

Icicle Creek Work Group Meeting

Thursday June 4, 2015

9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Confluence Technology Center

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees:

Tom Tebb, Ecology; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Dick Rieman, Icicle Watershed Council; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Derek Sandison, Ecology-OCR; Steve Croci, USFWS; Jim Craig, USFWS; Susan Adams, WWT; Mary Jo Sanborn, CCNRD; Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental; Dan Haller, Aspect Cons., Jay Manning, Cascadia Law Group; Keith Goehner, Chelan County; Jim Brown, WDFW; Dave Irving, USFWS; Lisa Pelly, TU; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Confederated Tribes; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Daryl Harnden, Farmer/PID; Mel Weythman, Farmer/IID; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; Melissa Bates, CELP; Rachael Osborn, CELP; Charity Davidson, WDFW; Ericka Hegeman, CCNRD; Bill Gale, USFWS; Greg McLaughlin, WWT
Kurt Beardslee (WFC) attempted to participate via conference call, however technical difficulties with the phone system occurred.

Review of IWG Member Survey

Lisa DW reviewed survey results and passed out a summary. Jay added details from individual meetings with IWG members summarizing that most felt like getting to development of a Base Package by September would be great.

Tom summarized the basis of the letter that went out as a ‘gut check’. Competition for funding necessitates unity by IWG. The IWG needs to move forward together. The question to each IWG member is, “are you in or out?”

Derek - we’re the most successful in securing funding as a cohesive group – we need a commitment together.

Jay: Establishing the base package is the beginning of the hard work. We need a united front to work through implementation and securing funding. Now that we know the BiOp, this brings some clarity.

Keith: We have a huge opportunity with this group. We did this in watershed planning where moving forward together was critical. Now we have a better understanding of the issues and opportunities. This way, we can get to meaningful solutions and a better future.

Lisa P – Building trust is important and we’re not there yet. Field trips could help.

Dave – LNFH is fully engaged in IWG. We need the IWG to accomplish our goals and this is the best chance to do it.

Dale – Now (with BiOp) we have easy projects to get behind and support at LNFH. Maybe we can focus on those that have a good chance of being successful. Members should forgo lawsuits and make some progress. This is very achievable.

Mel – It is time to see some progress. If we see some good progress, we are more willing to listen.

Jim – WDFW wants to see success. We may need to look closer at doable projects. Maybe set more controversial projects aside while we have some “wins”.

Dick – I agree. I like to focus on one project at a time to get success.

Jim – I understand the concept of the Integrated Package of projects but fear that trying to get a perfect scenario might get in the way of “good enough”.

Lisa DW – question to the group: Is it possible to phase projects and still meet all of the guiding principles?

Dale – I could see some phasing like what is being done in the Yakima.

Jay – it took trust as a group to do that (in the Yakima). Irrigators had to trust that their projects would happen.

Steve – We’ve done a lot of groundwork and need to look closely at what the target is. BiOp will help define some targets. We’re on the cusp of making progress.

Rachael – does the letter mean we cannot sue?

Tom – Yes

Dale – this process is about collaboration, not litigation.

Rachael – disagrees that litigation doesn’t have a role. Has the steering Committee been abolished? Has questions about 2015-17 budget. What is the process on concerns?

Jay – the process to vet concerns is to bring them to this table (to the IWG).

Discussion on communication on the IWG process with those outside the group:

Rachael asked if some of the concerns were a result of her blog? She will continue communicating with others and feels it is her responsibility to do so.

Tony – it is also about sharing pumpback information before there was consensus from the IWG.

Mike – the threat of litigation has a chilling effect on the group and reaching consensus. The blog mischaracterized the effort. Actions being taken are not in line with collaboration. Members need to collaborate.

Rachael – CELP has not threatened to litigate. Are they being asked to leave the workgroup?

Tom – the goal is to have support within the IWG.

Rachael – isn't this a quid-pro-quo process?

Several members responded no. IWG members cannot leave this room and then provoke public outcry. We need to focus on problem-solving. The threat of lawsuits, prohibits trust. We need trust to participate.

