | Overall Rating | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{array}$ | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ |
| 48 | Drawdown | Unanticipated Effects on Groundwater Wells <br> Reservoir dewatering and subsequent operation has greater than anticipated effects on groundwater wells. This may lead to additional cost. | Difficult to investigate and analyze groundwater relationships | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | ${ }^{3}$ | Low | Accept | Comprehensive field investigation and design review; Implement Groundwater Well Management Plan for evaluating changes in groundwater postreservoir drawdown and proactively mitigate impacted wells. | Owner (LIMF) / PDB <br> Owner: While owner has certain responsibilities, this is handled separately in the funding set aside for the LIMF and does not add to post-GMP contingency. <br> PDB: Has design liability for complying with plans and approach. | Open |
| 49 | Drawdown | Unanticipated Effects on Channel Flooding <br> Reservoir dewatering and subsequent operations have greater than anticipated effect on downstream channel aggradation/flooding. This may lead to additional cost. | Evacuated coarse sediment is greate than anticipated leading to increased flooding aggradation and associated | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Accept | Rigorous assessment on transport and flooding during detailed design; Monitoring post-drawdown; Raise awareness that active channel management program needed; Implement measures to manage channel aggradation and flood risk. | Owner (LIMF) / PDB <br> Owner: While owner has certain responsibilities, this is handled separately in the funding set aside for the LIMF and does not add to post-GMP contingency. <br> PDB: Has design liability for complying with plans and approach. | Open |
| 50 | Drawdown | Downstream Public Safety <br> Public safety risk in downstream channel during the reservoir drawdown. | Outreach and public safety measures insufficient to keep out public creating potential risk to public safety during drawdown (increased flows) | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Share | Comprehensive education and outreach plan; Detailed review and QA of safety program; Development of a Reservoir Dewatering Awareness Plan that will include procedures for notifying public of the schedule and anticipated flows for reservoir drawdown. | Owner/PDB <br> Owner: To the extent this risk is unavoidable. PDB: To the extent that safety issues are due to contractor fault. | Open |
| Contractor Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 84 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Contractor } \\ \text { Performance } \end{gathered}$ | Labor Strike <br> Construction shutdown due to labor strike may impact schedule and cost | Labor conditions results in a strike by construction workers | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Share | Include Contract requirements for living conditions in camps and worker safety. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: Responsible for a national strike. PDB: Responsible for this risk which is due to labor conditions. | Open |
| Dams, Powerhouses, Reservoirs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Dams | Slope Failure <br> Copco lake reservoir rim or local slope failure along access roads may lead to additional cost and schedule delay. | Slope instability, inadequate access road condition assessment prior to construction. Design analyses unable to be made for all geologic conditions and slope geometries; insufficient data | Construction | ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | High | ${ }^{8}$ | Med | Share | Comprehensive field investigation and design review; Develop plan to address slope failures along Copco Road if they were to occur during reservoir drawdown. | Owner (LIMF) / PDB <br> Owner: While Owner has certain responsibilities, this is handled separately in the funding set aside for the LIMF and does not add to post-GMP contingency. <br> PDB: Has design liability for complying with plans and approach. | Open |
| 55 | Dams | Diversion Tunnel Intake Blocked Copco No. 1 and/or Iron Gate Dam diversion tunnel intake blocked by debris during drawdown reducing flow capacity. This may lead to schedule delays and increased costs. | Debris within reservoir blocks intake | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 3 | Low | Share | Maximizing the size of the intakes to match the size of the gates; Design debris grating for intake with ability to clear debris from grating. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: To the extent this risk is unforseen. PDB: Aware that there will be some debris and contractor responsible for designing appropriate solution. | Open |
| 65 | Dams | Dam Failure <br> Iron Gate Dam or J.C. Boyle Dam overtopped during excavation by storm water flows in excess of 100 -year event resulting in dam failure. This would lead to additional cost. | Climate change; increased variability in precipitation patterns | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 1 | Low | Accept | Require that the dam height during excavation not be less than needed to safely pass a 100 -year event through the diversion tunnel; Completion of the FERC Potential Failure Modes Analysis process; Implement EAP, if necessary; Close coordination with the FERC regional office and state dam safety authorities. | Owner | Open |
| 66 | Dams | Hatchery Delay Iron Gate and/or Fall Creek Hatchery is not brought online in time to begin drawdown. This may lead to schedule delay. | PacifiCorp does not move forward with planning, designing, costing, and seeking approval for hatchery designs. Inadequate planning, equipment, staff, technical issues, or unfavorable weather | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 Moderate | 9 | Med | Manage | Rigorous design of replacement supply; Pilot treatment technology; Proactive QA/QC during construction. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: Within the contract, the owner has responsibility if IFC docs are not ready in time for Kiewit to begin construction; however, the risk would be passed on to CDFW/PacifiCorp who are ultimately responsible for design and funding related to the hatchery. <br> PDB: Responsible to the extent that they have the agreed upon time to do the work and do not meet their schedule. | Open |
