

ICICLE STRATEGY
Icicle Work Group Meeting
Conference Call (Teams)
Thursday, January 13, 1:00 – 3:30 PM
Meeting Summary

Members/Alternate Present: Kristin Bail, USFS; David Child, Reclamation; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Confederated Tribes; Cory Kamphaus, Yakama Nation; Jim Craig, USFWS; Christina Davis-Kernan, Reclamation; Jeff Dengel, WDFW; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Bill Gale, USFWS; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Brock Hoenes, WDFW; Levi Jantzer, IPID; Lisa Pelly, TU; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; John Sirois, Colville Confederated Tribes; Ryan Williams, CCD; Bob Bugert, Chelan County; Sharon Lunz, ICWC; Tim Walsh, COIC; Tony Jantzer, IPID; Carl Florea, City of Leavenworth; Tom Tebb, Ecology-OCR

Guests Present: David Ortman; Ingrid Ekstrom, Ecology-OCR; Mark Hersch; Lisa Adolfson, ESA; Kelli Scott, U.S. Representative Schrier's Office; Dick Fiddler, Sierra Club; Mat Maxey, USFWS

Staff/Consultants Present: Cynthia Carlstad, NHC; Peter Dykstra Plauche & Carr; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Dave Rice, Anchor QEA;

Welcome, Announcements

- USFS Kristin Bail is replacing Erik Walker on the IWG as the USFS member. Erica Taecker, new Wenatchee River District Ranger, is the new alternate.
- John Sirois will be the alternate for the Colville Tribes.

Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles

The presentation and discussion on mechanisms for protecting water for instream flow will take place at the April IWG to provide enough time for today's discussion and the instream flow protection discussion.

Metrics and Projects Status Review Against Guiding Principles.

Purpose of this topic is to gain a better collective understanding about the Guiding Principles, what they mean and the rationale that went into developing them. We will also check in on how we are doing in working toward meeting the GPs. Many of the original IWG members have left/retired since these were developed, so we'd like to hear from members who were here when GP developed. Newer members may not understand all that went into these and likely have questions. This is a chance to ask those questions.

Instream Flow GP

The instream flow subcommittee established these targets. What do members remember?

Jim – targets were derived from several factors. The Historic channel was selected as the target reach due to a lot of focus there – change of gradient, most impacted reach, recently completed PHABSIM work completed by USFWS that was the basis for targets.

Bill – historic channel is the most impacted reach as it's impacted by non-consumptive LNFH use as well as the consumptive uses by municipal and irrigation users. This reach has been a large focus for NMFS due to its unique habitat – high value for juvenile rearing for steelhead. There was a focus on maintaining/improving that habitat.

Sharon – hatchery reach has most room for improvement with prior management of diverting water through canal. Management has since changed.

Lisa – used term minimum indicating that we’re not done. We used the best data we had at the time.

Questions from newer members

Jeff Dengel – what were conversations about a holistic watershed approach? Broader scale of water beyond Icicle tributary?

Responses:

Jim – it was a natural fit to focus on that (historic channel) reach.

Tom – lawsuits at the time focused on this reach, Ecology’s 401, we focused holistically on the Icicle. We looked to the Wenatchee Watershed Plan for a holistic Wenatchee Watershed focus.

Tony – we knew that instream flow improvements would make the biggest difference in this reach. The assumption was any water added instream would make it to Wenatchee and stay instream. There are other needs in Icicle identified in Icicle Strategy.

Chuck - we focused on task at hand –which was the Icicle, but we recognize there are issues in other places (Mission Creek for example) that rely on other ongoing efforts.

Improve Sustainability of LNFH

What does this GP mean to IWG members?

Has anything changed in our ability to meet this GP?

Jim – these are still applicable. Nothing has changed.

Cory – these are straightforward, it does identify US v. Oregon, which is important.

Chuck – reflecting on original 2-day meeting to develop these. Focus on the Icicle Strategy is that not everyone will get what they want but should get what they need. Tribal harvest rights are not up for negotiation. Other GPs may have been up for negotiation. Both tribes identified these as being front and center as critically important.

Jim – correction to metrics: the second bullet says “at least...” 20 cfs. It should be “up to” and its non-consumptive only benefits reach.