Tony – the reason IPID has pulled pump exchanges off the table is because of a lack of trust. IPID is fine with the do-nothing alternative. Comments from CELP are challenging – not collaborative. We need to look for ways to solve problems, not look for barriers to stop projects. IPID will continue to look at the Dryden pump exchange outside of this group and if trust exists in the future, it could come back.

Wrapping this discussion up...

Derek – we need to acknowledge that not everyone is capable of collaborating. Focus on who is willing to work together to achieve the goals. There is a difference between objective dissemination of information and trying to undermine a process.

Keith – the goal of this group from the start was collaboration and to focus on a collective goal. If this does not work for you, then pursue meeting your needs in another manner and withdraw.

Lisa DW – if questions remain, contact Tom. Any IWG members unable to meet expectations in Ecology's letter need to respond to Tom by June 15.

Guiding Principle Metrics

There was discussion around the Guiding Principles (GP) Metrics figure (pie chart) and some confusion on the information the figure represented. The title is not clear, suggestion that the figure be focused on instream flow benefits. Dan will work on revising the figure.

The IWG discussed each of the GP metrics and the one-page handout was updated as to capture agreement (in black) and where more discussion and follow-up is needed (in red).

Domestic Supply

IWG had previously asked Wenatchee Water Work Group (WWWG) to develop metrics. There are questions on the how calculations were made. The group first focused on the policy questions that Dan presented as a basis for getting into the detailed metrics.

1. Should the 800 acre-foot dispute between Leavenworth and Ecology be included in the domestic guiding principle (Yes/No)?

IWG: Yes, all agree.

2. Should approximately 1,000 acre-feet of additional domestic demand (City of Leavenworth and rural) through 2050 be included in the domestic guiding principle? (Yes/No)

IWG: Ok, but need to know how the numbers are calculated. Leave open *how* this is solved. There could be other tools to consider. City #'s impact County #'s. This planning timeline is a legal requirement.

3. Should the increase from 0.1 cfs to 0.5 cfs (about 500 acre-feet) in the Icicle Reserve contemplated in the Wenatchee Instream Flow rule be tied to flow improvement in the Historic Channel be included in the Domestic GP (Yes/No)?

IWG: Ok, but Rachael has concerns about the calculations. The Steering Committee will review calculations and look for redundancy with other domestic metrics.

4. Should ensuring the Icicle and Lower Wenatchee Reserve (1,800 cfs acre-feet to 2,300 acre-feet) is reliable in the event that a Legislative fix of the Swinomish effect on the Wenatchee Rule be included in the domestic GP (Yes/No)?

IWG: want to see what the Legislature decides. There could be some phasing here.

Bring all policy questions (above) to the Steering Committee and work on the calculations. Then bring the numbers back to the IWG for agreement on the metrics.

Comply with Laws, Wilderness Acts

Questions on timing and phasing of projects. When will we know what is allowable under the various laws and acts? SEPA scoping is used to get agencies to engage and provides a timetable to get feedback. The next step on projects is feasibility which will answer these questions.

IWG: Agreement on metrics in table

Habitat Enhancement

Discussion on what to use as units of measurement and whether that is necessary to define quantitatively. Is it okay to have a qualitative statement here? Discussion on whether to include Boulder Field. There were some questions on the implications of including it.

[IWG: agreement on metrics in updated table. Some policy questions still exist.](#)

Overview of Hatchery BiOp Conditions

Dale gave a presentation that outlined the recently signed Biological Opinion for the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery. Bill Gale (USFWS) provided information and answered questions as well. The BiOp is broken into short-term and long-term actions. A collective instream flow goal of 100 cfs.

