

ICICLE STRATEGY
Icicle Work Group Meeting
Confluence Technology Center, Wenatchee
Thursday, February 13th, 2020

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees:

Mary Jo Sanborn, CCNRD; Peter Dykstra, Plauche & Carr; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribe; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Mike Cushman, Cascadia CD; Lisa Pelly, TU; Jim Brown, WDFW; Christi Davis Kernan, Bureau of Reclamation; Sharon Lunz, ICWC; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Mat Maxey, USFWS; Bill Gale, USFWS; Cory Kamphaus, Yakama Nation, Jeff Rivera, USFS; Tony Jantzer, IPID; Mike Kaputa, CCNRD; Tyler Roberts, Ecology-OCR; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; David VanCleve, Sierra Club; Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW; Jeff Dengel, WDFW; David Rice, Anchor QEA; Levi Jantzer, IPID; Sarah Walker, UCSRB; David Child, Reclamation; Dick Rieman, ICWC; Raquel Crowley, U.S. Senator Murray's Office; Kelli Scott; U.S. Representative Schrier's Office; Natalie Williams, ALPS; RJ Lott, Chelan County Community Development; Rich Evans, U.S. Senator Cantwell's Office; Cynthia Carlstad, NHC; Bob Bugert, Chelan County Commission

Welcome, Introductions, Review Agenda

Decision: Approval of November 14, 2019 IWG meeting summary. Approved

Draft Revised IWG Operating Procedures

At the November IWG meeting, we discussed decision making models. The IWG indicated a preference for using the full consensus model. Today, we will discuss member expectations and other revisions to the Operating Procedures. Specific edits to the document can be sent to Peter and Cynthia. Cynthia and Peter reviewed major potential revisions.

Biggest changes to Operating Procedures:

1. Decision Making Procedures – included framework for full consensus
2. Described different types of decisions: routine administration, routine or interim technical or process decision, and major decisions.
3. Added decision making procedures.
4. Member expectations
5. Description of committees/teams/organizations that support IWG
6. Removed Dispute Resolution; replaced with Resolving Disagreements
7. Made some updates to membership lists; these need to be updated more and confirmed.

Questions/Discussion:

Will we discuss taking out the Objectives section? Cynthia responded that the Objectives read more like a work plan that is now outdated. We are open to discussing this further and whether things have been eliminated that should be included somewhere else in the document.

When is the end point for the IWG? How do we identify when we are done? This topic has not been discussed. Is it worth adding something that discusses reaching an end, perhaps when all of the guiding principles have been achieved? Some of this may be determined by Decision Support Tool and how/who manages that. We could include an automatic check-in on how we are doing to reach the guiding principles every other year, for example.

Under the Purpose: There is a change that is significant that describes the Work Group “as an advisory body to co-conveners”. Was this always the understanding? This had not been explicit before.

- Feels we have been working this way and that could define the end of the IWG. When we’ve provided the guidance needed to co-conveners
- Is this related to SEPA co-lead responsibilities? The IWG convened long before SEPA was contemplated, so no it is not related.
- Could clarify use of “advisory” vs “decision-making”. The decisions are focused on what advice to give. Governmental bodies cannot give decision making authority to another body.
- It was always understood some entities had statutory authorities that could not be delegated.

Icicle Work Group Member Expectations:

- In #4 it’s hard to expect an organization to represent other organizations as it’s described to “coordinate with their constituencies”. TU for example is not comfortable representing other environmental organizations.
- In #4 “own views”. Individuals should be representing their organization NOT their “own views” as those may be different.
- Active listening as an expectation
- Collaborative is too binary
- Lacking the word Compromise – working towards consensus that requires compromise
- Likes #9
- Should Conflict of Interest section be moved or added here?
- All Icicle Strategy meetings are open to public, not just IWG
- In #10, clarify if this is for any funding anywhere, or just OCR funds? How does this apply to federal funding? Take out sharing proposals, etc. The idea was to encourage funding coordination. Also to help coordinate if multiple projects are submitting applications to the same funding source that will be competing against each other. There is value in sharing information to show how all funding helps leverage other, gaining a bigger picture of funding.
- In 10, what about other projects that are not included in preferred alternative? Is a better definition needed? Could tie projects to the goals of the Icicle Strategy, for those participating in this group.
- In #11, we need more clarity. For example, ICWC sent a postcard out to landowners for the PEIS open house in 2018 but did not notify the IWG that they were doing this. More clarity here is needed. When is notification to IWG needed? If it’s represented as from IWG, then approval is needed. Add “best effort, no surprises, effort” standard.
- In #13, replace “will” with “may” and indicate who will ask. Clarify the members are the organization, not the individual.
- In #7, could be re-worded
- More specificity in #13 could make a difference, look back to #1

