

## **Icicle Creek Work Group**

### **Meeting and LNFH Tour**

**Tuesday, September 29, 2015 - 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

**Best Western Icicle Inn – Wedge Mountain Rm (Leavenworth) and**

**Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery**

---

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Attendees:**

Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental; Dick Rieman, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Harriet Bullitt, Icicle Creek Watershed Council; Mike Kaputa, Chelan County; Anthony Jantzer, IPID; Daryl Harnden, PID/Orchardist; Mel Weythman, IID/Orchardist; Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere; John Bangsund, City of Leavenworth; Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth; Steve Parker, Yakama Nation; Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County; Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting; Meghan O'Brien, Aspect Consulting; Tom Tebb, Ecology-OCR; Jay Manning, Cascadia Law Group; Dale Bambrick, NMFS; Chuck Brushwood, Colville Tribes; Greg McLaughlin, WWT; Dave Irving, USFWS-LNFH; Kate Terrell, USFWS; Susan Adams, WWT; Jim Brown, WDFW; Jason Kuiken, USFS; Gabe Snider, USFS; Melissa Downes, Ecology-OCR; Tim Hill, Ecology; Keith Goehner, Chelan County

#### **Introductions, Review Agenda**

[IWG Approved the July 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary](#)

A clarification was made that the dispute resolution process is no longer applicable since CELP left the IWG.

#### **Domestic and Municipal Water Conservation Efforts**

Joel Walinski gave a presentation on the City of Leavenworth's water production and distribution system.

- Discussion on whether the City could pull more from the wells along the Wenatchee River and less (or none) from the Icicle: This would be difficult. There are lines fed from the Icicle along the way (Icicle and E. Leavenworth Roads). The Icicle is gravity fed and cheaper than pumping wells. It's important for the City to have redundancy with a secondary site (in case of source failure). Some City residents notice a taste difference and prefer Icicle water. The Wenatchee reserve (instream flow rule) and water right dispute with Ecology are two important issues that need to be resolved.
- Since the mid 80s, the population has remained stable. The number of connections have increased (944 to 1063) and the number of ERU's have increased (currently 4,302 are available). ERU use has changed from 389 gpd in 2000 to 304 gpd in 2009. The use is 66% Commercial and 31% Residential.

- Conservation fixes have included pipe replacement on East Leavenworth Rd where leaks were detected. Meter replacement program (source, commercial) as well. Residential meter program replacement is still needed (\$750K). This would allow a change from providing readings 7 months / year to monthly year-round. This would be necessary for a conservation-based rate structure, customer awareness, and more real-time leak detection/correction. 2015 use decreased during drought (City reduction in open spaces, other large users also reduced, newsletters/outreach had an effect), data to be available at end of the year. 1,389 accounts, which limits rate base affordability for larger infrastructure projects. What about conservation at cemetery and golf course? Golf course has its own water rights, and has been becoming more efficient. City has thought about reduced use on the cemetery, but has customer service and weed propagation questions. The Water Distribution Plan and Water System Production Plans will be updated starting in 2016. Rates over time have increased due to capital costs.

#### Other Conservation Items Discussed

Cashmere has eliminated 90% of leaks, has replaced all meters, provides monthly billing / use information, and has a conservation-based rate. Peshastin Water District has a similar rate structure.

County has additional obligations under the reserve to track and incentivize conservation to ensure reserve quantities stretch as far as possible. County tracks uses debited against the reserve. The County would like to identify conservation projects as well.

While working on the reserve allocation in 2014, the County and City of Leavenworth signed a resolution to form a water conservation forum through the Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit. There are conservation based actions identified in the watershed plan that could be brought into this process. The County would like progress on the reserve and on conservation efforts as it brings more certainty for future growth. The County and Cities may attempt a legislative fix for the reserve and may be asking the IWG for a letter of support in the future.

IPID has done extensive piping programs recently, with a portion of that savings being allocated to trust in Peshastin Creek under an OCR grant. On-farm conservation has been robust, with conversion to high-efficiency microspray (however, micros need more maintenance and very clean water to minimize clogging).

The communication team should develop several one pager outreach documents on conservation. They should be focused on each sector (LNFH, irrigation, on farm, municipal, rural domestic)—what's been done so far, opportunities in the future. Describe reclaimed water challenges. Specific conservation projects should be included in the base package (some already are, but they may need to be expanded).

COIC: Preliminary findings being presented to board tomorrow, including seepage loss testing results, and pump alternatives. Options may also exist around xeriscaping.

