

Icicle Creek Work Group Meeting

Friday, March 6, 2015

10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Confluence Technology Center (Wenatchee)

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees:

Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Tony Jantzer, IPID; Dave Irving, USFWS; Bob Barwin, Ecology; Sage Park, Ecology; Dick Rieman, Icicle Watershed Council; Jeff Rivera, USFS; Sara White, USFS; Charity Davidson, WDFW; Jim Brown, WDFW; Stuart Woolley, USFS; Lisa Pelly, TU; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; Keith Goehner, Chelan County; Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Steve Kolk, USBR; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Susan Adams, WWT; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Dan Wilkinsen, COIC; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribe

I. Introductions, Review Agenda

II. WWT Funding Request for Cascade Orchard Irrigation Company Project Alternatives

- **Action Item:** \$35,000 of current OCR funding to go to WWT for this proposal
- **Decision:** IWG in favor of allocating \$35,000 of current OCR funding to WWT for this proposal

Greg from WWT gave an overview of the proposal that had been distributed to the group which involves evaluating a suite of options for COIC that would have instream flow benefits to Icicle Creek. The WWT and COIC are working under an MOA and Dan Wilkinsen said that working with WWT has been a positive experience. Timeframe for moving forward: RFP in March, field work in May/June (with current funding allocation). Public engagement work will occur later, in the fall, and will include: outreach, stakeholder processing on decision-making.

III. SEPA/NEPA Update

- Recommended approach and timeline
- SEPA Coordination
- NEPA Coordination

Presentation and discussion regarding the Programmatic SEPA, NEPA coordination and a recommended approach and timeline that was discussed by a SEPA/NEPA subcommittee in January. A three year project schedule was provided to IWG members. The programmatic SEPA process, including this schedule, is dependent on budget approval. If possible, scoping will include: identification of data gaps between July to September, comment period from September to October, and a programmatic EIS will be prepared in November. IWG continued discussion of the timing of a base package decision. Some members felt the base package should be addressed by the IWG in the short-term, others said to wait and let SEPA help to identify which projects fall off the list. Bob noted that from Ecology's perspective, the purpose of a programmatic approach is to decide if it's worth the investment to move forward. We cast a

wide net then get to the core set of projects that should move forward. That will help define what goes to USFS, etc.

Concern was raised regarding NEPA timeline. Ideally NEPA should be done in parallel with SEPA, however Jeff Rivera, USFS, stated that they will not have capacity to address the NEPA elements fully until 2017. Jeff also stated that if a project is on USFS land, USFS will need to do the NEPA. Dan reviewed three approaches to a Programmatic environmental review process that had been discussed by the subcommittee in January: 1) strong NEPA first followed by SEPA, 2) integrated SEPA/NEPA, and 3) strong SEPA followed by NEPA. The message we heard was that funding and capacity for NEPA was a ways out, so we're focused on #3 which will include a SEPA/NEPA integration step along the way. USFWS could be the Lead Agency for the Programmatic Approach and would develop cooperative agreements with other federal agencies (USFS, USBR). USFS is having their Office of General Counsel review the situation to ensure they have the authority to make decisions regarding the easements around the Alpine Lakes. They should get some feedback in the next three months. They want to get clear about what activities can occur in the easement. There was discussion about the USFS and IID working together more on the easements. A request was made to arrange a presentation to the IWG on how the easements work.

More discussion focused on the programmatic approach and the timing of project implementation. There's concern that some more difficult and time consuming projects may slow down others that are ready to go. The Steering Committee reviewed and edited a letter that would go to the federal agencies that would describe the process that we're discussing. It was suggested to add language defining the "purpose and need" which is consistent with the definition of the proposal. The letter will be finalized and sent out soon. The County and Ecology will work on a SEPA agreement soon.

Tony expressed concerns of IPID about the lack of O&M funding for pump exchange projects. IPID support for their pump exchange projects is contingent on O&M funding and IPID is unwilling to move into SEPA Scoping without a clear solution to the O&M issue. Tony and other IWG members discussed the pros and cons of having pump exchange projects on the list. Tony requested that pump exchanges be taken off the list of potential projects until there's resolution around the O&M funding issue. The scale of funding needed for O&M is much higher than what folks are used to. A letter will be sent to funders asking them to weigh in on their interest and eligibility of funding O&M. A work group may be convened to discuss this in more detail.

IV. Outreach Update

- **Seattle Conservation Meeting Update (2/17/15)**

Mike and other IWG members who attended the Seattle Conservation Meeting provided an update of the 2/17/15 meeting. An overview of all projects was presented at the meeting that then focused on projects within the Wilderness Area. Overall, those that participated felt that the meeting was informative. There were questions but not a lot of interaction. Folks will need time to review the information. Notes from the meeting will be finalized soon. Several follow-up letters have been sent out by participants in this meeting, which will be sent out to the IWG.

V. Genetic Population Structure of Rainbow Trout in Upper Icicle Creek (Nick Gayeski, Wild Fish Conservancy)

Nick's presentation and published paper are available.

Discussion and questions focused on the different populations identified and interactions among them, shorter duration of active feeding (likely 8-10 weeks), potential interactions and risks to genetic populations by opening up passage at the Boulder Field for steelhead. Jim noted that WDFW is evaluating data to make a reasoned decision on the policy issue of whether to support passage modifications at the Boulder Field. The IWG has not decided yet what passage means for that Guiding Principle. The IWG may need to take a closer look at that GP in terms of geography and defining that metric.