Tribal and Non Tribal Fishery

Chuck – as things change, it’s imperative to ensure these rights are not impacted but also improve.

Cory – agree with Chuck. Strong coho returns are showing promise for multi-species opportunities so it is important that is included. The adaptive management plan is helpful to track what is happening and evaluate opportunities.

Bill – the intent was also to help maintain and not impact resident trout fishery upstream.

Tony – this is why IPID has offered expanded access for Tribes to fish upstream.

Municipal/Domestic Supply

Sharon – is unclear on where these quantities will come from. Would like to know if the quantities are still the same, especially for the City.

Cynthia – Good to know it is not clear where the quantities will come from; later in this discussion we will discuss that in more detail.

Carl – nothing has changed at this point. The Impetus for the City to be involved was the ongoing lawsuit with Ecology and the need to address that. We are committed to conservation ongoing. We are still comfortable with goals originally set.

Lisa Pelly – unclear where we will get this much water as a year-round water supply.

Cynthia – clarify that municipal/domestic is needed year-round unlike irrigation that is needed just during the irrigation season.

Mike – the County numbers are based on growth projections from OFM. Recent growth has been higher than predicted so it would be important to check in on those numbers again.

Agricultural Reliability

IPID's goal in participating was largely around restoring and improving O&M around the existing lakes based on public dollars in exchange for using some of their senior rights to meet instream flow and domestic guiding principles.

Sharon – regarding the interruptible water users on the Wenatchee River: What are guidelines for helping those users out?

Tony – currently there are users who are pro-rated even on average water years. There are minimum flows on the mainstem Wenatchee that drive this. If flows are improved this may occur less, IPID could potentially also service them from their canal.

Sharon – how does it get decided that these users are aided by IPID canal or by Wenatchee River?

Tony – if served by canal, served by consumptive use savings already being diverted.

Cory – it would be helpful to see how this all would work. Is there another group working on greater Wenatchee?

Jeff – this gets to the question of what is done with what water. A crosswalk to see what projects do what would be helpful. It's important to know the byproduct of all investments, outside Icicle.

Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat

Lisa – what is “offset project-related terrestrial impacts with land acquisition/easements”?

Mike – this may have come from WDFW (Dennis Beach) early in the process to address potential impacts from project implementation.

Jeff – recalls the land acquisition came from upper Wenatchee lands dialogue.

Brock – Curious what types of terrestrial impacts there would be that would need mitigation not already required by permits.

Dan – this was an opportunistic element by including some land protection. Also, it was getting at infrastructure projects that may have small land impacts, coupling this into the strategy.

Peter – Suggest we need to dig into the history here to understand the difference between mitigation required as part of a project vs. strategic land acquisition and that we are not mixing these. Show a distinction between voluntary vs regulatory.

Regulatory Compliance GP

Peter – would like to understand the history of why there is a call out of the Wilderness Act even though it's covered under reference to federal law?

Mike – there were ALPs and CELP participants at the time that requested a specific call out to the Wilderness Act.

Melissa – this was in response to comments that were received that we needed to highlight the wilderness aspects.

WATER LEDGER

Shows active water projects (varying stages of project development) and the water assignments (to instream flow or municipal/domestic benefit) as described in the PEIS and the reach where the instream flow benefit occurs. A discussion at the April IWG meeting will focus on how the water is protected, level of protection.

Questions/Discussion

Lisa – is most of this non-consumptive use?

Dan – it's a mix. LNFH is non-consumptive, storage would be consumptive. Each project is a different.

Tony – storage release is all consumptive. Conserved water will be a mix and we're working on defining that now.

Lisa – is this all permanent?

Dan – that is determined project by project. In many it is permanent.

Peter – this is a larger topic that we will discuss in April because we didn't have enough time today to cover all of this.

Cory – we should be careful not to look at LNFH water as an opportunity downstream as it is non-consumptive.

Jim – savings at hatchery has instream flow benefit above historic channel, into the reach above it.

Operating Procedures

Peter reviewed updates that were made to the operating procedures in Feb 2020 just before COVID.

These reflect the revised decision-making procedures that the group approved at that time. These updates were discussed again with the Steering Committee in December 2021 with no changes. Peter oriented the group to the document and provided an overview. The shift is focused on decision making and Consensus Decision Making Framework, which was developed by the group two years ago. After the framework on how decisions could be made there is a breakdown of the types of decisions, which defines routing administrative, major decisions and where decisions are made. Minor edits (clean-ups) were also made to describe expectations for IWG members.