Peter and Cynthia will re-work this section based on feedback and will discuss at the next meeting.

Steering Committee Vs Icicle Work Group Member Roles

IWG will focus on bigger topics. Steering Committee will get into more details on budget, project details, etc. What do people think about roles and membership on the Steering Committee?

Discussion:

- In the beginning, the Steering Committee was smaller. It grew for some reason, and it would be hard to limit that.
- There's a difference between being "on" the Steering Committee and attending meetings. Roles would be different.
- It would help to clarify individuals. Some organizations may come with several individuals.
- Perception with Steering Committee is that funding decisions are being made which leads to distrust. Need to clarify decisions – that Steering Committee considers and will make recommendations to the full IWG, then the IWG makes funding decisions.
- Some people recommend a small group of 5 or 6. The original Steering Committee was focused on helping develop agendas, etc.
- Representation on Steering Committee needs to be diverse (fed, state, tribal, etc).
- Should Steering Committee agendas be circulated to full IWG?
- Project sponsors find detailed project discussions at Steering Committee very helpful.
- Examples of other planning groups have an application process for Steering Committee members with timeframe/terms.
- The Steering Committee should consider IWG agenda items and provide input.

What is *action item* for membership? Feedback from today, at the next Steering Committee meeting the group will discuss this more and make a proposal to the IWG for the April meeting.

For all other updates to Operating Procedures – A revised draft will be sent out within a week or so. Then provide feedback before Steering Committee meeting on March 12th.

Public Engagement

- Steering Committee began this discussion last month and identified public outreach goals.
- Bill Gale wrote a vision statement for public outreach: "the goal should be to create or foster a well-informed and fully educated public that allows for a constructive dialogue between interested members of the public and the IWG."
- Vision should be focused on Icicle Creek, not IWG.
- A point of outreach is to foster communication and dialogue. The goal of outreach is different than the goal of the Work Group.
- Dialogue vs education
- Could add to vision statement "for purpose of supporting Icicle Creek".

Does IWG think we should do outreach for the Icicle Strategy? Yes. Why?

- If we don't communicate the 'what' and 'why', people will try to fill in the gaps without information.
- Open communication and dialogue in good faith.

- Outreach is necessary for success.
- Keep goals in mind.
- Caution against being reactive in our outreach. Reactive v Proactive is an important distinction.
- Two major pieces: message about collaboration and message about projects.

Two main elements: Both are very important

1. Marketing – tell story
2. Engagement – dialogue and feedback loop

Challenges in doing outreach:

- Difficult to identify the message if you don't have consensus
- Time commitment
- Lack of expertise

Is there support from IWG to create an Outreach Subcommittee? The Steering Committee discussed recommends forming an Outreach Subcommittee. IWG members concurred. Peter requested members to look into their organizations and find people to participate, if this is important to them. Time commitment at the beginning may be high, but we can do meetings over the phone. Send Peter and email if you are interested or have someone at your organization. Who (so far): Mary Jo, Tony, USFS will look into public affairs person, Ecology (not sure who yet), Bill Gale, maybe someone from WWT.

Value Planning Report-Out on Icicle-Peshastin Pumpback Project (Mike Kaputa, Tony Jantzer, Levi Jantzer, Dave Rice)

An overview of this project was given; it has been explored for several years. The project team has developed a new idea that is quite significant. Chelan County and IPID reached out to Reclamation to see if they'd be interested in conducting a Value Planning Study on this project. Value Planning is a creative process, done by a variety of specialists, with skilled facilitators over the course of one week. The results will help scope the use of the RCO and OCR funds for this project.