VI. Metric Development and Project Updates

- **Guiding Principle Table Review** – check in on metric development, identify gaps
- **Tribal Impacts Analysis**

IWG discussion on metrics and guiding principles. Some GPs have a strong metric development (eg., instream flows), and some do not. Question and discussion about passage and structures. How do we accommodate specific operational changes/structural changes/passage goals? How do we accommodate Tribal needs? Differing views on passage policy and structural changes (Structures 2 and 5) on the Icicle. WDFW is currently discussing passage policy and their position on the Icicle, upstream of the Hatchery. Jim and Charity will keep the IWG informed.

Steve Parker provided an overview of the Yakama Nation's Tribal Fishery and Scoping Issues for a Tribal Impact Analysis that is being developed, including Tribal catch data. The handout was provided. Yakama's are requesting that no harm be brought to their fishery ('Do No Harm'). Steve outlined primary reasons for diminished catch and data gaps as follows: (1) Hatchery ladder operation, (2) Flow Management in the Natural Channel, and (3) Fisheries enhancements including access to and facilities associated with the fishery. It was determined that the Tribe should work directly with the USFWS on item (1), but that items (2) and (3) were relevant to the IWG. Work with the IWG will include topics such as access to the natural channel, flow from the hatchery channel, changes at Structures 2 and 5, and consequences from sediment movement and additional flow on Tribal fisheries. Chuck said the Colville Tribe has similar concerns and are currently gathering information. Steve from BOR asked if the Tribal fishery could be improved in another location in the Usual and Accustomed Fishing area that is more productive to the Tribe. Steve Parker thought that catch per unit of effort is a metric for the tribal members. Preference is to restore and maintain the current fishery.

There was significant discussion around the Tribal fishery and the effects of operations of the structures and the hatchery ladder. Dale asked if the USFWS could pull ladders more frequently, consider changes in hatchery practices. Steve Parker summarized that he felt diminished Tribal catch is due to the fact that, now, fish come into the ladder more, less water goes over the spillway, and Structure 5 is totally open and Structure 2 is open more. All of these issues imply additional studies for SEPA. Steve talked about an attempt to find middle ground, somewhere between no water in the natural channel and all water in the natural channel. Would like to find a solution with some flows flowing over the spillway during the tribal fishery and the possibility of pickets on Structure 5.

NOAA Fisheries will issue a Draft BiOp internally mid-April, then sometime after that it will be shared. Flow options will be included in the BiOp and Steve requested that the Yakama Tribe see the results. If there is enough energy/flow into plunge pool, may not be a sediment model need.

Discussion regarding the placeholder for a sediment transport evaluation. Aspect/Anchor is preparing a summary of Hatchery Alternatives and they will add an evaluation of scour/flow over the spillway to determine whether a sediment study will be necessary for different scenarios. The Tribal Fishery Impact Analysis will continue to be developed based on this information.

- **Domestic Water Use**

The domestic use numbers were based on broad estimates from two years ago and need to be updated. The report back from Wenatchee Water Work Group on municipal and domestic needs was reviewed by Dan and are shown in the table below (end of document). If the instream flow rule is not fixed by current proposed legislation, the group may consider needs downstream of the Icicle. The amount of water needed to meet the domestic/municipal demand is small compared to the instream flow goals, however the type and timing of the water makes it more difficult to meet.

VII. **Project Updates and Next Steps**

- Finalization of Appraisal Reports – comments received will be compiled and considered for SEPA Scoping.
- LNFH Memo on structures is being developed that will summarize alternatives, historic information and will now also include the evaluation of spillway flows.
- LNFH Groundwater Investigations-Geophysical results, next steps and funding coordination. Dan summarized the geophysical results based on the evaluation from Hatchery Island and the Chelan County parcel northwest of the Hatchery. The best option is on the island as a groundwater collector system. Next steps will be funded by USFWS including assessing Well #10 and completing test pits on hatchery island. A funding request to PRCC is awaiting a response to fund the remaining tasks of the groundwater investigations which will finalize the Action Plan.
- Pump Station O&M Options – Tony reiterated his request to take all Icicle-only pump exchange projects off the list of consideration until a response from potential O&M funders looks promising.

VIII. **Next Steps**

- Steering Committee meeting in April or early May
- IWG meeting in late May
- Doodle Poll forthcoming for both.

IX. **Parking**

The following items have been continual points of discussion for the IWG:

- “Project footprint”/”Program footprint”: Icicle only or including confluence with Wenatchee (or prioritize Icicle over other)?
- Project implementation – Do we have to wait for the full package to put water instream?

- When do projects drop off the list?
- Passage Policy/position (follow-up with DFW).

	Existing Need (acre-feet)	Future Need to 2050 (acre-feet)	Total Need (acre-feet)	Notes
Exempt Wells, Icicle Basin	10	70	80	4.7 homes/year (Watershed Plan)
City of Leavenworth	800	900	1700	Based on Water System Plan
Total Volume Required	810	970	1780	2.5 to 5 cfs (average vs. peak)

	Reserve Quantity (cfs)	Annual Quantity Based on Constant Demand (acre-feet)	Annual Quantity Based on September CU Equivalent (acre-feet)	Notes
Icicle Reserve	0.5	400	500	Assumes mitigation in Icicle only
Wenatchee Reserve, Downstream of Icicle	2.5	1800	2300	Assumes mitigation in Icicle and lower Wenatchee
Total Volume Required		2200	2800	4 cfs to 7 cfs (average vs. peak)