Discussion/Questions/Edits Needed

Kristin – how do we define quorum?

Peter – 10 IWG members, this is located in the document in decision making procedures #1.

Jim – If no quorum, what happens? Is there an alternative process?

Peter – if no quorum, we wait until the next meeting.

Lisa – does this reference vote by email as an option?

Peter – that is not in here. Think about the different levels of decisions. Some are at the IWG level, some at the Steering Committee, or Co-conveners. We feel the level of major decisions at IWG level will be done in a two-meeting process.

Tony – we have made decisions via email, should we include language to that in here?

Peter – you would need to define what types of decisions could be made by email and what decisions would not need a two-meeting process?

Cynthia – previous email decisions have been nested within larger decisions previously made. For example, IWG authorized the Steering Committee to make some decisions which were then made via email.

Peter – level 2 types of decisions (routine or interim technical or process decisions) are the types of things that may be done via email. It doesn't feel like it needs to be written into these rules in order to do that.

Chuck – having the opportunity to hear other perspectives is very important so decisions are well informed. So, participation in meetings for decisions is very important.

Bill – Is consensus of all members present that make a quorum or do we need consensus of members not in attendance that need to be followed up with?

Cynthia – This process seeks to spread a major decision over two meetings to attempt to be inclusive if someone misses one meeting. If someone misses two meetings in a row, that might be a separate issue.

We could stipulate that facilitators could reach out to members that don't attend, but that would be our standard practice anyway. The Operating Procedures should reinforce that participation is important.

**Asking for 1st decision on these Operating Procedures with one edit changing CCT tribe alternative member. The 2nd decision (and final approval) will take place at the April meeting.
If anyone objects, say so now.**

IWG Approves Updated Operating Procedures for 1st the time. No objections, first approval as written.

Budget

At the October IWG meeting there was discussion on the best way to bring new projects to IWG. The Steering Committee recommends we try out a project summary sheet. For review is a new project summary sheet for the Alluvial Water Storage Project (AWS).

Tony – supports this project but wants it clear that this project could delay the effects of lake releases if more water goes into feeding the alluvial aquifer.

Mary Jo indicated that this question will be included in the monitoring design.

IWG confirmed approval of the AWS budget of \$176,500

Mary Jo will create a small project team (Cory and Bill) to review development of the monitoring plan and engage in design.

Other Project Updates, Upcoming Meeting Dates

Website – Mary Jo will advertise a request for qualifications to select a consultant to create the new website. If anyone would like to assist in this selection, please contact Mary Jo.

Dam Safety Assessments of Colchuck, Square and Klonauqua Lakes – we are expecting info by end of February.

Conservation Story Map – a small group met last month to review and provide edits. Aspect is revising the story map based on comments. The next step is for the Steering Committee to review then it will come to the IWG, hopefully, in April.

IPID Screen – Jeff gave an update on implementation timeline. Huge boulders took longer for Tony to work through this fall. The Yakima Screen Shop is working on fabrication of the screen. Tony will finish the concrete work this spring with installation planned to occur in Fall 2022.

Tony noted that many boulders were 20,000 lbs and bigger. Some at 80,000 lbs needed blasting. It was an enormous amount of work. The site prep is done, some concrete work is done, and he will finish the prep in spring.

Eightmile EIS – (Melissa) work continues on the draft EIS. Data gathering is taking longer. We are expecting a target for the draft EIS to be open for public comment in late spring.

COIC – (Greg) We have been working with Ecology and COIC on the water right change application and a path forward. We will know more in a couple weeks.

LNFH – (Jim) Reclamation is working on the final details on pRAS and will be transferring the asset from Reclamation to USFWS. A Commissioning ceremony is being planned. Hoping to move fish into tanks soon.

Intake and pipeline – Pipkin Construction was awarded the phase 1 contract. TEK Construction was awarded the pipeline contract. Work is expected to begin in April 2022.

Public Comment:

None

Upcoming Meeting Dates – in person meetings will not start up again yet. All meetings will continue to be remote.

Steering Committee – March 10, 2022

IWG Meeting – April 14, 2022