#### **10:10 SEPA Scoping Discussion (Dan)**

- a. Launched upon approval of base package
- b. Strong SEPA with coordination with federal partners/NEPA
- c. Timeline

Reviewed process and timeline for SEPA. Tom recounted a recent meeting with Reclamation and USFWS at the LNFH Salmon Fest anniversary. Some uncertainty exists based on litigation. There was a pledge to coordinate funding at LNFH. Ecology will support this effort as long as Tom got a signal that the federal agencies will support actions at the LNFH. Tom took it as a positive sign that there is a State/Federal partnership in the works and is ready to share with the public through SEPA process. IWG needs to help lobby federal partners to ensure endorsement is apparent. At some point there will be an agreement between the state and federal partners on cost-share, etc. Tom needs the path forward – the IWG is ready and the discussion today is about how to move forward.

The alternatives analysis was recently completed for the LNFH and the decision was made that the hatchery will stay – funding will be provided to make upgrades and focus on conservation. The analysis includes a list of upgrades and the LNFH. USFWS/BOR will be looking for help prioritizing the list from the IWG. The tribes need to be involved in this process (not just review) – separate from IWG involvement as they have their own planning considerations.

There needs to be a commitment from the Bureau of Reclamation on the IWG.

### **10:30 Base Package**

- a. What does it mean to support a base package?

Okay to initiate Environmental Review.

Okay to support the Base Package of projects through feasibility studies.

Support the ability of the Base Package to meet all of the Guiding Principles.

General consensus on base package at IWG means we need to begin coordinating with official organization decision-making. Ecology and County adoption of a SEPA MOA will be one formal endorsement. Local governments could adopt by a resolution, that base package support is initiating SEPA/NEPA, review of alternatives, feasibility, public review and comment. WDFW supports. USFWS supports. Official comments will be used in SEPA to reflect support. WWT supports to next step. Yakamas - Steve doesn't see anything at this stage that will be problematic, but needs to do internal diligence. Colville will do the same. Think they can get this by the next meeting and will initiate the process. Cashmere and Leavenworth are on board at this point. IPID is on board – noting that support means active support in public – if issues arise they need to be discussed in this group. Dave is on board. USFS o.k. with moving to next steps. Dick on board with moving to next steps. A letter or resolution would be preferred to the co-conveners to document the endorsement (prepare a form letter for IWG members to use: initiate env review, support BP, support ability to meet GP's—2 attachments, GP's and BP).

All projects will need some sort of authorization or permits to be implemented. For Alpine Lakes projects, for example, the USFS will need more specific details to respond. That information will be provided during the next step – feasibility.

Changes to current Draft Base Package: Separate IPID and COIC into different rows.  
Change to domestic—no more municipal references, add county domestic coordination.

The IWG approved moving forward with the Base Package.

b. TU Request to remove Boulder Field Project

IPID wants Boulder Field Project to stay in base package and is the landowner – the project has an effect of flows and other projects. NOAA-Fisheries wants it in as well and has questions about current design. YN has concerns about impacts to fishery. City of Leavenworth has concerns about project impacts to its infrastructure. Commissioner Goehner expressed concerns about not working together and removing the project from base package which would eliminate the opportunity for these issues to be resolved within this process. Other members expressed a desire to keeping it in.

TU was not in attendance to discuss this in more detail. The decision is to retain Boulder Field Passage, but not opine on the specific Boulder Field Project by TU until opportunity for further discussion. Refer specifics of issue to the Steering Committee meeting.

Steve asked what the expectation is on how comments would be provided on the base package by IWG members? For example, there could be elements of a project that are problematic to the Tribe. The IWG discussed that members should bring questions/issues forth info to IWG first (no surprises). Try and articulate how projects can be implemented in a way to align with Guiding Principles. For example, support of passage but does not want any negative impacts to the tribal fishery.

**11:30 Outreach/Communications Strategy**

- a. Draft Outline
- b. Upcoming outreach opportunities (AWRA, Icicle Valley TU)

Work will continue on draft, Steering Committee will help refine.

Resurrect RTT presentation and see what needs to be updated.

**11:50 Other Items**

- a. New Steering Committee Chair: Jim Brown is the new Chair.
- b. Regular Monthly Meeting Date:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday for Icicle-related efforts. In the short-term, the next meetings are:

October 21<sup>st</sup> – Steering Committee from 9:30-11:30 in Wenatchee (CTC)  
No November meetings currently scheduled  
December 3<sup>rd</sup> – Icicle Work Group (CTC in Wenatchee)

**11:55 Public Comment** – there was none.

**12:05 Lunch** (provided)

**12:50 TRAVEL TO LNFH**

**1:00 Meet at Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery to begin Tour**