

Icicle Creek Work Group
September 16, 2014
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Confluence Technology Center

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Paul LaRiviere, WDFW; Jeremy Cram, WDFW; Gabrielle Snyder, USFS; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Bob Schmidt, City of Cashmere; Bob Barwin, Ecology-WRP; Jim Brown, WDFW; Dick Rieman, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Tom Tebb, Ecology-CRO; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribes; Anthony Jantzer, IID/PID; Dave Irving, USFWS; Patrick Enger, Reclamation; Steve Kolk, Reclamation; Greg Mclaughlin, Washington Water Trust; Rachael Osborn, CELP; Kurt Beardslee, WFC; Mark Hersh, WFC; Charity Davidson, WDFW; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth

Instream Flow Committee Update

Paul and Dan reviewed the process that the IFC has gone through over the last several months to come up with the following recommendations.

a) WDFW Fish Passage and Survival Assessment (Cram)

Jeremy Cram provided an overview of the assessment proposal that it will fill a data gap on the need for baseline information on the life history of bull trout and steelhead for Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. This effort will be coordinated with the IWG efforts to help leverage funding and support filling data gaps in SEPA. Funding will be coordinated through the OCR/WDFW Contract.

Action Item #1 Approved: Approve recommendation to support funding requests for WDFW Fish Passage and Survival Assessment

b) LNFH Historic Channel Flow Recommendation

Rob Richardson, USBR, provided a Rapid Geomorphic Assessment of the historic channel to assist the IFC with high flow recommendations given that current WUA values might change if higher flows run through the historic channel. Rob's report focuses on evaluating what would happen to the historic channel in three scenarios. Discussion by the IWG focused on the value of the habitat in the historic channel under current conditions and that some control (i.e. Structure 2 or something in its place if it were removed) would maintain current peak flows of 2,600 cfs. Some members would like to be able to consider bigger options in the future with regard to high flow habitat, so the original action item was modified to address that.

Action Item #2 Approved: Approve recommendation to maintain current peak flows not exceeding 2,600 cfs and essential functions in the historic channel during high flows at this time. Further study will refine this recommendation. Recommend augmenting low flows (see e below).

c) Additional high flow and low flow habitat

Action Item #3 Approved: Approve recommendation to explore opportunities for additional habitat during high flow events and refugia during low flow events in Icicle Creek. Further study will refine Action Item #2

d) Boulder Field Passage – discuss how this project interacts with overall Icicle Work Group efforts. Schedule TU presentation on the Boulder Field Assessment and Design. TU will provide a presentation on the Boulder Field project at the next IWG meeting.

e) Instream Flow Recommendation

Much discussion took place by the IWG on this recommendation. Some was focused on the biological basis of the suggested instream flow values and what the operational impacts might be as a result of them. Differences in opinion were stated on the overall purpose of this recommendation: whether it should be instream targets or whether it's an iterative process in selecting projects to evaluate what the habitat benefit is of those projects. We can show incremental improvements with projects which is a significant improvement over current conditions. Discussion also focused on the role of regulators - they are here and are participating but have a separate process. This process will inform the regulatory processes but will not determine their outcomes. The IWG came to agreement over the recommendation below that shows long-term goals and will rely on the SEPA process to show what it would take to achieve each instream flow value, what is achievable, and whether the targets need to be modified.

Action Item #4 Approved: Approve recommendation as stated below:

Projects should be developed that provide 60 cfs in drought years and 100 cfs during non-drought years in the historic channel. A long-term goal of 250 cfs is established for future project development. During SEPA review, these project flow targets will be re-evaluated as part of the alternatives analysis.

The discussion on the instream flow recommendations above took significantly longer than had been estimated on the original agenda. To make up time during the meeting, the next several agenda items were shortened. More details on these will be provided at the next IWG meeting.

Project Updates

a) LNFH Groundwater Action Plan – status and funding need

Next steps planned by the groundwater technical committee include investigating new well locations by first conducting a geophysical survey and then constructing a test well if needed. An assessment of existing Well No. 10 will be done to assess its current condition. The Bureau of Reclamation committed \$150,000 for this work and is currently contracting with CCNRD. An additional \$70,000 is needed for test wells. The Steering Committee discussed options to look into including PRCC and Tributary Committee.

b) LNFH Effluent Pump Back Update – this appraisal level cost estimate is on track to be completed by the end of the year.

c) Conservation Study Scope of Work – this work will be focused on the Irrigation districts (IID and COIC) and the City of Leavenworth. COIC has been talking about potential projects

with WWT and Chelan County and have indicated that they are interested and will participate more in this process.

Discussion focused on potential conservation projects at LNFH that are on the master project list, specifically the Water Re-Use pilot project. That pilot project was estimated at \$3.6 million. USFWS completed a report on doing pilot re-use at a number of hatcheries within this region. The pilot project would evaluate whether water would be saved, whether phosphorus inputs could be decreased, and whether it would work for fish. High costs have slowed progress on getting this done.

The IWG requested a presentation at the next meeting on existing circular tanks/re-use systems at other hatcheries, specifically Chelan PUD's eastbank facility. Steve Parker and Tom Tebb will follow up.

