

Icicle Work Group Water Resource Management Strategy Overview

Presentation to Conservation Organizations

February 17, 2015, Good Shepherd Center 7:00 – 9:00 pm

Attendees

Mike Kaputa	Chelan County Natural Resource Department
Keith Goehner	Chelan County Commission
Grant Learned Sr.	Friends of Lake Kachess
Andrea Matzke	Sierra Club
Pat Sumption	Sierra Club
Rebecca Wolfe	Sierra Club
Derek Poon	Unaffiliated
Ann Wechsler	Sierra Club
Lisa Pelly	Trout Unlimited WA Water Project
Trish Rolfe	Center for Environmental Law and Policy
Lloyd Fetterly	Sierra Club
Ben Greuel	The Wilderness Society
Tony Jantzer	Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts
Lisa Dally Wilson	Dally Environmental
Charity Davidson	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Tom Tebb	WA Department of Ecology
Andrea Imler	Washington Trails Association
Jay Manning	Cascadia Law Group
Don Parks	Sierra Club
Harry Romberg	Sierra Club
Karl Forsgaard	Alpine Lakes Protection Society
Thom Peters	Alpine Lakes Protection Society
Raelene Gold	League of Women Voters
David E. Ortman	unaffiliated
Elaine Packard	Sierra Club
Randy Jones	Five Corners Family Farmers
Paul Gould	Sierra Club
Morgan Ahouse	Sierra Club
Rachael Osborn	Center for Environmental Law and Policy
Janine Blaeloch	Western Lands Project/Wilderness Watch
Connor Braggs	Aqua Permanente
Susan Adams	Washington Water Trust
Michael Garrity	American Rivers
Tom Uniack	Washington Wild

Presentation

Mike Kaputa (Chelan County Natural Resource Department) provided an overview of the Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy that is being developed by the Icicle Workgroup stakeholders. The intent of the meeting this evening is to provide an overview to attendees and gather input, feedback and concerns on the management strategy, specifically those projects that relate to the Alpine

Lakes. The powerpoint presentation is available on the Chelan County NRD website:
http://www2.co.chelan.wa.us/nr/planning/icicle_work_group/default.htm

Key points of the overview:

- Co-Conveners are Ecology Office of the Columbia River and Chelan County DNR
- A group of stakeholders (Icicle Workgroup) have been assembled to address a water resource strategy for Icicle Creek. They've been working since December of 2012 on reaching consensus around goals for the strategy and initiating project evaluations
- Primary Goal – Meet both instream and out-of-stream objectives in the Icicle Creek Basin, agree on a “base package” (of projects) that meet all guiding principles agreed upon by the Icicle Workgroup, and provide an alternative to resolving conflict in the Basin. The concept of a base package of projects that meets both instream and out-of-stream objectives is very important to the process.
- The guiding principles will form a “base package” of projects that provide balanced benefits for existing and new domestic and agricultural uses, non-consumptive uses, fish, wildlife and habitat while protecting treaty and non-treaty fishing interests. A matrix showing each guiding principle and corresponding projects, metrics, studies, data gaps and schedule was distributed to the meeting attendees.
- Benefits: Water from the suite of projects will be used to augment flows (40-50 cfs short term, drought years; 130 cfs long-term, non-drought years), benefit agriculture (2-4 cfs) and benefit municipal use (5-7 cfs). Instream flow needs were determined using the most restrictive species and lifestage: Steelhead spawning. This flow augmentation is extremely ambitious and provides much more water in the channel than has been there historically.
- There are three types of water that will be made available from these projects: guaranteed, firm and interruptible.
- An overview of the current withdrawals in the basin was provided.
- It was emphasized that Reach 4, the reach that includes the USFWS hatchery area, is of particular focus and importance in this effort. The projects will put significant flow into the natural channel (versus the hatchery channel). As a result, there will be a total of no less than 60 cfs in drought years and no less than 100 cfs in non-drought years. Historically, the purpose of the hatchery was mitigation for Grand Coulee Dam – circa 1945.
- Projects: There are many different types of projects that will make up the “package” of projects for the Icicle Water Resource Management Strategy. These include conservation, groundwater augmentation, reuse, pump exchanges, modification of existing storage, new storage, water markets, fish passage and screening (and structures), habitat improvement in the historic channel in the hatchery reach (maintaining the historic channel as side channel habitat), and enhancements for the Tribal Fishery. A brief overview was given on a number of these types of projects. However, the emphasis of this evening's session is on modifications to existing storage.

Storage Related Projects – Alpine Lakes

Three types of storage related projects were discussed: automation and optimization of existing withdrawals from Alpine Lakes, Restoration of Eight-Mile Lake, and new storage at Eight-Mile Lake and Klonauqua.

