

Columbia River Policy Advisory Group July 26, 2012

Columbia River Treaty

Five people who have been working on Iteration One of the Columbia River Treaty discussions briefed the CRPAG. The panel members were: Tony Norris, BPA; Margie McGill, Corps of Engineers; Bill Tweit, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Jim Heffernan, Columbia River Inter-tribal Fish Commission; and Tom Karier, NW Power Planning Council. Bonneville and the Corps have sponsored an iterative set of reviews to determine if the CR Treaty can meet the future needs of the region or whether it needs to be changed, and if so, how. There will be three iterations to review sets of alternatives, with the alternatives becoming more refined over time. The first Iteration was recently completed. It assessed the current condition and compared it to two alternatives, a 450kcf alternative and a 600 kcf alternative. The initial assessment focused on flood risk management, ecosystem based functions, and hydropower.

The panelists described in detail the impacts of the alternatives on several central issues, including Canadian Entitlement, Effective Use, Called Upon Flood Control, and Peak Flows.

[Note: The PowerPoint presentation and handouts from Jim Heffernan have been sent along with these meeting notes. They will also be posted on Ecology's website. The PowerPoint presentation and additional detailed information is available at:

<http://www.crt2014-2024review.gov>]

CRPAG members and the audience posed these questions and comments:

- How will we know what Canada will do? That is, will they behave the way the model is designed? Do they agree with your scenarios? [Yes. They agree with the 35 scenarios that have been designed. They might opt for different choices among those scenarios than the U.S. would.]
- What is the value of the Canadian Entitlement? [In 2024 the estimated combined energy/capacity value is between \$229m and \$335m per year.]
- Did the model assume that they would put turbines in empty bays? [Yes.]
- Regarding Effective Use, is it a static definition? [In our model, we stayed with authorized storage only. We did not seek out additional storage from other reservoirs in the region.]
- Will you seek to optimize the scenarios regarding Effective Use? [We are looking at alternatives that test the boundaries of Effective Use; but we acknowledge that Effective Use is a basic Treaty requirement.]
- For Iteration Two, will you calculate an annual payment in advance? [We need to figure out how to get the money to Canada.]
- Under the current scenario, how many times have we asked for Called Upon Flood Control? [Zero.]
- Does the CoE have authority to go after storage in other reservoirs? [Yes. We prepared a paper in the fall of 2011 that details the Corps' authority on each project. Canada and the U.S. have very different views on which reservoirs are called into play in Effective Use.]
- Is there a sense of how these alternatives affect the Snake River reservoirs? [Yes. Those reservoirs are assessed in the 2011 paper.]

- How will the 600 kcfs alternative effect summer Chinook? [This alternative definitely gives us more water to work with. We must allow water to be released in the spring, but we have more ability to shape it. There will be different answers in wet and dry years.]
- Are your values for the Canadian Entitlement based on market rates? [No. They are based on projected markets forecast by the modelers.]
- There is an order of magnitude between the current and future alternative energy value. What percentage is this? [It is about 100MW less in 2024.]
- Do you plan to incorporate climate change in the modeling? [Yes, in Iteration Two for some of the alternatives.]
- Are there good climate change models for the Canadian headwaters? [We have done some preliminary work. The University of Washington has extensive information, with new data on Canada forthcoming.]
- Is there any indication that climate change will effect Called Upon? [The data set is vast and the data are not all in the same direction. Generally we will see warmer temperatures, wetter winters, more moisture in the northern headwaters, and dryer summers.]
- Will off-river consumptive use be factored into the alternatives? [Yes, in the water supply work group.]
- What is Canada doing? [Canada has sent representatives to all of the listening sessions. They are hosting similar sessions in Canada.]
- What are other northwest states doing? [Each state has a different subset of interests. For example, flood control is particularly important to Oregon; Montana is attentive to upriver reservoirs.][Oregon is also focused on water for consumptive agriculture use in the northeast Oregon.]
- I am concerned that we are getting spread too thin trying to cover all of the values. We need to seek the highest value and optimize that.
- What are you hearing at the listening sessions? [Similar questions to those being posed today. There is a lot of discussion about the Canadian Entitlement. Another big issue that has emerged is water supply as a fourth major priority for consideration.]
- How does this process relate to the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty? [The Boundary Waters Treaty birthed the Columbia River Treaty. If the Columbia River Treaty terminated, we would revert to the 1909 Treaty.]
- Early on it looked like only 4 major reservoirs would be affected. Is this still true? [For Iteration One we stayed within our current authorities. For Iteration Two we will look at other basins and sub basins to get as sense of benefits and impacts of a “synthetic reservoir.”]
- The Spokane Tribe has been flat-lined in terms of mitigation monies. Will you help us with additional resources? [We aren’t trying to fix what is broken. But if we have need of alternatives that would affect the Spokane Tribe, we need your assistance to assess the impact of our recommendations.]