- Long-Term operations of LNFH Surface Water Withdrawal to contribute to the 100 cfs goal include developing and evaluating plans for RAS, which could reduce water needs by at least 20 cfs. Discussion on the timeline for implementing RAS: BiOp says anticipate pilot RAS within 3-4 years. Previously, plumbing issues onsite at LNFH limited their ability to implement RAS. These issues are being fixed right now and should be completed by August 1. Implementation could be faster than 3-4 years if the funding is available. The size of the pilot was originally 4 tanks, but it could be built out fully if the funding is available.
- Long-Term Operations of Structure 2 for Aquifer Recharge: Identify and implement a preferred option to replace the use of Structure 2 for aquifer recharge within eight years, or sooner. USFWS feels there are good options being explored now (via IWG) to ensure access to their groundwater by implementing some other project(s), which would eliminate their need to rely on Structure 2 for aquifer recharge.
- Update screen at intake within eight years. Discussion focused on how the size of the screen would depend on water savings from implementing RAS and potential projects that COIC may implement.

Tom asked if there was a group formed that will focus on adaptive management under the BiOp? Bill responded not specifically. There has been a group evaluating fish passage over the years and this group would continue to meet. Tom will be developing an adaptive management group through WDOE's 401 certification.

Guiding Principle Metrics continued...

LNFH Metrics

[IWG: Agreement on metrics in table](#)

Agricultural Reliability Metric

[IWG: Agreement on metrics in updated table with the exception of Rachael \(CELP\) who cannot agree to the first two bullets.](#)

- Automate / Optimize Alpine Lakes for improved reliability (plus instream flow benefit)
- Restore/repair 8-Mile Lake up to 2,500 acre-feet (275 acre-foot agricultural benefit, 900 ac-ft additional instream flow/municipal benefit)

Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal harvest

Discussion resulted in updates to the table to characterize this metric in ‘catch per unit of effort’ (CPUE) and fine-tuning some language. Also added was ‘maintain multi-species harvest opportunities’.

[IWG: Agreement on metrics in updated table](#)

Project Updates

Tribal Impacts Study – Dan showed the bathymetry video based on data collected at the pool. Collecting information on split flow scenarios between the historic channel and hatchery canal, how flow over the spillway and resulting hydraulics impacts fishing. We will be evaluating if there are opportunities to provide the attraction/bubble effect without needing to push as much flow through the hatchery canal.

Groundwater Investigations – based on the geophysics done last fall, test pits were dug on Hatchery Island. Initial results show potential for good groundwater augmentation there. The next step is to do physical pump testing there, which will happen soon. Rachael asked whether pumping from the well will require a water right and what are the impacts to the stream? Dan responded that this will all be clear in the Action Plan that will be written up once the pump testing is done. Dave noted that the goal is for the hatchery to get off the use of Structure 2 for aquifer recharge. This project provides an option to access groundwater without relying on S2.

COIC Alternatives Analysis – Greg gave an overview of their work to evaluate several alternatives to improve Cascade Orchard Irrigation Co. system. Anchor has been hired to help with this work and they are evaluating the alternatives now and working with COIC to gather information. A draft of the alternatives will be done late summer and then outreach will occur with the shareholders to discuss a preferred alternative.

Base Package Development

The IWG discussed *how* they might move forward with developing a base package of projects by September. There was discussion about having the metrics defined now enables the group to get this done. We could develop some filtering criteria and identify a process to pull it together. Greg suggested identifying a process to work through difficult projects so they don’t hold up others.

There was a question on what is meant by “Base” package. Mike defined the Base Package as meeting ALL of the guiding principles. Jay said that typically there would be a lot of compromise on a full package. The package should be more ambitious than just saying we have support for one or two projects that we’ll get going with.

There was discussion on phasing implementation of projects. Steve asked what the risk is of losing support from those that get what they want early? Trust will be important for this to work.

There are multiple ways to meet all of the GPs. How can the facilitation team help pull this information together for the IWG? This will be a process of working through trade-offs.

IWG Decision: Work through this process of how to formulate a base package with the Steering Committee on June 18, 9:00-1:00, CTC. Then bring draft to IWG on July 9. Final at IWG in September (meeting date not scheduled yet).

Next IWG Meeting is July 9, 2015, All Day, CTC