

**IWG Meeting - February 20, 2014**  
**Summary Meeting Minutes**

1. IWG quarterly meetings were rescheduled to the third Friday of the quarter: May 16, August 15 and November 21.
2. Guiding Principles: No objections to edits as proposed by the Steering Committee. Approved.
3. Operating Procedures: Approved by IWG. Remove ALPS from Appendix A Membership list (prefer to be an informal observer)
4. ALPS Letter: ALPS requested to be an informal observer, rather than a formal member.
5. Discussion on Steering Committee size and composition: Dawn: Is it too big? Target was about 5. Now we're 11, which is almost all of the key IWG members anyway. Scheduling challenges. Workload commitment challenges. Probably no turning back to a smaller group. Reclamation (Dawn Wiedmeier) requested to be added to Steering Committee because it wasn't the smaller group she anticipated and wants to be included. IWG approved.
6. Invitation to Cashmere: Steering Committee will convene and send a letter out to Cashmere asking that Bob Schmidt participate on the Work Group. Concern over out-of-basin representation by CELP. IWG approved
7. Invitation to Agricultural Stakeholders: Waiting for parties to be identified. Likely that two additional members of the agricultural community will be invited to join the IWG.
8. Master Scope of Work: IWG agrees it is a useful tool. Dick Rieman suggested that a groundwater study from the late 90's be used to obtain information on groundwater levels and hatchery well use. (ref?) The current master scope includes 401 Certification elements. How does the IWG interface with the formal regulatory processes that are on-going?
  - a. Dale: The BiOp is only about LNFH, whereas this group can think bigger. A condition in the BiOp is to stop using Structure 2 to recharge the aquifer (5 year timeframe), but they are not doing anything regarding the flow. The BiOp will not pre-empt anything this group is considering. Work by the IWG will result in better integration/supplementation with Snow/Nada Lakes. Could modify BiOp by letter later if another project provides mitigation instead of Snow/Nada Lakes.
  - b. Mike: Can other uses be linked to Snow/Nada Lakes? Dave said his primary concern is to protect water rights. The hatchery could lose their water rights if Snow and Nada Lakes are used to improve flows, so it is important to him to maintain the purpose of use for his water rights. Still have tribal trust and U.S. v.

Oregon Court targets. It was suggested that efficiencies could be used for mitigation.

- c. Tom: Instream Flow Subcommittee can work within the bounds of the 401 Certification. Ecology wants to optimize the split at structure 2 and will explore adaptive management approaches.
9. Given the IWG feels it is advantageous to understand fatal flaws and feasibility as they explore IWG projects, 401 Cert (and Flow Management Plan for the hatchery) and instream flows, the Steering Committee recommended moving forward with Decisions 2 – 7 on the agenda.

10. Decision Items on OCR Funding:

- a. Alpine Lake Optimization (Decision Item #2 of the agenda): IWG approved notice to proceed on the study.
- b. Sediment Transport Study (Decision Item #3 of the agenda): IWG o.k. deferring until better understanding of LNFH Flow Management Plan. Steve reminded the group that an existing sediment study is available. Bob thinks it could be helpful to have the information from the study for the Flow Management Plan. Referred back to Steering Committee to check into existing studies, and authorized to direct expenditure if warranted.
- c. IPID (Decision Item #4 of the agenda): Potential scope of work change to focus on O&M options and fatal flaw property owner issues, plus coordinate with TU alternatives analysis. Significantly reduce design work. Is it appropriate to move forward now or wait on TU work? Tony commented that Peshastin is a restoration project and Icicle an enhancement project, and restoration should take precedence, particularly if it has the potential for benefits on both. Decision is to keep Tasks 5.1, 5.2, and little of 5.5 (to ID fatal flows associated with a permitting) and enough of 5.7 to support O&M numbers, and O&M costs. Prepare new scope / cost estimate. The new scope and budget will be sent to the IWG. If there is any opposition to moving this project forward based on the new scope, the IWG member is to contact Tom Tebb, Chair of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will evaluate and approve new scope and cost. IWG approved moving project forward after Steering Committee review of narrowed scope and cost.
- d. Eight-Mile Lake (Decision Item #5 of the agenda): Some concern about Alpine Lakes studies—need questions answered about permitting, water rights, and fatal flaws. This fatal flaw analysis around permitting is included in the scope of work. Eight-Mile provides an option for 1600 ac-ft for IPID and up to 900 ac-ft

for Guiding Principles. Ecology: even if there is some relinquishment risk to IPID, there is the option of obtaining a new permit. WDFW o.k. with increased storage to historic levels if legal. Tony asked the group if there was any opposition to 2500 ac-ft? CELP/USFS/WDFW want to see data first. 4' increase, changes volume from 2700 ac-ft to about 2900 ac-ft. Gravity flow releases about half that. Siphon or pump the rest. IPID does not consent to a feasibility study for Eight-Mile Lake now; wants to do a legal review first.

