

Icicle Creek Work Group
December 12, 2014
10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Confluence Technology Center

Attendees:

Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Rachael Osborn, CELP; Steve Kolk, USBR; Charity Davidson, WDFW; Tom Tebb, Ecology-CRO; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Dick Rieman Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Harriet Bullitt, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Jim Craig, USFWS-LNFH; Kate Terrell, USFWS; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Daryl Harnden, PID; Keith Goehner, Chelan County; Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Pete Cruickshank, Chelan County; Bob Schmidt, City of Cashmere; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth; Elmer Larsen, City of Leavenworth; John Bangsund, City of Leavenworth; Gabrielle Snider, USFS-Wenatchee River RD; Kathy McMillon, USFS-Wenatchee River RD; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribes-F&W Program; Lisa Pelly, Trout Unlimited; Jim Brown, WDFW Region 2

Meeting Summary

Agenda Review – The order of some agenda items changed slightly to link key discussions together. Below is the revised agenda.

10:10 Review Gantt Chart/Timeline – SEPA/NEPA
11:40 Guiding Principle Table and Project Development
12:15 Lunch
1:00 Project Updates
2:00 Funding Coordination
2:30 WFC Lawsuit
2:45 Other Updates, 2015 Schedule
3:00 Adjourn

Timeline/Gantt/SEPA/NEPA

Tom reviewed the IWG process to date and expressed a need to share all projects with the public and get input, identify issues and define where we're moving. Before, the IWG felt we needed a more defined project list to go into environmental review, but instead the public process should help define where we're headed and the project plan. We are at a critical point to take this out to the public and get their input.

Dan reviewed Gantt chart and overall timeline. We still have some gaps that need more definition – guiding principle (GP) metrics. Project List – we need work to pair projects with GPs to ensure we're meeting all of them. There will be SEPA/NEPA meeting in January. For projects, some are pretty mature and will have feasibility details and some will not. If some projects move forward, there would be project level EIS completed.

The Steering Committee had a detailed discussion of project reports and discussed the need for additional groups to work through project details and policy issues. That could be said for all of the projects and the larger group/public. A question was asked if we would wait for any further

progress for entire 12 month environmental review process or are we able to continue to gather data/information? Answer: SEPA tells us what the expectations are, if data can be obtained, we shall gather it.

Lisa Pelly is concerned about pushing through a process. Everyone is busy and it takes time to put thoughtful comments together. We need to be thoughtful about requesting comments.

The IWG was asked what they think about this timeline and moving forward with SEPA/NEPA?

If someone out there has ideas that we haven't thought of, does this process allow for that to be added? YES! Everything on our master project list and anything anyone else thinks of will be included.

A question was asked about the relationship between SEPA and NEPA. The connection between SEPA and NEPA will become more clear in the January meeting. That clarity will come from the NEPA lead which is not determined yet.

Comment: We need to ensure the process is open to new ideas and encourages them.

How do we show/explain the IWG process? Start with the guiding principles and explain that all of them need to be met. Dick noted that when we go to the public we're asking if they see something we don't? But we start with checking with the public on the GPs, are these right? And the metrics, are these right?

Charity noted that filling data gaps now is critical and we should think about that now.

A comment was made that we should connect with Chelan PUD in this process.

Is anyone opposed to beginning this environmental review? No one opposed.

January Meeting: key staff for this.

Data Gaps: If you have ideas, submit to Mary Jo by the end of the second week of January – January 12. Schedule the Agency SEPA/NEPA meeting after that. Results of this meeting would go to IWG.

Tony – when are we discussing the development of the project list? Tony is not comfortable moving pump exchange to the list until O&M figured out. He does not want any chance for the district to be liable for paying any O&M.

Others noted that similar things could be said for other projects. The SEPA/NEPA process will help clarify those issues and get input on those. There may be solutions brought out in the process that we haven't thought of. It's a fair point for the district and others to consider. What are the things that will make folks comfortable moving forward with what the list is. The O&M seems like a data gap that needs to be identified... in order for this project to move forward this funding source needs to be identified.

The January meeting should discuss assurances that would move forward with specific projects.

The programmatic SEPA process highlights broad scale pros and cons, not on a specific project level.

Tony's concern is that there would be a way for them to be forced to implement the project as a result of this SEPA/NEPA project. Has that ever happened in a programmatic process? Tom doesn't think so, the point of a programmatic is that it is broad and is not binding anyone to do anything. This is a scoping phase, collecting information. Folks understand Tony's concern, the idea is to collect information at this time.

The IWG will consider all information before moving forward with scoping. Tony's concern is with the high flow recommendations (250 cfs) and that a pump back is the only way to meet that.

The January meeting will discuss assurances, concurrently there will be some discussion on funding O&M by a small group.