Project Updates

Margie McGill of the CoE and Carl Marks of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation briefed the CRPAG on the status of the Walla Walla Pump Exchange Project. A major effort in the last year has been to look for opportunities to reduce the cost of the ecosystem restoration. Working from value engineering provided by CH2MHill, project proponents have dropped the price of some of the alternatives by as much as \$100m. The project is now anticipated to cost between \$200-300m, down from \$350-525m. A major consideration at this point for the federal government is how to secure waters that are freed up in Oregon and flow to Washington, to assure that those waters are not appropriated to other water users. The laws of the

two states make this quite challenging. To help protect the flows, the tribe ultimately determined that a negotiated settlement of its tribal water right was the best vehicle. Subsequent to this decision, there were two processes that needed to be completed: first, a documentation of the tribe's claim; and second, documenting a process in Washington State which makes the settlement enforceable. These two steps are intended to provide the federal government a "reasonable plan for flow protection." The parties hope to get these processes completed by the end of 2012.

- Is there a long-term monitoring plan? [Yes. The water budget is monitored and there will be physical monitoring in the field.]

Wendy Christensen of the Bureau of Reclamation briefed the CRPAG on progress on the Odessa Subarea Special Study. The Final EIS is expected to be issued at the end of August. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have been providing assistance on EIS and USFWS Coordination Act report activities. Engineering, Economics, and Special Study Reports are also being finalized. The Bureau has entered into informal Endangered Species Act consultation with NOAA and USFW. The Record of Decision is anticipated to be released in December 2012.

Columbia River Account Capital Budget Request

Derek Sandison from the Department of Ecology briefed the CRPAG on the status of the agency's capital budget request from the Columbia River Account. The current (2011-13) budget is about \$75m. Ecology will propose a budget of about \$70m in the 2013-15 biennium, including about \$10m in reappropriated monies. The department is currently vetting projects to identify: (1) projects which could be funded by other resources, (2) projects where stakeholders may not yet be ready, and (3) projects where benefits don't justify the costs.

Here is the current list under consideration:

- 9 mile/Goose Lake – appraisal level of 2 projects to determine if it makes sense to move to the feasibility stage.
- Odessa -- \$30-35m for construction to improve the conveyance of water.
- Irrigation conservation to free up to 30 kaf, \$6m.
- Odessa Well Drilling -- \$1.8m to monitor groundwater to assess aquifer health.
- WAC 508-14 mound of groundwater; \$2m for geo-technical studies to assess whether water could be used for new water rights.
- Sullivan Lake -- \$9m additional funding to complete the project.
- Kennewick Irrigation District Red Mountain – another \$5m for moving a pump station.
- Aquifer Storage and Recovery -- \$3.5m to assess projects in Kennewick, White Salmon, and Boise Cascade.
- New project proposals:
 - Horse Heavens Aquifer Storage, \$125K.
 - Spring Creek Storage Analysis, \$95K.
 - Wenatchee Integrated Plan, \$125K
 - Walla Walla Ecosystem Restoration, \$400K.
 - Spokane Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer, \$200K.
 - Icicle Creek Irrigation District, \$225K.
- Methow Valley Irrigation District Diversion, \$6.2m.
- Fifteen Irrigation Efficiency projects, \$7.2m.
- Water acquisition and leases, \$4m.
- Barkley Diversion Replacement in the Methow, \$750K.

- Gardena Irrigation District piping, \$15m.
- \$1m for staffing support for the Columbia River Office and project oversight.
- \$700K for WDFW project analysis.
- 2016 Supply and Demand Forecast, with new emphasis on groundwater.

CRPAG members and the audience posed these questions and observations:

- What is the status of the Odessa Special Studies? [The two projects will reach 70,000 acres by expanding the East Low Canal to its ultimate size through a series of pipelines. The irrigation users would establish a series of Local Improvement Districts for each lateral.]
- All of the Trout Unlimited projects have been vetted through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, with partial funding by BPA and the Bureau.
- After the proposed funds are spent, how much would remain from the initial \$200m authorization? [About \$49m.]
- Are the appraisal assessments on the Colville Reservation complete? [About 95% complete.]
- Will there be consultation with the CRPAG about the Colville Reservation projects? [Yes, following consultation with the Colville Tribe.]
- How much money has been spent on the Odessa Subarea projects to date? [About \$23m.]
- Representative Warnick, ranking member on the House Capital Budget Committee, observed that there is good support in the Legislature for the irrigation projects and especially the Odessa project; but to secure full support for the projects, we need a united front.
- The Columbia River Treaty discussions provide another opportunity to secure our water supply goals.

Yakima Integrated Plan

The Implementation Committee of the Yakima River Basin Integrated Plan then briefed the CRPAG on their efforts in 2012. The panel consisted of Urban Eberhart (alternate), Kittitas Irrigation District; Michael Garrity, American Rivers; Mike Leita, Yakima County; Tom Ring (alternate) Yakama Nation; and Derek Sandison, Ecology.

