Icicle Strategy

Icicle Work Group Meeting

July 27, 2017

Final Meeting Summary

Attendees

Tyler Roberts, Ecology-OCR; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribe; Cody Gillin, Trout Unlimited; Mike Cushman, Cascadia CD; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Dick Rieman, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Karl Forsgaard, ALPS; Dave Irving, USFWS; Bill Gale, USFWS; Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW; Jeff Dengel, WDFW; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Lauren Johnson; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Jim Brown, WDFW; Bruce Williams, Icicle Resident; Hillary Heard, Chelan County; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Heather Lawrence, BOR; Christi Davis-Kernan; Keith Goehner, Chelan County; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Dan Haller, Aspect Consultant; Tyler Mackay, Rep. Dave Reichert's office; Jeff Rivera, U.S. Forest Service, Mary Bean, U.S. Forest Service; Molly Hanson, U.S. Forest Service; Susan Adams, WWT

Meeting Summary

Jeff Dengel, WDFW, facilitated this meeting, which opened with a review of the agenda, introductions and asked to approve the meeting summary from the previous IWG meeting.

The April 27 Meeting Summary was approved with no changes.

Programmatic EIS Update

Mike and Melissa updated the IWG that the Draft PEIS is expected to be released in October. There have been some delays in reviewing the document and ensuring it is complete.

Dan Haller gave a presentation focused on the structure of the PEIS and how IWG members can review it once it is released in October. Dan focused on the five chapters, their purpose and structure; how the PEIS will roll out for public review; how IWG members can assist in the roll out; and next steps. The presentation is available on the Chelan County website or from Mary Jo Sanborn (http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/iwgminutes?parent=Planning).

Chapter 1 focuses on background information, the purpose and need and the guiding principles.
Chapter 2 provides a summary of the 4 alternatives and No Action Alternative and how they were created, descriptions of the projects in each alternative, and the alternatives eliminated from further study. A handout was distributed that shows each alternative in table format.
Chapter 3 includes the resource descriptions and affected environment for each alternative. These include earth, water resources, water quality, water use/water rights, fish and wildlife, vegetation, aesthetics, air quality, climate change, noise, land use, wilderness, shorelines, transportation, cultural resources, and socioeconomics.
Chapter 4 describes the projected impacts by each alternative.

Chapter 5 describes the consultation and coordination that has occurred.

Karl asked several questions about how the base package was created, specifically referring to a slide that 'stacks' projects to meet the guiding principles. Dan and several IWG members answered that the slide in the presentation is being used to illustrate *how* the IWG created the base package of projects (Alternative 1) and the decision making process of evaluating combinations of projects that would meet all of the guiding principles. This was done by the IWG two years ago. Membership in the Icicle Work Group requires agreement with the guiding principles. And the IWG endorsed the base package as what they think is the best way to meet the guiding principles and wanted to move it into environmental review. If a project becomes fatally flawed, then the IWG must replace it with another project that fills that gap in the guiding principles.

There were several questions on the hydrographs presented to show instream flow benefits from various projects. Dan will incorporate the suggestions made regarding drought year data, etc.

Dan provided some guidance on how to focus on one particular thing in a huge document

- Chapter 2—Use master alternative table to find what alternatives your project is in then go to project description in that alternative.
- Chapter 3– Resource descriptions are organized by geographic area (e.g. Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and Wenatchee River).
- Chapter 4—Short-term and long-term impacts are organized by resource, impact type, alternative, and project. For example, surface impacts associated with COIC would be under Surface Water, Alternative 1, Long-Term, and then COIC Project.