Presentation:

The idea of a pump station has been discussed for over 10 years. A significant challenge has always been finding a way to fund ongoing pumping costs. Previous studies have focused on a partial season pump station to keep pumping costs lower. This project originated in the need to increase stream flow in Peshastin Creek but has recently expanded to address flows in Icicle also. The new idea would expand pumping to two full season pump stations and add a hydropower facility to offset power costs.

Peshastin Creek flows are naturally very low. This project could eliminate the Peshastin diversion completely. The Value Planning Team identified three alternatives to evaluate.

The following alternatives were evaluated:

Alternative 1 – Pump to Canals

This alternative has two full season pump stations: one near Monitor and one near Dryden or Stines Hill. This project would generate power to offset pumping power needs. A hydropower facility could be added at the bottom of Snow Creek located on IPID property. A lot of work needs to be done to answer the question of whether the hydropower idea would work. Current power rates are very low, but there is no way to know what future rates will be. Having power generating capability would protect IPID against future cost increases. Cost estimates are about \$20 million.

Alternative 2 – Pump to Pipes

This alternative replaces the canal system with three separate, independent piped systems supplied by three pump stations on the Wenatchee River. Maintenance cost savings by converting to pipes could offset pumping costs. Estimated cost at \$80-\$90 million to implement.

Alternative 3 – Gravity to Pipes

This alternative replace the canal system with closed pipelines. Supply with gravity flow from Icicle Creek diversion and two pump stations on the Wenatchee River (Gibbs and Monitor). Estimated costs at \$80-\$100 million to implement.

Reclamation developed flow tracking graphic to help evaluate different alternatives, which is included in the report.

Regarding the hydropower facility, the group evaluated power needs for the pump stations and then identified the scale of kw that could be generated at the Snow Creek site (with 400 ft of drop). This high-level evaluation concludes that it may be possible to generate the kilowatts needed to offset the pump stations at this site. Communication with Chelan PUD has been initiated, they are aware of this project concept. Locally, Columbia River hydropower facilities drop off right when the Snow Creek generation would increase. Ongoing coordination with Chelan PUD on cost for power, distribution, etc is needed. When the report is finished, the PUD will be engaged in discussions on feasibility. Solar and wind power generation will be evaluated to compare to hydro as well.

The first two alternatives are not mutually exclusive. Alternative 1 could be a first phase in reaching Alternative 2. The hydro facility would need to be included in any alternative with pump stations.

Chelan County and IPID have OCR funds to match the RCO funding that was recently awarded. The plan is to integrate feasibility and design of this project with the Icicle Strategy.

Cost estimates are made at a very high level.

The report will be distributed when finished.

The Reclamation Value Planning Team was extremely helpful – thank you!

Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project Update

A meeting took place in Seattle in January with wilderness stakeholders to have a dialogue with IPID, Ecology, and the USFS on the Eightmile Lake Project. The meeting was well attended, and the group engaged. The meeting agenda covered the following topics:

- Participants goals for the meeting and ongoing engagement
- Tony presented the history and design alternatives.
- USFS discussed their process and factors that trigger different pathways for USFS engagement.
- Melissa and Tom discussed the Ecology process. They are trying to solve problems into the future. Ecology Office of Dam Safety (ODS) determined that no action is not an option, so some sort of dam rebuild will be the baseline for the SEPA/NEPA analysis.

Cynthia summarized discussion that occurred at the meeting:

- Clarifying elements common and different between the 3 dam designs, including what is the underlying assumptions (water rights, future climate, use of low-level inlet pipe)
- Understanding USFS process, triggers, etc.
- Trying to understand the regulatory and process roadmap for each alternative
- Special warranty deed language
- When and how a water right evaluation fits into this
- Concerns about providing input piecemeal; want to know about all actions affecting wilderness (e.g. automation)
- Commitments about uses for stored water
- Summation – Good first conversation, but much more is needed.
- Next meeting is scheduled for March 4 in Cle Elum

Kitty, Natalie, Dave – agreed with the summary Cynthia gave. Appreciate everyone coming. There was not enough time to get through all of the details. A lot of conversation is still needed.

