

Icicle Creek Workshop 5
July 8, 2013, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm
Best Western Icicle Inn, Wedge Mtn. Room

Meeting Notes
(also see ppt)

1. Introductions, logistics
2. Dan summarized the previous work group meeting and staff assignments. He discussed modifications to the Integrated Project list. Staff prepared and presented sample two page project descriptions as requested by the Work Group. The Work Group agreed to the general style and level of information.
3. Mike provided updates regarding external communications related to the Icicle process. Updates included:
 - UC Salmon Recovery Board follow-up
 - US Forest Service
 - Env. Caucus (Seattle) follow-up
 - Growers and grower groups
 - Legislative caucus
 - Chelan-Douglas Land Trust, TPL, TWS (Lands Plan)
 - Cascadia Cons District (IEGP)
 - Economic development interests
 - Broader community
 - Others (Wenatchee integration)

General message: There is now a need for broader community outreach and stakeholder input into the Icicle process. Need to reach out to growers, people involved in the lands component, other. There was also discussion that there is a need for regular guidance for the staff group/project team.

Action item: Workgroup or SC to determine how to engage the greater community and generate an outreach strategy for implementation or SEPA.

4. Icicle Work Group Process – Letters of concern. CELP, WFC and IPID (Tony) submitted letters to the Work Group this month. Each organization summarized their concerns to the workgroup.

CELP Summary – Rachael Osborn

- Process concerns
- Concerns regarding decision making

- Concerns that the package won't solve all the flow issues. Supports WFC letter outlining these concerns.
- Don't understand the base package, what is it, what does it mean
- 8-Mile projects may be problematic. They need more information before they could support it.

Comments/Discussion from the group : How do we get to the base list, how do we manage decision making, Need to ID problem we are trying to solve, what is the purpose, need more information, data, understanding. Feel top down, try executive committee, decision making with sub-committees. Guiding Principles were an attempt to define these things, are they wrong?

WFC Summary – Kurt Beardslee

Concerns about low flows in autumn and winter (Oct – March).

- WFC has done an analysis to show concerns (distributed with letter at the meeting)
- Need to consider the timing of benefits.
- Request to resolve integration process (timing on hydrograph using projects)
- Request a plan from the Hatchery to address consumptive use
- Request to add clarity/specificity to the guiding principles
- Request to look at baseline hydrograph too

IPID Summary – Tony Jantzer

- IPID came to this process not wanting anything, but felt it was important they participate as a major diverter in the Icicle Watershed and that they could help solve some problems.
- Don't feel pumpback for IPID is the best solution for meeting Icicle water needs (hatchery pumpback makes more sense). A pump station does not solve any district issues. It is only for instream flow benefit.
- IPID's priority is Peshastin Creek, and IPID wants a pumpback project for improving instream flows for Peshastin Creek.
- IPID feels storage is the best option for Icicle Creek, most flexible, no O&M issues (unfortunately, haven't been able to find a storage option in the Peshastin).
- Don't want this process to negatively impact IPID's Peshastin Pump Exchange efforts.
- Peshastin –restoration/Icicle –enhancement. IPID priority is restoration
- Want to partner with Leavenworth to have help with funding and maintenance of the dam. Give Leavenworth up to 400 AF.
- 8-mile – IPID has no intention to go beyond historic storage.
- Feels threatened by public records request from workgroup member. (Rachel clarified that CELP made the request about IPID water rights)
- Most of the discussion focused on whether IPID (Tony) would continue to participate in this effort or not.
- Tony clarified storage:
 - 1200 acre-feet is current storage capacity

- 1827 acre-feet is historic use based on an engineer’s estimate. Flooding and ice damaged this storage capacity. IPID is planning repairs to bring storage back to this level.
- 2,000 acre-feet permitted level and land that was bought by the district from the state. This should not be within wilderness since it was purchased before wilderness act and this area becoming a wilderness area.
- 2,500 acre-feet adjudicated level Tony clarified what is important for him to continue participating at this table
 - If there is only one pump station – the Dryden location is preferred.
 - Does not want this process to interfere with the Peshastin Pump Exchange project and 20-cfs improvement to Peshastin Creek. That is their priority. IPID prefers one pump station location.
 - IPID will not take on any O&M costs beyond existing O&M expenses.
 - IPID expects the group to support their efforts to repair Eight-Mile Lake infrastructure to get storage back to the historic use level (1,827 acre-feet)

Work Group Discussion

Given the concerns about the process that were conveyed in the letters, the group stepped back, discussed goals of the group, the role of the workgroup and what it means for a project to be on the integrated project list and in the base package. General discussion included a request for ground rules that address keeping the discussion in the room, decision making process, good faith participation that is needs based (if you don’t have a need should you be at the table?), a process to address data requests, add clarity and specificity to the guiding principles, and that comments be constructive and not critical. There were requests for science to make informed decisions and a need to integrate the results of the recent ISF study. When asked what could keep him at the table, Tony’s requests included that they (IPID) would not be injured by participating. That they would not be challenged in their maintenance of 8-mile Lake and that they would not pay O&M costs associated with pumpback alternatives. Also that if the group sanctioned a pumpback scenario, that it would provide at least 20 cfs to Peshastin. Both Gus and Jay commented on how the regulatory requirements for restoring 8-mile Lake would provide for analysis of impacts and scrutiny.