| Yreka Water Supply Pipeline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 74 | Yreka | Design Changes by City of Yreka Design review by City of Yreka may result in changes to design. Coordination or other design delays related to City of Yreka water system design. | Lack of coordination or agreement on <br> design process or details | Post-GMP |  | Less Likely $(20-39 \%)$ <br> (20-39\%) | 1 Very Low | 3 | Low | Manage | Proactive coordination with City engineers on process and design requirements; Strict adherence to schedule milestones and KRRC QA process; Keep Designer under KRRC/AECOM control so payments can be withheld due to schedule delays. | Owner | Open |

Attachment A Risk Register (KRRC-Owned Risks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New risks New risks | entified since J entified or chan | uly 29,2019 <br> ged probabilities/impacts since February 25, 2020 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Impact } \\ & \text { (I) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { Weight } \\ (\mathrm{P} \times 1) \end{gathered}$ | Overall Rating | $\begin{gathered} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ |
| 100 | Yreka | Yreka Water Supply Construction Delays <br> Yreka Water System Pipeline Crossing is not constructed in time for dam removal start. If this happens it pushes the dam removal to next calendar year. Differing Site Condition claim during Yreka Water Supply Pipeline Crossing Construction. On-site investigation shows much more complex. | Unforeseen seasonal flow condition inriver, and other unforeseen adverse conditions (e.g., geology) impacting construction schedule. | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Low | 6 | Med | Manage | Consider obtaining permits early; consider approved in-river work window for fish protection and other potential risks to construction schedule in planning for contingencies - in order to complete construction in-time for the dam removal start. | Owner / PDB <br> Owner: To the extent IFC docs and permits aren't obtained in time for PDB to begin work. <br> PDB: To the extent that they begin work on schedule but don't complete it on time. | Open |
| External Events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | External Events | Uncontrolled Circumstances Uncontrollable circumstances (e.g. force majeure, war, terrorism) | Uncontrolled circumstances | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Moderate | 3 | Low | Accept | Prepare Emergency Response Plan (PERP) and require Contractor to prepare their own PERP. | Owner / LTC <br> Owner: To the extent this risk is unforseen (as defined in the Project Company agreement). <br> LTC: Within the RES agreement, uncontrollable circumstances are extremely limited such that the LTC has to cover the majority of them. | Open |
| 20 | External Events | Extreme or Wet Weather Hotter- or colder-than-expected weather causes work stoppage and schedule delays. Wetter-than-expected weather or flows higher than expected during instream construction window increases costs and causes delays. | Climate change; Hydrology | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Very Low | 1 | Low | Accept | Weather analysis during construction planning needs to foresee heat/cold delays; consider including greater than average number of excessive heat/cold days; for hot weather, consider ways to increase night work without affecting noise levels. Rigorous flow analyses during planning/design; Consider defining anticipated rain days in contract as a number greater than average; Define flow return period; Contract requirement for contractor plan for wetter-than-expected weather. | Owner / LTC <br> Owner: To the extent this risk is unforseen (as defined in the Project Company agreement). <br> LTC: Within the RES agreement, LTC would be responsible for this risk. | Open |
| 22 | External Events | On-site Fire <br> Fire in watershed causes on-site fire damage | Lightning; Accidental; Arson | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Very Low | 2 | Low | Share | Fire Management Plan has been developed and <br> Contractor will be required to prepare their own Fire <br> Management Plan Contractor will be required to prepare their own Fire Management Plan. | Owner / PDB / LTC <br> Owner: Responsible for force majeure. PDB: For fire resulting from fault. LTC: Responsible for any item resulting from LTC fault; LTC does not have relief for this type of force majeure event once their work begins. | Open |
| 24 | External Events | Earthquake - During Construction Earthquake damages temporary construction leading to additional cost and schedule delays. | Earthquake occurs near project | Construction |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Low | 2 | Low | Accept | Consider specifying a contract defined design earthquake for temporary construction. | Owner / PDB / LTC <br> Owner: Responsible for force majeure. <br> PDB: Builder's Risk may apply in some instances (depending on exclusions ultimately negotiated). <br> LTC: Does not have relief for this type of force majeure once the work begins. | Open |
| 79 | External Events | Domestic Terrorism <br> Domestic terrorism or actions to disrupt or stop project during construction may lead to schedule delays. | Extreme opposition to project | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Very Low | 3 | Low | Accept | Develop site security plan that includes project response to different scenarios for disruption of project by domestic terrorists. | Owner | Open |
