

ICICLE STRATEGY
Icicle Work Group Meeting
Chelan County Fire District: Station 11 (206 Easy St) Wenatchee
Thursday, May 9th, 2019

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Mary Jo Sanborn, CCNRD; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Levi Jantzer, IPID; Daryl Harnden, IPID; Dave Rice, Anchor QEA; Tyler Roberts, Ecology-OCR; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW; Jeff Dengel, WDFW; Jim Brown, WDFW; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Mike Kaputa, CCNRD; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Chris Lynch, Reclamation; Dan Church, Reclamation; David Child, Reclamation; Cory Kamphaus, Yakama Nation; Bill Gale, USFWS; Jim Craig, USFWS; Dave Irving, USFWS; Mat Maxey, USFWS; Carlo Aguon, USFWS; Parker Wittman, Aspect Consulting; Lisa Pelly, TU; Gus Bekker, ALPS; Kitty Craig, TWS; Sharon Lunz, ICWC; Sarah Walker, UCSRB; Mike Cushman, Cascadia CD; Martha Bean, Interested Consultant; Erick Walker, OWNF; Bob Bugert, Chelan County (arrived late)

Welcome, Review Agenda - *The IWG approved the February 14th, 2019 Meeting Summary*

Public Comment – none

❖ *Presentations from this meeting are available online at,*
<https://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group-meeting-information>

Fish Screen Designs: IPID, City of Leavenworth (Jenni Novak, WDFW)

Jenni presented the City and IPID screen designs. The City's intake will remain the same. It works well and is not a good location for the screen due to ice and access issues. The new screen and house structure will be located near the current one but will be located up higher, out of the floodplain. The current screen house will need to be demolished.

The IPID screen includes replacement of the bridge deck to widen the bridge approximately 4 to 6 feet to accommodate equipment. This will not require work on the bridge footings, just the deck and stringers.

Total cost for the City of Leavenworth screen is estimated at \$941,500. \$125,000 is not secured and is needed. \$200,000 is being requested in the current SRFB process, a decision will be known approximately August 2019.

The IPID screen cost is estimated at \$1,435,000 which is covered by current grant funds and in-kind work from IPID.

The IWG discussed the funding gap for the City screen and how to fill that. The timing depends on the status of the boulder field project. Lisa Pelly said that is being planned for 2019 construction. One option is to ask Tributary Committee for additional funds. Dale noted that the

City's contribution of \$40,000 seems low. Joel responded that the original cost estimate was lower. Any consideration of additional OCR funds needs to go through the Steering Committee to discuss in the context of all of the projects to be funded in the 2019-2021 biennial budget. Dale feels that the compliance issue exists now because of bull trout. Tony noted that because of the in-kind work contributions for IPID, that the match is larger than the 25% requested by Trib Committee so that could help meet the overall 25% match for both projects. Joel asked about the meeting that was held a month ago to discuss screens. At that meeting, it was not clear that there was still a funding gap for the City's screen. Jeff said the funding table is the same. At the previous meeting, they requested \$85,000 of OCR funds to help meet the 25% non-fish funding match but there is still a funding gap. The IWG agreed this will not be resolved now, so the discussion should continue among the project sponsor and then at the next Steering Committee as needed.

Examples of Decision Support Tools

Two presentations show how different tools are being used to manage water in other basins (Yakima, Okanogan River in Canada). These are examples for the IWG to consider as it develops a similar tool to be used to manage releases from the Alpine Lakes to meet a variety of guiding principles.

Okanogan Fish and Water Management Tool (Jim Brown, WDFW)

Tom Kahler with Douglas PUD presented this decision support tool last month to the Steering Committee since he was unable to attend this IWG meeting. Jim is presenting a shortened version of Tom's presentation to give an overview. Detailed questions should be directed to Tom Kahler, tomk@dcnud.org. Some questions discussed include: that a lot of data was in place so there did not need to be a large investment at first. The tool was focused on addressing three challenges: large variation in annual flow, balance of multiple competing objectives and trade-offs, and the low level of trust between the parties. A set of rules were developed that govern the success in meeting flood protection, fisheries and other water-use objectives. With modeled analysis from agreed upon data, water managers make decisions on water releases and storage and can react to in-season management crises (i.e. late January storm that may push the hydrograph above the red-scour threshold).

Yakima River Basin (Chris Lynch, Reclamation)

The Yakima includes a variety of facilities including 5 reservoirs, over 400 miles of canal, 7 project diversions, and approximately 60 fish screens and fish ladders. Chris discussed the Yakima "tea cup" model which manages storage releases throughout the Yakima basin. Several important things help govern the water release patterns: treaties, authorizing legislation, contracts, flood control and dam safety, state water law, power and transmission needs, ESA and Clean Water Act, and engineering, science and discretion. Operational goals include: meeting flow targets, meeting irrigation demands, reducing flood damage, maximize carryover, improve operations for environmental concerns, and produce power. Chris discussed the fish based flow target goals and a release scenario referred to as "flip flop" that seems similar to conditions in the Icicle. In this situation, releases from one lake will be decreased to present a smaller wetted channel just prior to spawning to ensure redds don't dry up in winter. This may be a similar condition to consider for French and Leland Creeks. Other similarities to the Icicle include the

downstream instream flow targets with bull trout further upstream. Rules are established based on different needs in different locations and also to maximize water supplies.