Rollout Strategy – Draft PEIS expected out in October with a public meeting in Leavenworth soon after (late October or early November). The comment period will likely be 60 days but that is still being discussed.
How can IWG members help? Participate in the public meeting, brief elected officials/decision makers, be a champion for the Icicle Strategy, help deliver clear and accurate messages and correct inaccuracies.
Questions that IWG members should be asking in response to the PEIS: Is the Base Package (Alternative 1) still the best choice? Should modifications be made? Is there another alternative that is a better choice? How do we pair and phase project implementation? The IWG will meet and will need to decide if they will continue with the base package as the preferred alternative or something different.
What else should IWG members consider for next steps beyond the PEIS: What is the role of the IWG moving forward? How often do we meet? How do we stay informed? How will funding be coordinated (currently through the Steering Committee)? What political and outreach efforts are needed?

Dick asked about having a meeting specifically to discuss wilderness questions.

Response – that level of detail will be in the PEIS, it will discuss underlying rules, laws, etc. Review those sections of the PEIS and make comment.

Cody asked about alternatives not considered.
Response – this is a standard thing to include and a response to scoping comments. These are things that are too far from the guiding principles or the owner of the facility has stated they don't support moving that forward.

Karl – suggested having a 60 day comment period and to consider the timing over the holidays. He also said having a public meeting in the Seattle area was important.
Response – Mike noted that the co-leads (County and Ecology) are not planning a formal SEPA meeting in Seattle. We have done several outreach meetings there before and could have another informational meeting there but it would not be a formal SEPA public meeting. He suggested if the wilderness groups would like to plan a meeting, that we would participate and answer questions. Other IWG members noted that it is not common nor is there an obligation to have a formal SEPA public meeting/workshop outside of the affected area/watershed.

Comments will be accepted via email, written mailed letters, and written and provided at the public meeting. The Draft PEIS document will be available online, flash drives can be mailed upon request.

Greg M asked about the Programmatic EIS outcome in relation to specific projects.
Response – the intent is that the Co-Leads will select a preferred alternative/package of projects. Once a project moves toward implementation, each permitting agency will determine on a project-level basis if the Programmatic EIS is sufficient or if project-level review is necessary.

Conservation Update
Dan gave a presentation (http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/iwgminutes?parent=Planning) that focused on the conservation content in the PEIS, conservation under climate change scenarios, legal constraints and messaging around conservation projects. We have struggled with this message as it seems that some IWG members have not been fully informed on the conservation projects. Looking at the alternatives summary table, the conservation based projects are included in all 4 alternatives. The City of Leavenworth and Chelan County presented conservation efforts to the IWG a couple of years ago. The County and Leavenworth have an agreement with a provision to form a conservation committee which they will do this fall and will depend on the outcome of the PEIS. Cascadia CD has a grant to explore conservation opportunities and will be part of the discussion. Karl said that the alternatives identify conservation but no single alternative focuses on conservation. Several IWG members noted that all of the alternatives focus on conservation. The presentation shows current water use and proposed future use with the implementation of conservation projects. Conserved quantities would be 42 cfs or more. Stream flow improvements from conservation projects are fixed, and cannot be changed/are not adaptable. With climate change scenarios, the conservation based benefits erode over time. There are legal constraints under Alternative 3

which relies more heavily on conservation. In order to meet all guiding principles, specifically domestic demand, there would need to be a legislative change to waive impacts to instream flows when conservation based supplies cannot meet demand. The standard is for in-kind, in-time, in-place which under Foster/Yelm requires a legal fix.

LNFH Update

Bill Gale noted that they are nearing completion of the Implementation Plan. Draft sections of the Plan have been prepared and are going through internal agency review by USFWS and USBR. They are hoping to bring it to the Tribes for review in September but Bill can meet with the Tribes at any time to discuss.

Question: How do these delays impact the overall timeline to meet the compliance schedule (under the BiOP)? Heather responded that they are still moving forward on projects.

Comments focused on concern of delays and that the overall timeline will be shorter if full EIS will be done. Several IWG members discussed that having another check in with agency leadership in October would be good. Annual check-ins were discussed at last years' October meeting. IWG members would like to convene another annual check-in this fall. Contact Mike Kaputa if you have thoughts/ideas.