One of the needs identified at the meeting was clear communication materials describing the three alternatives. IPID has a first draft of new drawings and comparison table to present to the IWG and wants feedback on clarity.

Presentation on design.

Showed current conditions and then alternative designs.

- Alternative #1 – primary spillway elevation is 4,667’ and is 60 ft wide with 3 gates (more redundancy) to enable storage to lake level 4,671.5’. Gates must trip automatically (Dam Safety requirement). The gates will also work electrically for automated releases. This alternative has the smallest footprint.
- Alternative #2 – spillway elevation is 4,671’ and 180 ft wide; there are no gates. The footprint of the dam into lake is greater.
- Alternative #3 – Spillway crest is 2 ft lower at elevation 4,667’; similar to Alternative 2, there are no gates, however the footprint is smaller than Alternative 2.

All three alternatives have the same kind of pipeline. The location of pipe outlet would be outside of the current easement. IPID would need a USFS ditch bill agreement or special use permit.

4671' elevation is natural high lake level, pre-dam construction. The original plans when the dam was constructed were to raise the lake level 10 ft, however that was never done because of the known leak in the lake bed or outlet area.

Tony provided several considerations influencing how IPID proceeds:

- ODS determined that no action is not an option, so IPID must do something at the site. There has been a recent change to the high hazard dam category, which increases dam safety requirements to Eightmile Lake.
- IPID's proof of appropriation document allows pumping to get water; he does not recall that this has been done.
- In the Special Warranty Deed, IPID retained rights that include the use of motorized transportation and equipment, or aircraft. IPID and USFS have discussed a proposed concept where both parties are willing to take this reference out of deed, to ensure IPID will not build a road into site in the future. IPID has never intended to build a road into the lake, this would ensure it is not done in the future.
- There is disagreement about the meaning and effect of the language in the Special Warranty Deed among some, including between IPID and USFS.

Discussion

- Peter asked the group what additional information is needed: acres of lake surface area? Peter will send the table out for review. Let him know if you think of other information that would be helpful.
- Kitty asked if there has been a dam considered to re-build at current elevation? Tony responded that if IPID built at 4667 (the current lake level), it would be same as option 1 without gates.
- All alternatives include automation.
- Lowering the lake – there are concerns about aesthetics. How much lower is the proposal level than historic low level? That is difficult to quantify because of the leak. Annual operations can have effects on low level. IPID is willing to work to minimize those impacts.
- Pumping - Proof of appropriation says IPID can pump, but wouldn't do that unless under extreme drought conditions.
- If the pump station project moves forward, would you still need full 2500 acre feet released? Answer: cannot answer at this time. Important question that needs future dialogue. A lot more information would be needed.
- Who is invited to the March 4th meeting? All meetings are open to the public. That meeting is intended to be a focused dialogue with information brought back to the IWG.

EIS – Melissa gave an update on the project-level EIS the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project:

- Reiterated that ODS says do nothing is not an option. Also, the classification of Eightmile as a high hazard is not a result of new information but rather ODS becoming more aware of conditions in recent years.
- The three alternatives in the design will be basis for the EIS being done by Ecology. OCR is the Lead.
- A Request for Proposals for an EIS consultant went out February 7th and is open until March 17th. Next, Ecology will review proposals and select a consultant. Design features for each alternative will be evaluated in the EIS.

Questions:

1. How do you deal with the issue like the need for a special use permit with USFS?
Response: You do not need all permits in place to make a decision in an EIS. The EIS will identify what permits are needed.
2. How will NEPA be addressed? Response: NEPA can adopt SEPA or portions of it. The RFP includes the opportunity to include NEPA coordination.

Instream Flow Subcommittee Update

Subcommittee met on January 9th – reviewed data gathered in 2019, and discussed the proposed PHABSIM work in French Creek. The group is creating a comprehensive data list. The next meeting will be the morning of March 12th.

Decision: Funding for French Creek PHABSIM Study – and base flows for Leland Creek. \$115,000 Approved

General Updates/ Public Comment

None

Upcoming Meetings:

Let Mary Jo know if you'd like to participate in and be added to the Water Conservation Committee.

Adjourn 3:00