The IWG discussed these similarities and the importance of the Alpine Lakes Automation project as a way to manage releases better.

Bill noted that the complexity of the Icicle may make it more valuable to do a model like Lake Osoyoos (Okanogan). It's a structured process that tries to eliminate the guess work, and helps in crisis driven decisions.

Dan noted that we still need data to feed a model and develop business rules.

Sharon stated the need to identify values like ecological value of stream.

Mary Jo reviewed what the instream flow committee started working on last month. This committee will be developing a matrix of issues, questions, and data needs for automation. The matrix will note if the issue is resolved, or is a data gap that needs to be filled. The data gaps identified will be described in a Multi-Year Research Plan that we will discuss with the USFS and others on how to implement.

Things for the IWG to consider on this topic include:

- extending consideration to the lower Wenatchee River (in developing business rules, etc),
- establishing a consultation group, which is the instream flow committee now.
- Who will host a model and manage the releases
- Consider how to manage a diverse system – more than just fish and flow, pool height, hydrology, temperature, etc.

Working Lunch

IWG Member Letters

Melissa discussed that since the finalization of the PEIS there have been several discussions about letters submitted by IWG members. She wants to touch base on what has been submitted and next steps. Some letters have conditions identified that need to be discussed and worked through. The intent is to do this process with the Facilitator that will be hired soon. Letters in support of the preferred alternative have come from IPID, City of Leavenworth (resolution), WDFW and WWT. Daryl Harnden and Yakama Nation submitted comment letters for the draft PEIS in support of the preferred alternative. Other letters have come from TU and ICWC that focus on questions and concerns. Mike noted that there are issues and conditions in many of the letters that are just hanging out there right now. We look forward to having a facilitator to work through them. In the case of the ICWC, we are working directly through the issues in the dispute resolution process. Sharon noted that the facilitator should address Steve Parker's comments sent via email recently.

Dispute Resolution Update (ICWC, WDFW, Ecology-OCR, Chelan County)

Sharon has been on vacation and just returned so the ICWC Board will meet next week to discuss the latest information. After that meeting, Sharon will reach out to the panel to schedule a meeting.

Climate Change Memo (Dan Haller, Aspect)

During the dispute resolution process, ICWC asked for additional climate change analysis. This Memo is a result of that additional work. The additional analysis helps understand performance of the preferred alternative under more severe drought conditions than evaluated in the PEIS. In these analyses, the drought year flow target of 60 cfs is achievable with the Preferred Alternative in every scenario, except the most extreme High Climate Change scenario projection for 2080 where the 2015 Drought is the base condition. Flows vary between 5 and 12 cfs below the flow target during 5 weeks. If the IWG ends up achieving additional flow improvements (10%) as projects are implemented and through adaptive management, then we'll be ok. The UW Climate Impacts Group (CIG) recommends using the Medium scenario when using these models. Bill Gale noted that it is important to look at the huge impact these projects will have in improving the conditions in Icicle Creek.

Did this additional analysis address the questions raised by ICWC? Sharon said that Dick Rieman has done his own analysis on a daily averaging scale which results in a much worse outlook.

Tyler responded that the time scale matters a lot. If you use daily averaging, you can't expect a stable outcome. Also, weekly average time step is used because that is how Ecology manages instream flow rules, etc.

Preferred Alternative Project Table

Dan reviewed a table prepared by Aspect and Chelan County to help track projects in terms of project-level environmental review and timelines. Help is needed from project proponents to make this accurate and keep it updated. It was noted that local permits should be added to the table. The IWG was asked to review this table and provide input on accuracy and whether the table is helpful for planning purposes.

Project Updates:

COIC – Greg updated the group that they are working through negotiations with the landowners on an easement and continuing with design work. They had anticipated beginning construction on the laterals in early fall but that may be delayed a few months.

Eightmile Lake – Tony updated the group that they developed draft 30% designs several months ago (and presented to the IWG). They are working through negotiations on the draft designs with Ecology's Dam Safety Office, mostly focused on the gate structure. They anticipate that the new facilitator will help move things forward with the USFS. Construction in 2019 is not likely, so 2020 looks more realistic at this point.