COIC

Greg gave a presentation update (http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/iwgminutes?parent=Planning) on the Cascade Orchard Irrigation Company project. The shareholders approved a set of pump station locations. The top choice is located on the mainstem Wenatchee 100 yards upstream of the Icicle confluence. Washington Water Trust (WWT) is currently contracting with Bonneville Power Association (BPA) for some of the work. They expect to have 30% design completed in October. This project is also the top project on the regional Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) list.

IPID Comprehensive Plan

Tony gave an update on this plan to identify projects. Many conservation projects were completed (ditch lining, piping, etc) since the last plan was completed many years ago. The plan should be done in October and will identify cost estimates and flow savings for each project. Last fall the IPID Board approved an increase in assessments by 10% for system upgrades, etc.

Alpine Lakes Pilot Flow Augmentation

The trust water donation from last year's pilot was rolled over for this year as well. The instream flow committee met several times last winter to develop the action plan for lake releases based on targets in the historic channel. Chelan County hired two lake runners again to hike to the lakes and make manual adjustments which began late July. Weekly emails are sent out to those interested to track what's happening.

Tribal Creel Survey

Chuck gave an update that adult spring Chinook return numbers were low this year (based on Leavenworth tagged fish passing Bonneville), so the tribes did not authorize a fishery until the

Hatchery was confident that their needs would be met. The Tribal fishery began late June so the creel data set will be more limited this year.

Screen Update (City of Leavenworth and IPID)
WDFW is currently contracting with BPA to do these designs. Design work should begin late summer. BPA will fund design, however permitting and implementation funding will need to be secured. Mary Jo showed a project timeline developed with WDFW's screen shop. We will need to start working to secure permitting and implementation funds this winter once designs are further along.

Habitat Projects
In addition to the COIC project, two other projects in lower Icicle were proposed in the regional SRFB process. One is enhancing a side channel at the confluence of the Wenatchee/Icicle and the other is to develop conceptual plans at RM 0.3-1.1 with the goal of improving rearing habitat.

Other Updates
- Chelan County and IPID are working with SRFB funding to complete 30% design of the Dryden Pump Station for Peshastin Irrigation District Canal (this could include a booster for additional Icicle benefit).
- Cascadia Conservation District is working on outreach within the Icicle Watershed with the USFS and City of Leavenworth under a drinking water providers partnership grant.

Funding Coordination and State Budget
Funding continues to be coordinated through the Steering Committee. No other funding updates other than what's been discussed today. Mary Jo tracks funding needs and funds secured for all Icicle Strategy work so please let her know of new information.

Melissa gave a state budget update. There is a special appropriation of previous biennial funding into this biennium. Currently, there is no capital budget yet. Agreement is held up by Senate republicans wanting a fix to the Hirst decision. If they get an agreement, the Governor will call a 4th special session to approve the capital budget.

Public Comment
Karl Forsgaard said that there needs to be more attention to Wilderness. He referred to a presentation from the April meeting about Eightmile Lake and that there should be more attention focused on Wilderness.

Dave asked Karl what his opinion is about inholdings within the Wilderness Area.
Karl noted that he thinks there may be an issue of relinquishment related to IPID water rights at Eightmile Lake. Tony responded that IPID has water rights that existed prior to the Wilderness Act and Alpine Lakes Wilderness designation. Relinquishment is a state water law issue not a federal one. IPID has rights to maintain, upgrade, etc the infrastructure at those lakes. Tony

noted that Eightmile Lake currently holds more the 2500 acre feet so IPID is able to access that water via pumps if needed.

Upcoming Meetings
No August meeting
September 28th is currently the next IWG Meeting
The Steering Committee may call a meeting before that if needed.
Facilitation team will work on organizing an annual fall check in with LNFH federal agency leadership (USFWS, USBR).

Meeting Adjourned