Tony asked the group if they (IWG) can support storage at Eight-Mile Lake at legally permitted levels? Yes all, except for CELP (no) and USFS (report back).

Tony asked the group if additional approvals are needed, does the IWG support obtaining those approvals if legal and meets Guiding Principles, yes (group), Ecology (can't presuppose, but not object to concept), CELP (no) and USFS (report back).

Tony's 2 questions to the group

1. "Will the IWG support using the Lake to 2500 AF if it is found that it is legal and available?" Yes (group), except for CELP (no) and USFS (report back)
2. "Will the IWG support allowing use of the Lake to 2500 AF in the event that there are issues and a new permit would need to be issued?". Yes (group) except for CELP (no),USFS (report back) and WDFW (depends on data)]

IWG o.k. moving forward on funding, subject to IPID approval following legal analysis and USFS report-back. IPID and USFS will report to Steering Committee for final decision on moving forward with this OCR appraisal study and fatal flaw analysis.

City of Leavenworth, want a package approach rather than piece-meal, all or nothing, to accomplish all of the Guiding Principles. Mike, what about prioritizing advancing another parallel project if Eight-Mile falls off. City o.k.

IWG o.k. with moving forward to study pending IPID internal review/approval, and report back from USFS.

In the event that Decision #5 does not move forward, the first agenda item for the IWG will be to find other projects to meet those Guiding Principles.

- e. LNFH Groundwater Investigations (Decision Item #6 on agenda): \$70,000 retasked from SEPA work, plus secure \$80,000 matching from Reclamation, Grant PUD PRCC, or SRF Board. IWG ok with notice to proceed on first phase and working to obtain funding on future phases.

First phase would be to work with LNFH to define scope and identify members for GW Technical Subcommittee. Steering Committee to ID data gaps.

IWG approves.

- f. Instream Flow Committee (Decision Item #7 on agenda): Tony: asked for clarification that any flow regime in historic channel if adopted in rule or modified in rule has a junior water right. Several IWG members confirmed this.

IWG agrees to set up committee. Steering Committee will work to appoint committee chair (likely Paul LaRiviere) and key participants. Purpose to develop flow goals not to set a flow. Steering Committee to report back to IWG.

- 11. Metrics: Steering committee will revisit metrics and determine what committee or committees are appropriate to address. This would include conservation comparables. Suggestion that SC might want to address conservation potential assessment as a metric and as a project.
- 12. Ecology Listserv: Will be used for broadest audience of IWG plus public, interested parties. Separate email lists for IWG and for SC to be maintained by Chelan County.
- 13. Future Agenda Items:
  - a. Dave: Water Rights and How they work- (GW, SW, Storage) information for IWG (Bob, and others).
  - b. Jim: pit tag proposal (funding need) for greater fish information in Icicle (he will bring additional information). Dale: probably on the order of \$100K necessary. Dave: updates on work progress.
  - c. Updates on projects approved today

- d. Dave: Later in the year – update on Hatchery: ongoing NEPA for fish screens fish screen alternatives. Will share when ready.

#### 14. Roundtable:

Tony: planning to redevelop its Icicle diversion (working with County). Install a structure (near end of September / October). Seeking match funds. Alan at County has details. Kate: helps fishery migration, keeps water where it should be, new screens to isolate the canal.

Dave: Ongoing NEPA – evaluating fish screen alternatives. Will include on agenda later in year when ready.

#### Steering Committee Tasks

1. Revisit concept of balanced package once decision is made on moving forward on 8 Mile Lake study.
2. Send letter to Cashmere inviting them to join IWG.
3. Revisit Decision Item #3 (need for a sediment transport and hydrologic modeling study between RM 3.8 and 2.7 for \$10K). Look into existing sediment study (ref from Steve Croci) and determine whether to move project forward. (See 10b of IWG notes).
4. Evaluate and approve new, narrowed scope for IPID Pump Exchange (Dryden location) feasibility to evaluate fatal flaws and O&M options (Decision Item #4).
5. Decision Item #5 – Appraisal study of 8 Mile Lake storage restoration and fatal flaw analysis of 8 mile Lake storage expansion. IPID and USFS will report to Steering Committee for final decision on moving forward with this OCR appraisal study and fatal flaw analysis.
6. Revisit metrics as they relate to guiding principles and identify holes, what will it take to identify metrics for guiding principles. Assign appropriate committee (s)
7. LNFH Groundwater investigations and creation of a technical subcommittee (Decision Item #6). First phase - work with LNFH to define scope and identify members for GW Technical Subcommittee. Steering Committee to ID data gaps that need to be addressed as part of the investigation and assist in determining membership for Subcommittee.
8. Instream Flow Technical Committee (Decision Item #7). Steering Committee will appoint committee chair and key participants and report back to IWG.