Peshastin Full Season Pump Station – Mike and Tony discussed a new project being considered for Peshastin Irrigation District that is a variation of other pump station projects. This project would include a small hydropower facility on Snow Creek to help offset the costs of O&M (electrical costs of pumping). This project would eliminate the Peshastin Creek diversion and add two pump stations on the Wenatchee River. There would be instream flow benefits to Icicle Creek in addition to Peshastin Creek. Greg (WWT) is assisting by looking into examples from Oregon on the use of hydropower.

Outreach

Mike and Melissa discussed that a Seattle area meeting is being planned for June. The exact date has not been set yet but will be soon based on availability of IWG members who would like to participate and meeting room availability. The focus of the meeting will be to share the Preferred Alternative and make it clear that the other alternatives are not being pursued and to give project design updates. A meeting will also be held in Leavenworth in the fall to give the local community and update.

The original project handouts are being updated and will be circulated for input soon.

There have been several requests for Icicle tours with IWG member discussion/presentations. One is the Western States Water Council on July 16 as they are having their meeting in Leavenworth. The other is the Washington PUD Association that is holding a meeting in Leavenworth in September. Organizers will work with Co-Leads and other interested IWG members on tour details.

Icicle Design Overlay District (Chelan County Community Development)

Kirsten Larsen with Chelan County discussed the Icicle Design Overlay District which may apply to several projects within the Preferred Alternative. (this is located within Chelan County Code 11.72, <https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/ChelanCounty/>). The code calls out permitted uses. If a use is not called out, it is not allowed. This overlay district was adopted in the 1980s and it's not clear why it applies to alternating sections. Dan provided a map produced to show project locations and where the overlay district applies. Some projects are right on the line so it is difficult to know without looking more detailed at designs. Federal projects on federal land are not subject to local review. Kirsten suggests setting up a pre-application meeting for specific projects to discuss each project specifically. There is a form online to request a meeting. Questions were asked about the IPID screen and if the screen is in the canal, is it exempt? Also, need to work through the bridge. A meeting should be set up to look at the design. Community Development has determined that IPID is a utility, not agricultural use. There is no process for allowance of a use not identified. A change to the County Code would be needed which would take at least several months. It's important to note that there are people who support this code so we cannot assume what the outcome will be in the code change process.

Conservation Committee (Mike Kaputa)

The conservation committee met last month and participants had a productive and engaging discussion. Next steps are for Aspect to develop a 2-pager for each water user (IPID, County, City of Leavenworth, COIC) that will highlight what conservation work has been done so far and identify future work. These will be the basis for the detailed conservation strategy.

IPID Conservation/Efficiencies Completed Projects (Tony Jantzer)

Tony presented water conservation projects that have been completed by IPID over the last 20 years. Most of the projects were funded by IPID assessments (IPID raised rates by 10% in 2017). Other funding included WDOE, state infrastructure rehab grants, Ecology-OCR, and from a timber sale on IPID property. Some of the IPID infrastructure stats include:

- 4 Canals: Icicle, Peshastin, Tandy, and Gibbs
- Total combined length of canals 58 miles
- Total piped canal 15.4 (not including syphons)

- Total unlined ditch 3.2 miles
- Total partially lined ditch less than 6.7 miles
- Total piped syphons 5.6 miles

Work over the years included piping, replacing lining, replacing leaky wooden flumes, and more. As a result of this work, IPID will donate 7cfs to instream flow this year on a temporary donation. This a significant step towards their 10 cfs conservation goal to put towards permanent instream flow. IPID has been working hard to save water, however Tony noted that they (Board members) feel upset when comments are made by IWG members that they are not doing much and have criticism directed at IPID. Because IPID feels they have overall been harmed by this Icicle Strategy effort, they now feel that they need to focus on saving funds for some future lawsuit (regarding Eightmile Lake) and hold off on additional conservation work. Tony asks IWG members to consider the work IPID has accomplished. Several letters by IWG members have not been supportive of IPID. IPID would like to keep saving water and they must make improvements to the 100 year old infrastructure at the lakes.

Daryl pointed out that farmers have been making improvements on their water use as well. Most users on their district use low volume sprinklers.

Melissa pointed out that this 7 cfs temporary donation to instream flow is a big deal and a huge early action for the Icicle. We need to do some outreach on this.

Funding Coordination (Melissa Downes)

The legislature finished on time this year and passed the 2019-2021 budget with OCR well funded. It is likely that the Icicle Strategy will receive \$4 Million as requested. Next steps will be for the Steering Committee to work through how to spend that. This will be a topic at the next Steering Committee meeting. The earliest the funds will be available is July 1st, but it will likely be longer to get contracts in place.

IWG Meeting Schedule

The IWG decided to cancel the August 8th IWG meeting and re-schedule it for September 12th. The next IWG meeting will be **September 12th, 10:00-3:00 at the CTC** in Wenatchee.

Upcoming Steering Committee meetings will be on June 13th and July 11th.

Adjourn 3:00 PM