Guiding Principle Table

Dan walked through the first two columns (GP and metric defined) with the IWG. These have come from the decisions made by the IWG (instream flows). The Tribal Treaty GP #3 still needs some work defining what it means to protect the Tribal Treaty rights. We will develop a tribal fishery impact analysis and development of alternatives. Are these shown in numbers of fish? How will we know when it's met? Chuck said that it will be meeting meaningfulness harvest. We could model impacts from changes and then adaptively manage if changes appear. We don't have a baseline now because flows have been higher in the historic channel for 5 years or so. There have been other changes, fish ladder management, that need to be considered as well. We need to be careful moving forward and we don't have certainty right now. Tribes could describe what they need, but how we get that is not clear. This would be another data gap identified that needs to be filled – establish a baseline, and establish a comfort level for the Tribes. Some is being done now with a Didson counter at the headgate counting fish to determine if gates need to be closed to stop fish from moving at times.

Another GP that needs more effort to be flushed out is “meeting municipal and domestic demand”, GP #4. The instream flow reserve for the entire Wenatchee basin is less reliable now. The municipal/domestic members need to give more thought to what the number is. We need that number defined. The Wenatchee Water Work Group is meeting next week and can discuss this further.

GP #6 Improves ecosystem health... What are we going to be doing to improve habitat? A lot of focus so far has been on reach 4 (historic channel) flow regime and habitat improvements. We will need clarity on level of effort and investment for all of the reaches.

GPs #7, 8, 9 (Comply with state and fed laws, protect non-treaty harvest, and comply with wilderness acts) are more of a presence/absence trigger instead of a number that needs to be met and screened through the project level evaluation. Each project will be 'checked' against these GPs to ensure they are being met.

Do we need small groups to more clearly define the ones needed? The municipal and agriculture metrics can likely rely on existing groups like the Wenatchee Water Work Group (WWWG) and there has been a local Agriculture group in the past that could discuss this. This will be done to address GPs #4 and 5.

Rachael asked about details on the existing conservation and what the basis is for the domestic demand. We should consider this moving forward.

Rachael asked a question on the instream flows established and how that meets up with the pedigree of water: firm, interruptible, etc. Dan has information on that we will discuss later.

Project Updates

Dan showed the following information to illustrate the bridge between the GPs/metrics and projects.

Flow-Based Guiding Principle Metrics

1. Instream Flow (60 cfs drought, 100 cfs average, 250 cfs goal long-term)
 - a. Need discounting natural flow (40 to 50 cfs short-term, 190 cfs long-term)
2. Municipal = 5 to 7 cfs, pending IWG definition
3. Agricultural = 2 to 4 cfs, pending IWG definition
4. **Total = 50 to 60 cfs short-term, and 200 cfs long-term**

Flow-Based Options to Meet Guiding Principles

Guaranteed (permanent supply available)

Firm (permanent supply available, short of Court/Congressional action)

Interruptible (Only available in non-drought years)

- Pump exchanges (40 to 62 cfs, or 117 cfs) **Guaranteed, reach benefits only**
- Alpine Lakes Optimization (30 to 42 cfs) **Interruptible**
- Conservation (20 to 30 cfs) **Guaranteed** (non-consumptive, reach benefits only)
- Eight-Mile (5 to 18 cfs) **Guaranteed**
- LNFH Groundwater Augmentation (7 cfs) **Firm**
- LNFH Reuse (20 cfs) **Firm**
- LNFH Effluent Pump Back (28.5 cfs to 57 cfs) **Firm**
- Klonaqua Bathymetry (5 to 20 cfs) **Guaranteed**
- Water Banks (? cfs) **Interruptible?**
- Other opportunities to fill gaps, address projects that drop off (? cfs)

Flow based GPs: The role of this IWG is to identify projects where there is consensus and pair projects to meet all GPs. Two gaps that look to be the hardest to meet seem to be meeting municipal demand and the 250 cfs target. The challenge moving into SEPA scoping is that there are holes.

Has climate change been considered? Not for flow targets but yes for the Alpine Lakes OMA project.

How do we stack up what we have with what we need? It's a lot of information to consider.

High flow goals – 250 cfs. There are many opportunities to get to the 60 and 100 goals. But the 250 goal will be very hard to meet and would require full consensus and a lot of money. The domestic needs are difficult because of the *type* of water needed (consumptive and guaranteed). Is the source for Leavenworth's supply limited to the Icicle or could it be higher in the Wenatchee? Possibly, some of that could come from mainstem Wenatchee.

Municipal has three components: City of Leavenworth lawsuit (800 ac/ft), future demand both city and county and reserve needs (new issue).

Rachel asked if water markets might work here as an economically viable solution. The other idea is a POD change for IPID. The problem is the high cost, but the idea of water markets might be able to provide funding to help.

We can add water markets (already on the master list) and add the full POD change to things to gather information on. Water market supply and demand might be a challenge. But we need to analyze demand to get a better idea of that. There is value in doing the evaluation and it will likely still show some holes that need some other 'relief valve' (storage and/or OCPI). Elmer suggested that we need to consider all domestic needs in the Icicle – beyond City of Leavenworth service area. People have problems getting water now and there might be issues with septic impacts. Finding the consumptive use for domestic or use storage.