| 114 | External Events | Confiscation by Governmental Body Government confiscates resources or stops work. | External events (disaster, etc.) | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Low | 2 | Low | Accept | N/A | Owner | Open |
| 115 | External Events | Circumstances Affecting Suppliers External events (disaster, etc.) affect the ability of PDB to acquire supplies and materials. | External events (disaster, etc.) | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Low | 2 | Low | Accept | Early coordination with suppliers to avoid supply limitations. | Owner | Open |
| 72 | External Events | PacifiCorp - Access challenges/ Coordination of Work Delays | PacifiCorp access constraints result in schedule delays | Post-GMP | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & \$ 1.5 \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | 6 | Med | Manage | Develop plan during prelim services for needed PacifiCorp involvement during construction. Address in a revised O\&M agreement. | Owner | Open |

Attachment A Risk Register (KRRC-Owned Risks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New risks identified since July 29, 2019 <br> New risks identified or changed probabilities/impacts since February 25, 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized | Probability <br> (P) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Impact } \\ & \text { (I) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { Weight } \\ & (\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{l}) \end{aligned}$ | Overall Rating | $\begin{gathered} \text { KRRC } \\ \text { Management } \\ \text { Strategy } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Management Measure |  | Risk Owner | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Risk } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}\right\|$ |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 211 | Contract Issues | Conract Disputes - Contract disputes between contractors increase as a result of spliting Kiewit/RES contracts. | Disagreement over who is responsible for work or issues pertaining to work | Post-GMP | $2 \begin{gathered} \hline 2 \text { Unlikely } \\ \text { (10-19\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Manage | Work closely on related work protocol, ongoing partnership meetings and conversations to determine where there may be overlap. | Owner |  | Open |
| 212 | Insurance | Pollution Events - Construction resulting in pollution / enviornmental issues cause KRRC to pay for deductibles on pollution policies. | Pollution event requires triggers insurance | Post-GMP | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 4 & \text { Likely } \\ \text { (40-59\%) } \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 4 | Med | Accept | Carefully implement BMPs and review all documentation and devlop plans to mitigate exposure to this risk. | Owner |  | Open |
| 213 | Field Conditions | Reliance Documents - Reliance documents may be inaccurate, leading to errors in design. | Once on site, PDB discovers reliance documents were inaccurate | Post-GMP | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1 \\ \hline \\ \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 1 | Low | Manage | Limit number of reliance documents since not finalized until project implementation date. | Owner |  | Open |
| 214 | Insurance | Cost of Premiums - Estimated costs of premiums for insurance are too low given that estimates are determined over a year in advance. | Estimat for premiums is too low since estimate was made over a year in advance of securing insurance | Post-GMP | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 4 & \text { Likely } \\ (40-59 \%) \end{array}$ | 2 Low | 8 | Med | Accept | Seek pricing updates regularly; regularly review insurance approach in light of changing insurance industry. | Owner |  | Open |
| 215 | Contract Issues | Contract QA/QC Issues - Given the complexity of the contract, the contract ends up being difficult to interpret or operationalize. | Once project implemntation begins, it is determined that there are either errors in the contract that need to be renegotiated or terms that are vague and difficult to operationalize. | Post-GMP | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1 \\ \hline \\ \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 1 | Low | Manage | Work closely with the project team, peer review of contracts, clarity on related work protocol, etc. | Owner |  | Open |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Risk } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) | Impact <br> (I) | Risk Weight (P x I) | Overall Rating | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | Risk Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental \& Permitting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 112 | Environmental \& Permitting | Permit Reopener Changes during construction that require an amendment to a permit. | Unforeseen or changed site condition requires altering planned construction and project impacts which require a change to a permit. Design change by PDB to save costs or time. | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 Moderate | 6 | Med | Flexible project descriptions that allow for design options; Comprehensive field investigation and documentation. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 27 | Environmental \& Permitting | Construction Permits PDB may be unable to obtain construction permits (e.g. County encroachment permits) in time for construction. This may lead to schedule delays. | Poor planning, insufficient communication, difficulty negotiating requirements | Post-GMP | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 6 | Med | Owner coordination with Contractor for proactive communication with Counties; Contingency planning for delayed start during first year of construction. | PDB | Open |