1. Automation and Optimization

- Mike explained several alternatives for automating and optimizing releases from the lakes. He referred attendees to the Appraisal Study that has been done for Automation and Optimization. The table titled 'cost benefit summary' in the Executive Summary, page ES-4, was distributed.
- Discussion, Concerns and Q&A
 - Concerns about retreating glaciers and the actual quantity of water that will be available in the future. Mike noted that the appraisal studies evaluate risk of climate change scenarios.
 - What constitutes a drought year? When low flow occurs that is equivalent to the lowest one year out of ten. Concern that this may change over time as flows are reduced due to climate change.
 - Is any of this water allocated for fire management? Yes, it can be used as necessary for fire.
 - Request for Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area boundary on the maps used for Icicle Strategy. **Action:** put boundary on map and post on website.
 - 'Do no harm' concept – encourage that approach
 - Questions and concerns about aesthetics. What will automation look like in the Wilderness? It was explained that it would include a solar panel, battery and antenna (likely up in a tree, not visible) that would be hooked to the gate system. The Icicle-Peshastin Irrigation District (IPID) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Hatchery have concerns about vandalism. IPID mentioned that they have been operating these lakes for 80 years, and most people don't realize they are reservoirs.
 - Concern that we may be altering the ecosystem by pulling more total water from the Wilderness. IPID explained that the District has the ability (water right) to take more water out of the lakes. With automation, they would spread the withdrawals over a number of lakes, drawing less water out of an individual lake, and impacting individual lakes less.

2. Restoration of Eight-Mile Lake

- Mike presented information regarding existing storage at Eight-Mile Lake and presented four storage options for Eight-Mile Lake. He also provided excerpts from the language in the easement agreement between the USFS and IPID.
- Discussion, Concerns, Q&A
 - Question regarding protection of existing and designated uses. How are you treating the intersection of ESA (Section 7 Analysis), water quality (CWA – 401 Certification process), etc. Suggestion to build a matrix showing existing and designated uses and how they will be protected.
 - Discussion and quotes from The Wilderness Act. Mike and Tony (IPID) further explained the easement agreement between IPID and USFS that authorizes operation and maintenance, repair and modification of the lakes. IPID explained that the District actually owned the lakes at one time, and that the 1976 Wilderness Act for the Alpine Lakes recognizes pre-existing uses.
 - Tony explained that all of the work at Eight-Mile has been done by hand and that no equipment is brought in.
 - Question – how will things change at Eight-Mile Lake/what will it look like with automation or increased storage? Photos were presented. Different storage options were discussed. Reference was made to several reports that can be accessed on the Chelan County website (link above). See the Forsgren Report Appendices showing graphics of inundation for different elevations on the Chelan County website.

- IPID explained that the District stands to lose water with this project. They will limit their total water right to 1600 AF if they can restore Eight-Mile Lake, and will provide the additional 900 AF for instream flow benefits. There was some discussion regarding these benefits in drought years.
- It was noted that the studies thus far for Automation and Optimization and Restoration of Eight Mile Lake are Appraisal level studies. They are conceptual level studies with bathymetry information. They are not full feasibility studies.

3. Upper Klon aqua

- Mike presented information from a very conceptual assessment of new storage opportunities at Upper Klon aqua Lake. An appraisal level study has not been performed. The project would result in 5-20 cfs (over 60 days) benefit from additional storage at Upper Klon aqua that would be transferred to lower Klon aqua via one of three options: either siphoning, pumping or tunneling. There are no current control structures or siphons at the upper lake.
- Mike explained the thought around this concept was “if we could do something on Klon aqua, we could reduce pressure on Eight Mile”. Again, the concept is that instead of impacting one lake (Eight-Mile), the drawdown that results in instream flow benefit would be spread over a number of lakes. The IPID has an easement for Upper Klon aqua.
- Discussion, Concerns, Q&A
 - How would tunneling occur? Envision low impact, labor intensive tunneling. No large equipment. In the past, would have hauled tools up with a horse. May consider helicopter.

Next Steps

Mike explained the following next steps in the process:

1. Initiate SEPA/NEPA Scoping (note this is programmatic level scoping, not project level)
2. Begin Feasibility studies on early action items that have consensus (eg., Groundwater Augmentation at the Fish Hatchery)
3. Establish Metrics for the remaining Guiding Principles
4. ID data gaps and begin studies to address them
5. Final Integrated Project List that accomplishes ALL Guiding Principles

There was a request from participants to hear more about water conservation. Mike noted the current conservation efforts and efficiencies. Participants also noted that this is a lot of information to digest. Mike would like to hear any additional, specific concerns regarding the projects so that those concerns can be addressed moving forward. As folks are able to review the studies, would like to keep an open dialog.