How do we characterize this for SEPA scoping? Dan asked the IWG, "*What if there's disagreement with what has been decided?*" We can "tell the story" for how we've gotten to where we are.

SEPA is not a decision or legal document – decisions come in permits for projects. There is room to do a broad review based on a set of goals.

It's important to get all of these projects and goals lined up in a 'common currency'. We need to start thinking in terms of a 'balance sheet' to evaluate the benefits and costs. We can start matching up our goals with likely projects. There will be a series of tradeoffs that we'll need to decide if we're willing to do to meet some of these goals. We (IWG) need to continue to consider these. We need to move to a framework that shows the tradeoff in order to come up with a recommendation.

We need to go back to our GPs as a whole package that we support as a group.

At some point there will be a cost-benefit analysis, so we don't want to get too far into projects that we're stuck. Is there a mechanism in SEPA scoping to start looking at cost?

What will the end of SEPA show, 2 decisions/alternatives? That will come out in the process? There may be several ways to meet some GPs and only one or two for another.

What is the proposed action? We're doing an Icicle watershed plan to address goals.

Develop an Integrated Plan to meet the Guiding Principles?

Or, that we (IWG) have our preferred alternative (set of projects). This group shows preference for a 'package'. Some folks feel like they don't have enough information to make that decision yet.

Key Question to IWG: Determine whether an integrated project list that meets GPs will be agreed to in advance of environmental review, or be developed concurrently with environmental review.

The Programmatic Approach is helpful to find out what the rest of the world thinks of what we've been doing.

Some folks don't think we can come to agreement on a list right now and we need scoping to get feedback to then determine the project list. Others are concerned that we'll be in the same place we are now, in 18 months. Dan clarified that it would be 6 months from now that an integrated package is determined. We could disclose that we have GPs – metrics – project types and then say that we have a preference to specific projects that we're evaluating.

Tony wants to go into SEPA with some detail on what we want: i.e. types of projects and show a preference.

It would be helpful to see an example of what this would look like – SEPA/NEPA Programmatic. That would be a goal of the January meeting. Ecology handbook on SEPA is very helpful, <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sepa/handbk/hbintro.html>

Definition of when to start SEPA. We can shape that proposal. See Yakima example and clarify project types. This defines what the package needs to include, gives specifics on the things we know now and highlight what we don't know. ***Are we okay moving forward with a topical approach... include GPs, metrics and topics (project types/tools)?***

January meeting will develop a straw dog proposal that will come back to the IWG for approval, along with a timeline for a process.

The IWG is okay moving forward with a topical approach to SEPA/NEPA Programmatic. The January meeting will work through some of the issues identified above and develop an example that will be reviewed by the IWG. A Steering Committee meeting will take place in February to review the initial SEPA/NEPA info and prepare for a March IWG meeting. A group will also meet in January to discuss pump exchange O&M solutions.

Project Updates

Dan gave a high level summary of the draft reports, which are all on the website at http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/nr/planning/icicle_work_group/current_project_development.htm
Comments on reports are due to Mary Jo by the end of the year, then they will be finalized.

LNFH effluent pump exchange - Effluent water quality report is coming out in late January.

Funding Coordination

OCR budget status, we will re-evaluate by task as we finalize all of the reports in the next month. Then we will be able to see if there are savings that could be re-allocated to fill data gaps, etc. USBR has committed \$150,000 to the LNFH groundwater investigations. CCNRD submitted a proposal to PRCC for the additional \$75,000 needed.

Action Item approved by IWG: Support funding request for WDFW's Fish Screen Proposal.

Travel Expense Reimbursement: Approval has been given to reimburse IWG participants for mileage. Contact Mary Jo for the appropriate form. Reimbursement can begin with today's meeting.

Other Funding Updates: USBR announces their WaterSmart grant with a deadline in January. Give some thought to whether any projects are appropriate. The County will follow up with Dawn to ask her opinion as well and will put together some ideas.

WFC Lawsuit – Steering Committee followed up on IWG request to develop a letter asking WFC to clarify deficiencies in IWG effort that doesn't meet their concerns. Steering Committee could not agree with language in a letter. Discussion was on whether the County should submit a letter, not on behalf of the IWG. County is considering that. It's possible that Yakama Nation and Colville Tribes may play a role in the lawsuit at some time, as Interveners. IWG and Steering Committee meetings can continue to provide a forum for sharing this information.

Other Updates

The County will give an IWG update to the Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team in January.

Schedule for 2015 – Doodle Poll for Environmental Review in January, Steering Committee in February, and IWG in March. Another meeting for an O&M meeting in January.

Rachael commented that she has concerns about not moving forward with the Wilderness Impact Advisory Group at this time.