Action Item #5 Approved: Approve recommendation to give notice to proceed to complete the conservation study identified in the Technical Assistance task of the County/OCR contract for \$12,000.

- d) IPID Pump Exchange Alternatives – Anchor QEA is assisting Tony with property owner coordination and updating some cost estimates for the IPID Pump Exchange project at Dryden. A crosswalk between this study and TU's IID options study needs to be done and discussed the group.
- e) Eightmile Lake Restoration and Expansion Update – Some cost savings occurred due to the Gravity/Forsgren work at Eightmile. These savings could be used to collect similar data on Klonaqua Lake (see g below).
- f) Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation Feasibility Study – The radio/cell survey was completed and the results look good. There is possible communication at all the lakes.
- g) Klonaqua Lakes Data Collection – The proposal is collect bathymetry and topographic data at upper Klonaqua Lake in the same way that data was collected at Eightmile Lake. IPID has easements on both lakes. The fate of any additional water from any potential project here is undefined. The first step is data collection to determine if this is a possible tool. CELP has concerns about Wilderness impacts from any project here. Steve P pointed out that these are the kinds of tradeoffs the group would need to consider if we really want to get to the 250 cfs instream flow in Action Item #4 above. The IWG agreed it was okay to collect the data.

Action Item #6 Approved: Approve recommendation to conduct bathymetry and topographic surveys in Upper Klonaqua Lake and prepare a technical memo summarizing data and conceptual lake management options for further study. Funding amount of \$25,000 would be reallocated from Eightmile Lake savings (\$15,000) and Technical Support (\$10,000).

Project Schedules and Integrated Project List

Review project schedules and discuss a process to develop the final integrated project list. Options include this work be completed by the IWG Steering Committee or a new Project Review Subcommittee.

Action Item #7 Approved: The IWG determined the Steering Committee will develop the integrated project list options to be brought to the IWG.

Guiding Principle Metric Update – the IWG discussed the status of some metrics development (i.e. instream flow) and that there is a lack of metrics being developed for other GPs. Steve Parker noted that he would like the sediment transport study done. It was originally scoped but put on hold. Mike mentioned that out-of-stream uses metrics could be tasked to the IFC.

- a) Streamflow Metrics
- b) Sustainable Hatchery Metrics
- c) Tribal Metrics
- d) Municipal/Domestic Metrics
- e) Agricultural Reliability Metrics.
- f) Habitat Metrics.
- g) State/Federal Law Compliance.
- h) Non-Treaty Harvest Metrics
- i) Wilderness Act Metrics

Action Item #8 Approved: IWG to determine whether adequate projects are being evaluated and scientific questions being answered to meet the Guiding Principles. The IWG assigned the Steering Committee to evaluate these questions and report back to the full IWG.

SEPA/NEPA Workgroup

Action Item #9 Approved: Approve recommendation to form a SEPA Committee to develop a recommended framework for moving an Integrated Project List through SEPA and NEPA, including scoping, lead agencies, and coordination. Participants should include local (County, City), State (Ecology, WDFW) and Federal (USFWS, Reclamation, USFS) representation.

This group will have an initial meeting and report back to the IWG at the next meeting. This committee will develop a detailed timeline for SEPA scoping and EIS development.

Wild Fish Conservancy Notice of Intent to Sue LNFH

There was a full discussion on WFC's notice of intent to sue the LNFH. Kurt explained that WFC has been working for 15 years to make changes to hatchery operations that would bring LNFH into compliance with state and federal laws. There was concern from some IWG members about a member initiating litigation against another member at the same time as abiding by the IWG operating procedures that all members agreed to. Kurt indicated that he would like to continue participating in the IWG but is concerned that issues at the hatchery will not be addressed soon enough. If things are addressed by the IWG sooner than through the lawsuit, that's great, but WFC intends to pursue both paths. One of WFC's high priorities is on passage and screening. The discussion focused on what deficiencies might exist with the IWG process/project list that do not address WFC concerns. WFC wants a schedule and certainty that the issues will be addressed.

The IWG agreed that the Steering Committee will conduct a Crosswalk with the IWG Projects and the WFC lawsuit to see how they match up. The crosswalk will evaluate if there are gaps in what the IWG is doing that would address WFC issues, are there timeline issues, and if so is there something else the IWG should take on. The Steering Committee will look for opportunities to help with schedule and certainty.

Budget Updates NRCS opportunities may not be the most appropriate source for this type of project but it will be looked into. WDFW and NOAA wrote a joint letter to NRCS asking that this funding be able to be used for salmon restoration related work. TU applied for RCPP funding for the IID pump exchange project and stated that Derek Sandison committed to funding half of this project. The BOR WaterSmart application for the IWG process was not successful. CCNRD is contracting with BOR to support the groundwater investigations tasks and is looking to secure an additional \$70,000 for that.

Review IWG Meeting Schedule (All)

Steering Committee Meetings will be held on October 14, from 1:00-4:00 and on November 21, 10:00-4:00. The next Icicle Work Group meeting is on December 12th from 10:00-4:00.

Public Comment there were no public comments

3:00 Adjourn