| 42 | Environmental \& Permitting | Cultural Resource Damage Known cultural resource may be damaged during construction. This may lead to a cost impact. | Mitigation measures fail to protect resource | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Identification of existing cultural resources to the extent feasible; Ongoing coordination with tribes and local historical societies to assess potential damage and identify measures. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 68 | Environmental \& Permitting | Downstream Biological Resource Damage Greater than anticipated effect on downstream biological resources may lead to additional costs. | Effect of suspended sediment causes greater than anticipated impact to given species | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Develop appropriate aquatic resource measures through coordination with the regulatory agencies; Implement risk management measures to address effect on downstream resources. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 71 | Environmental \& Permitting | Bat Loss <br> Bat roosts do not meet success criteria requiring additional mitigation, which may lead to additional cost in fines. | Predictive model of bat roost effectiveness is incorrect | PostConstruction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Agency input into performance requirements in DB contract and design; Proactive QA/QC during construction. Cost estimates should assume prudent amount of replanting or other habitat maintenance. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 72 | Environmental \& Permitting | Habitat Restoration Unanticipated maintenance or repair required during regulatory monitoring and reporting period (e.g. plant establishment, tributary passage blockage, etc.). Habitat restoration may lead to additional cost. | Constructed project component does not meet agency expectations | PostConstruction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Agency input into performance requirements in DB contract and design; Proactive QA/QC during construction. Cost estimates should assume prudent amount of replanting or other habitat maintenance. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 86 | Environmental \& Permitting | Restoration Materials Unavailable Local restoration materials (seed, plants) may not be available. This may lead to schedule delays and increased costs. | Insufficient quantities available for collection or insufficient quantities produced by propagation | Construction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & \text { (10-19\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Early collection of seed and nursery propagation of plants for restoration prior to award of DB contract. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| 96 | Environmental \& Permitting | Proliferation of Weeds <br> Weeds outcompete native plants and site restoration goals are not met. This may lead to a cost impact for the project. More monitoring at the end of tail end. | Proliferation of weeds | PostConstruction | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Unlikely } \\ & (10-19 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Contract warranty period; Post-construction maintenance requirements in contract. | PDB / LTC | Open |
| Post-GMP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Post-GMP | Contractor Rework Design errors or omissions lead to Project delays or cost overruns | Designer error | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 Low | 6 | Med | Comprehensive design review; proactive QA/QC. | PDB | Open |



| $\begin{gathered} \text { Risk } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized |  | Probability <br> (P) |  | Impact <br> (I) | Risk Weight (P x I) | Overall Rating | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | Risk Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dams, Powerhouses, Reservoirs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | Dams | Large Gate Procurement Copco No. 1 and/or Iron Gate Dam large gate procurements delay gate installation resulting in delay of reservoir drawdown | Manufacturer requires additional information; (note: E\&O covered elsewhere) | Post-GMP | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 | Low | 8 | Med | Early detailed design; Early involvement of the Contractor to initiate gate procurement activities including input from the gate fabricator; Contractual milestones with liquidated damages; Early Contractor input including planning underwater work to modify/demo the existing Iron Gate Dam gate structure. | PDB | Open |
| 53 | Dams | Tunnel Modifications Copco. No. 1 and Iron Gate Dam tunnel modifications are more difficult to construct causing schedule and cost overruns | Changed site condition or design omission | Construction | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less Likely } \\ & (20-39 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Moderate | 9 | Med | Comprehensive field investigation and design review; Early Contractor input as well as transparent Contractor progress cost estimates based on proven means and methods. | PDB | Open |
| 54 | Dams | Dam Diversion Malfunction Copco No. 1 or Iron Gate Dam diversion gate malfunctions during drawdown resulting in delay of reservoir drawdown | Faulty equipment or equipment failure (note E\&O covered elsewhere) | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 1 | Low | Proactive QA/QC during design; Include backup systems for operating the gates in the design and construction including special inspections and testing of the gates prior to drawdown. | PDB | Open |
| External Events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | External Events | Onsite Public Safety <br> Public safety at construction site. Injuries or damage may lead to additional cost and schedule delays. | Public safety measures insufficient to keep out public | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Very Low | 1 | Low | Development of appropriate health and safety qualifications, experience and other requirements during the procurement process, as well as active overview and enforcement of the Contractor's health and safety and site security plans. No public access to work areas. | PDB | Open |