Request for more data linking guiding principles to projects (provide copy of original spreadsheet with the details of the principles)

Action Item: Develop Ground Rules for Workgroup or Steering Committee and get agreement

Action item: Workgroup or SC to work on the guiding principles- add specificity, renewed clarity

Action Item: Continue to link principles to projects

Action Item: Add non-treaty harvest to Guiding Principles

Moving Forward

Committee Structure: Workgroup discussed a potential change in structure: from Work Group to Steering Committee and Subcommittees (similar to Yakima process and Wenatchee

Watershed Planning) where the Steering Committee provides guidance to the staff group, and is the decision making body and the Work Group functions in an advisory capacity. It was suggested, that where possible, existing committees could be used to form the basis for sub-committees. Dawn discussed the structure and participation in Yakima. Hatchery mentioned they are committed to staying at the table. There were several requests for ground rules for any group. Staff provided some examples of work group and steering committee functions within this construct. In summary, the group was positive about establishing a steering committee to provide regular guidance to the staff group/project team and serve in a decision making role.

A Steering Committee with approximately 8 participants including SEPA lead or co-leads was discussed. The work group suggested the following membership (individuals to be self selected (what does that mean...)). Greg suggested this consist of people that can make decisions or “kill a deal”.

Steering Committee

- SEPA co-lead Ecology (Could also represent other State interests)
- SEPA co-lead County (also represents Leavenworth)
- Tribe
- Federal – Hatchery/BOR/NOAA (select 1 or 2 to represent)
- Environmental – Fish/Water/Recreation (select 1 or 2 to represent)
- Irrigation District

Potential Sub-Committees (note, some may merge)

- Instream Flow
- Hatchery changes
- Pumpback/Storage options
- Outreach
- Lands

Action Item: Finalize self selection process for Steering Committee members and communicate to WG

Action Item: Formal buy-off on new structure – decision point

After lunch several individuals/entities offered support for the process and highlighted the importance of keeping IPID at the table.

LNFH – wants to stay positive and have constructive criticism. Wants to stay at the table. Tom Tebb supports the effort and has no intent to take any regulatory action. They have an obligation under permitting but DOE is here to collaborate. They see a win/win with Leavenworth. Jeff Rivera (USFS) noted this table may not lend to collaboration – it’s too big. USFS will support the process and stay involved as long as the process involves the USFS. City of Leavenworth supports IPID’s participation as they share a diversion location. The City will

support the collective effort as they clearly have an interest in securing water. WFC and Harriett noted support earlier for IPID's participation.

SEPA: The Work Group discussed the need for community outreach. The Work Group also discussed the need to develop evaluation criteria with which to evaluate projects on the project list. The group discussed commencing SEPA pre-scoping. Program level SEPA could provide the basis to initiate outreach and to evaluate the integrated project list. It was clarified that in the SEPA process, projects would be organized by the guiding principles, and that SEPA "would be about guiding principles and not projects". It was clarified that SEPA would evaluate ALL projects and not just projects in the base package. The group discussed SEPA process and a SEPA presentation was provided by staff. Examples of how projects would be addressed during SEPA scoping were provided.

In summary, there was support for the concept that outreach and stakeholder input, and project evaluation could be addressed via SEPA scoping. Several members felt SEPA scoping should wait for the results of more studies, and other members felt things were moving too slowly. Dawn encouraged the group to:

- a. Identify who is lead, or co-lead on SEPA
- b. Agree to what goes into SEPA pre-scoping and when it starts
- c. Be more specific for each of the guiding principles – build in clarity, examples
- d. Make a clear decision around SEPA scoping of the base package or all of the projects on the integrated project list.

Action Item: Clarify a, b, c and d above at the next meeting – get buyoff, decision points.

A meeting date of Tuesday, September 17 was set aside for either a work group meeting or a steering committee meeting if one is formed.

Next AGENDA

1. Groundrules to play at this table
2. Metrics around guiding principles – add clarity/specificity (use Dec meeting notes and table of guiding principles to start)
3. Agree to new Steering Committee with Subcommittees Construct
4. ID Steering Committee members
5. ID Subcommittees
6. Agree formally to Commencing SEPA pre-scoping (items a – d above)
7. Outreach plan