

Icicle Creek Work Group Meeting

Thursday July 9, 2015

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

Confluence Technology Center

---

MEETING SUMMARY

**Attendees:**

Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Tom Tebb, Ecology; Melissa Downes, Ecology; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Jason Kuiken, USFS; Gabrielle Snider, USFS; Dick Rieman, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Lisa Pelly, TU; Dave Irving, USFWS; Anthony Janzer, IPID; Daryl Harden, Orchardist/IPID; Mel Weythman, Orchardist/IPID; Charity Davidson, WDFW; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribes; Linda Jamison, Ecology; Steve Kolk, USBR; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Ericka Hegeman, CCNRD; Mike Kaputa, CCNRD; Jay Manning, Cascadia Law Group; Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; Keith Goehner, Chelan County; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth

**Introductions, Review Agenda**

**Update on Response to OCR**

Tom Tebb noted that CELP has not formally responded to the OCR funding letter. CELP Board plans to meet on July 16th to determine CELPs future role in the IWG. No response from WFC to date.

[IWG: No additional input](#)

**Operating Procedures – review of changes and vote to adopt amended version**

Lisa DW: comments received by several group members, revisions only made to the sections regarding funding expectations of the members and dispute resolution.

Revision #1 – Litigation

Harriet Bullitt provided a letter to Dick Riemen to present at the IWG. The letter will be distributed to the IWG after the meeting. The letter objects to removal of a litigant. Dick and Harriet Bullitt would prefer that all parties in litigation be removed.

[IWG: This revision was agreed upon, with the exception of dissent by Dick Riemen and Harriet Bullitt](#)

Revision #2 – Funding

TU raised that grant timing may prevent advance IWG review of grant proposals, but concepts would be shared prior to submittal of application (if necessary the information can be provided by email). Also, want to make sure that confidentiality is maintained as it is necessary for successful project implementation. The language is acceptable as long as IWG members agree

with flexibility in implementation. WDFW had a similar response, proposed to add “notice of an application”.

IGW: Agrees to revision with change in text regarding “notice of application.”

### Revision #3 – Outreach

Dale: first sentence of bullet beginning “Members shall work in a collaborative manner . . .” is missing a word. Propose “collaborate” instead of “in a collaborative manner”.

Tom: prefers to add a notice provision “The party will be notified via letter from the Steering Committee Chair”.

IWG: Agrees to revision with proposed changes

### Revision #4/5 – Working together and withdrawal

Lisa Pelly: who makes decision on out-of-bounds behavior? Jay: it should vest with Co-Chairs. Dale and Steve: prefer it to be with the IWG. There should be a high bar for this decision. Last bullet clarifies that the IWG makes this call.

Tony: suggests we begin approving previous meeting minutes.

Dale: can someone rejoin after removal if issue is resolved? IWG says yes.

IWG: Endorses the revised language.

### Revision #6 – Dispute resolution

Remove comma after Ecology, as it appears it is both Ecology and OCR. Lisa, suggests Jim with WDFW as third party. Steve concerned with WDFW since they may already have a position. Tony, change to “dispute party may request IWG select another party in lieu of WDFW”.

IWG: Dispute resolution process endorsed as revised.

USFS, request Jeff Rivera and Jason Kuiken as alternate.

Also, change CELP primary to Rachel Osborn.

Melissa Downes as alternate for Tom Tebb for OCR.

### **Dispute Resolution for CELP Initiated**

WDFW is third party on panel, unless CELP decides an alternate. If CELP objects to WDFW, then Chuck Brushwood will serve.

### **Base Package Development**

Three packages were presented: Charity (WDFW), Steve (YN), and Joel (Leavenworth)/Mike (Chelan Co.)

WDFW presented package. Tony and Dale, prefer project implementation be limited to Icicle basin. Geographic scope of projects within the WDFW package extends beyond the Icicle watershed.

Steve presented package that included a project list ordered by priority. Goal is to draw a line where guiding principles are met.

Tony: all proposed projects should be advanced into SEPA/NEPA. Steve, agree, put them on the table (Bumping Lake example). Charity, agree they can be put on the table, but context and phasing is a focus.

Dale: phasing is important with first phase limited to more palatable projects.

Lisa P: other projects can go outside of this process.

Jason (USFS): priority is to be a good neighbor, however, must obey laws and regulations. In 1990, USFS purchased land around Eightmile Lake. IPID holds rights and easements. USFS permission to increase lake size will require presidential signature. Restoration of Eightmile Lake is okay, as it can be restored to the Ordinary High Water Level (OHWL) of 4,671 feet from current height of 4,667 feet.

Tony: IWG just recommends projects going to environmental review as a package, not guaranteed to be built/funded/permited.

Lisa: there is enabling legislation in the Yakima Basin that provides some greater context.

Dale: needs consensus and support of all IWG members if we're going to make a package successful.

Joel and Mike presented a base package that includes nine projects and a possible tenth project (pump exchange). Jason: restoration to OHWL is within existing easement. Optimization is more difficult to answer at this point (does it require different structures or not). Dave: how does USFWS lakes work (easement or ownership)? Jason: hasn't looked at those lakes closely. Dave: needs plumbing replacement at the lakes (valves currently limit discharge to 50 cfs).

Ecology, Yakamas, Dick, Dale o.k. with base package before leaving (but Dale thinks Dryden Pump Exchange may not be best alternative).

After lunch, Dan provided a conservation presentation regarding the limitations of using conservation to supply water for new development versus relying on it for instream flow benefit only.

May need to increase fish screen costs and scope. Add reach benefits to the table. Greg, pump back for LNFH should be included. Dave, we've considered it, but it has impacts to the Tribal Fishery; it is also an issue due to NEPA timing. Dan, currently it's a 20 cfs performance standard. Can we remove "effluent" and just make pumpbacks more general? Leave for now, but can revisit after studies are done.

Charity: Add a project to row 2, add municipal conservation. Augment cost \$1 million? Check with Joel Walinsky and base on Water System Plan. NOTE: After the meeting, Joel described metering and piping upgrade opportunities and suggested that municipal conservation be added to the package as a \$2M level of effort.

General consensus around this as a draft Integrated Package. Water Supply Benefits pie chart, show 2 versions, one for drought and one for average year. Look at Yakima examples.

Share actual budget that was passed. Share what was requested.

### **Next Steering Committee:**

Date for next Steering Committee meeting will be set via doodle poll. Steering committee to take on recommendations for phasing and environmental review as next steps. Identify which projects go to scoping and which require additional feasibility work. Also discuss conservation messages.

### **Big Picture Questions to address at Steering Committee**

- How broad – Do we expand scope to confluence downstream or Icicle only? (Comment to allow SEPA/NEPA Environmental review evaluate broader consequences – and to focus actions in the Icicle. Track other projects with a paragraph writeup.)
- Factor Implementability into the package
- Phasing
- Project Footprint for environmental review

### **Outreach and Messaging – IWG notification opportunity**

No comments

### **Schedule**

Next IWG meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>, in Leavenworth. Try for ½ day and do field visit on other ½.

**Public Comment**

No comments