| 104 | External Events | Wildfire <br> Wildfire ignited by construction activities spreads and affects other properties. | Hot work, or other activities during the dry months generate sparks or heat that ignite dry grass and brush around the project that then spreads to neighboring populated areas. | Construction | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Very Unlikely } \\ & (1-9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | Very High | 5 | High | Fire Management Plan has been developed and Contractor will be required to prepare their own Fire Management Plan. | PDB | Open |


| Risk ID | Risk Category | Risk Description | Root Cause(s) | Phase When Actualized | Probability <br> (P) | Impact <br> (I) | Risk Weight ( $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{I}$ ) | Overall Rating | Risk Management Measure | Risk Owner | Risk Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental \& Permitting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12c | Environmental \& Permitting | Permit Reopener Changes during construction that require an amendment to a restoration permit. | Changes during construction that require an amendment to a restoration permit. | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 1 & \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array}$ | 2 Low | 2 | Low | Maintain positive relationships with regulators and have contingency plan in place for permit amendments. | LTC | Open |
| 37 | Environmental \& Permitting | Special-Status Species Presence Special-status species (incl. bald and golden eagles) presence delays construction | Unanticipated species found onsite cause stop work | Construction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 4 & \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{array}$ | 2 Low | 8 | Med | Additional surveys to identify nest locations in the years leading up to construction; Implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures identified in the Definite Plan; Effective transfer of risk through Contract terms to Design-Builder. Pre-construction surveys; Design planning; Require work areas to be cleared prior to nesting season; Proactive surveys for nesting activity during nesting season; Proactive nesting mitigation measures during nesting season. Draft permits so that stop work is not a remedy, absent negligence by restoration company. | LTC | Open |
| 40 | Environmental \& Permitting | Permit Requirements Not Satisfied Mitigation measures or permit requirements may not be satisfied. This may lead to delays and additional costs. | Responsible party (PDB or LTC) does not meet expectations of permitting agencies in meeting permit requirements | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 4 & \text { Likely } \\ & (40-59 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 4 | Med | Coordination between Designer, Contractor, and permitting agencies; Satisfy permit requirements. | LTC | Open |
| 70 | Environmental \& Permitting | Protected Species Loss <br> Coho or Bald and Golden Eagle net loss within 5 years of construction completion may lead to additional cost in fines. | Mitigation and rehabilitation measures provide insufficient protection | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2 \\ \text { Unlikely } \\ (10-19 \%) \end{array}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Proactively monitor species before and during construction; Implement additional risk management measures | LTC | Open |
| 190 | Environmental \& Permitting | Non-CEQA Related Mitigation | Unanticipated mitigation requirements included in final permits that increase cost | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2 \\ \text { Unlikely } \\ (10-19 \%) \end{array}$ | 2 Low | 4 | Low | Maintain close coordination with regulatory agencies. | LTC | Open |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 91 | Construction | Fish Barriers Unknown fish passage barriers are found during drawdown. Their discovery will lead to additional cost. | Unknown pre-existing barriers exposed during drawdown | Construction | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \hline 3 & \text { Less Likely } \\ \\ (20-39 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 3 | Low | Review of historic documents for evidence of barriers; Require Contractor to develop contingency plan to evaluate for barriers following reservoir drawdown and actions to remove barriers during dam removal. | LTC | Open |
| 92 | Construction | Insufficient Dam Foundation Removal Copco 1 - Removal of concrete foundations of the dam do not go deep enough to ensure long-term fish passage. | Fish passage barrier develops at Copco No. 1 former dam location | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array} \end{array}$ | 3 Moderate | 3 | Low | COVERED BY LTC - dependent on timing <br> Assess removal designs and fish passage designs to ensure long term fish passage, including assessment of river bed erosion downstream and impact on the river grades and future river bed levels. | LTC | Open |
| 95 | Construction | Insufficient Dam Foundation Removal Copco 2 - Removal of concrete foundations of the dam do not go deep enough to ensure long-term fish passage. | Fish passage barrier develops at Copco No. 2 former dam location | PostConstruction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Very Unlikely } \\ (1-9 \%) \end{array} \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 1 | Low | COVERED BY LTC - dependent on timing <br> Assess removal designs and fish passage designs to ensure long term fish passage, including assessment of river bed erosion downstream and impact on the river grades and future river bed levels. | LTC | Open |
| 207 | Construction | Landslide during drawdown | Landslide occurs creating issue with passage | Construction | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 2 & \text { Unlikely } \\ (10-19 \%) \end{array}$ | 1 Very Low | 2 | Low | Develop contingency plan. | LTC | Open |

## Attachment A Risk Register (LTC-Owned Risks)