The panel made a wide set of observations, including:

- In the last 18 years, this is the most momentum we have ever had.
- One outcome of our meetings in Washington D.C. will be the establishment of a federal workgroup within the Department of Interior to work in close coordination with local interests from the Yakima Basin.
- We are seeking to use existing authorities for conservation, fish passage, and land purchase. We will exercise patience as we assess how quickly we seek to fund the Plan.
- American Rivers has been joined by a wide array of environmental and conservation organizations in support, including National Wildlife Federation, Forterra, Conservation Northwest, the Wilderness Society, and Trout Unlimited.
- The traditional method has been to look at singular projects. This plan seeks to maximize inter-reliability.
- Never before have we had a united coalition like we have seen in the Yakima River Basin. We had a unique experience in DC with the federal departments and Senators and Congressmen, because they had never seen a coalition like this committed to a common goal.

- Both Attorney General McKenna and Congressman Inslee have voiced strong support of the Plan.
- In a meeting with Interior Secretary Salazar last fall, the Governor Gregoire, Yakama Tribal Chair Smiskin, Senator Cantwell and Congressman Hastings, met with the workgroup with its wide spectrum of interests. Each of the parties expressed their commitment to work together to carry out the set of interests that they have in common. This is the most remarkable thing I have seen in my career in the Yakima Basin.
- The Bureau of Reclamation is a full partner in these efforts but cannot be on the Implementation Committee. The Governor and Legislature have been extraordinarily supportive, as has the Department of Interior. Congressman Hastings and Senator Cantwell will do the heavy lifting on funding.
- We must be careful not to lose the grass roots integrity of this effort.

CRPAG members and the audience had these questions and observations:

- Is there an expectation of new water rights? [The goal is to provide a guarantee of water use by junior water users during drought years, in addition to new municipal and industrial water rights. In total, the Plan would provide almost 500 kaf of storage and 170 kaf of conservation.]
- Is there a project acre-foot cost? [The cost analysis report will be issued in early September.]
- Cities need to be on board as well. Both Ellensburg and Cle Elum have passed resolutions in support of the Plan.

The meeting adjourned. The next CRPAG meeting is being rescheduled until mid-October.

Attendees:

CRPAG members and alternates:

- Jon Culp, Washington State Conservation Commission
- Michael Garrity, American Rivers
- Mike Leita, Yakima County Commission
- Ruben Ochoa, Oregon Water Resources Department
- Gary Passmore, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- Lisa Pelly, Trout Unlimited
- Rudy Plager, Adams County Commission
- Phil Rigdon, Yakama Nation
- Dave Sauter, Klickitat County
- Mike Schwisow, Columbia Basin Development League/WA Irrigation Districts
- Teresa Scott, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Warren Seyler, Spokane Tribe
- Craig Simpson, East Columbia Basin Irrigation District
- Richard Stevens, Grant County
- Leo Stewart, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation
- Rob Swedo, Bonneville Power Administration
- Stephanie Utter, Bureau of Reclamation

Others in attendance:

Neil Aaland, Washington State Association of Counties
Moroni Benally, University of Washington, Evans School
Tom Buchholtz, IRZ Consulting
Wendy Christensen, Bureau of Reclamation
Roscoe Curnukl
Marie Cobb, Intera
Jim Davenport, Davenport LLC
Mike Dixel, WA Department of Health
Rick Dinicola, U.S. Geological Survey
Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Irrigation District
Doug England, Chelan County Commission
John Foltz, Klickitat County
Jeff Gomes, City of Cashmere
Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting
Jim Heffernan, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Tom Helgeson, CH2MHill
Wally Henderson, ICF Jones & Stokes
Tim Hill, Department of Ecology
Al Josephy, Department of Ecology
Tom Karier, Northwest Power Planning Council
Chuck Klarich, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
Jonathan Kohr, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Paul La Riviere, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave McClure, Klickitat County
Jason McCormack, Washington Water Trust
Margie McGill, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Keith McGowan, Bureau of Reclamation
Chris Marks, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation
Carl Merkle, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation
Tony Norris, Bonneville Power Administration
Troy Peters, Washington State University
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation
Rick Roeder, Department of Natural Resources
Derek Sandison, Department of Ecology
Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County
Roy Savoian, Central Washington University
Cathy Schaeffer, Walla Walla Watershed Management Partnership
Bob Schmidt, City of Cashmere
Mark Schuppe, Department of Ecology
Dan Silver, facilitator
Paul Stoker, Groundwater Management Area
Steve Thurin, HDR Inc.
Terry Tolan, GSI Water Solutions
Bill Tweit, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Chris Voigt, WA State Potato Commission
Dawn Vyvyan, Yakama Indian Nation
Bill Wagoner, National Frozen Foods Coop
Representative Judy Warnick, House of Representatives, 13th District
Donald Weeks, Alpine Water District
Dawn Wiedmeier, Bureau of Reclamation
Charisse Willis, Stevens PUD

Bill Zachmann, Department of Ecology
Rebecca Zahler, Department of Ecology