

Contact: Wendy Christensen, Columbia-Cascades Area Office, (509) 575-5848, ext. 203
Derek Sandison, Washington State Department of Ecology, (509) 457-7120

Meeting Notes

August 25, 2010

Yakima Arboretum, Yakima WA

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (YRBWEP) 2010 Workgroup

Opening Comments

After introductions and an overview of the meeting agenda, Wendy Christensen (Reclamation) informed the Workgroup that Reclamation has awarded grants to support two more basin studies in the Pacific Northwest--the Deschutes River in Oregon and Henry's Fork of the Snake River in Idaho. She also reminded the Workgroup that the Integrated Plan under development is the product of the Workgroup; Reclamation, Ecology, and the consultant team provide support and tools to enable the Workgroup to develop the plan. Full Workgroup support for the Integrated Plan will be needed to request and effectively compete for the resources at the state and federal level to implement the plan.

The Workgroup welcomed Paul Jewell, Kittitas County Commissioner, who is replacing Mark McClain as the county's Workgroup representative.

Review of Previous Meeting Notes

There were no comments on the July 28 Workgroup meeting notes. Ben Floyd had received an email from one individual with a minor editing change and attendance adjustment. Be sure to sign the sign-in sheet for the meeting.

Out-of-Stream Water Needs Recommendation by Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA

Bob presented the Out-of-Stream Needs Subcommittee recommendation to the Workgroup. Workgroup action on the needs characterized in the one-page summary included in the meeting packet is scheduled for the September meeting. (*For this one-page summary and additional information on other topics discussed at the August meeting, see <http://www.usbr.gov/pn/programs/yrbwep/2010workgroup/meetings/index.html> .*)

The following items were discussed:

- Hydrologic modeling will test how the projects in the Integrated Plan will meet the instream and out-of-stream needs.
- Will the need be characterized as a single value or as a range? Municipal demands are presented as a range, based upon different population growth forecasts (low, medium, and high growth). A range may also be applicable for agricultural needs. Climate conditions, changing crop needs,



and water year type will affect the water requirement for a given year. The proratable irrigation districts have identified their targeted need as 70 percent of their current water right entitlement.

- When will the final demand number be provided to the Workgroup? Demand information is scheduled for presentation at the September meeting, including future agricultural needs and potential climate change impacts. Further needs refinement will likely continue beyond September. The subcommittee has focused on current needs because they are not currently being met during drought conditions.
- How does economic analysis fit in, particularly in considering willingness of basin users to contribute (cost-share)? Economic analysis findings will be available in the next month or so. Economic, hydrologic, and aquatic habitat effects and benefits, and project cost information will be provided to the Workgroup over the next two or three meetings. This information will help facilitate the cost-sharing discussion.
- Cost-sharing is based upon a Reclamation process that involves analysis for repayment by each irrigation district based upon ability to pay.
- The Workgroup still needs to have a conversation about allocating new water supply from projects identified in the Integrated Plan.
- NMFS would like to know how much of the need is dedicated to landscape irrigation as agricultural lands are converted to residential development. Basin interests will have a difficult time justifying the multi-billion-dollar price tag of the Integrated Plan if some of the water is going to support large lawns in the desert. The Out-of-Stream Needs Subcommittee has been discussing this topic and is making some progress (see the Municipal and Domestic Water Conservation Proposed Actions handout at the internet site listed above for additional detail). Water marketing should also help.
- Conservation is targeted at both irrigation districts and individual water users.
- Need to change the culture regarding landscape irrigation through education. Will take some time to affect change.
- When implemented, the Integrated Plan will improve the water supply for the basin, including savings in groundwater usage. Non-Federal irrigators with post-1905 water rights will have enhanced water supply. Need a mechanism to include them in cost-sharing for plan implementation.

Agricultural and Municipal Conservation Recommendation by *Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA*

Bob presented the Out-of-Stream Needs Subcommittee agricultural and municipal conservation recommendation to the Workgroup. The following items were discussed:

- How will conservation affect irrigation districts in the Lower Yakima? Conservation is not expected to affect supply for these districts; modeling will provide more detailed information.
- Does agricultural conservation apply to all districts? Yes, it is a programmatic approach with the \$375-million cost-estimate based on a list of conservation projects presented at the July Workgroup meeting. However, the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) will review and recommend projects for funding under the proposed conservation program for the Integrated Plan. Is \$375 million a final number? No. It is an estimate, and will be re-visited by the

Workgroup along with the rest of the Integrated Plan project or program budgets when the Integrated Plan is finalized. Conservation benefits are reach-specific. The 175,000 AF in conservation savings is based on average flows and are currently being modeled. It is important to note that water conservation will not achieve major supply benefits.

- Over time, conservation should reduce the gap in drought years and instream flows should benefit.
- Changing paradigms on landscape irrigation water use and conservation may take a couple generations to be realized.
- Reclamation does not have authority to provide municipal supply and conservation in the Yakima Basin. The Workgroup needs to be clear on what Reclamation is being asked to support regarding municipal and domestic conservation. Land use planning is outside the purview of the Workgroup. Workgroup focus should remain on implementation of conservation best management practices for all water users. (The Washington State Growth Management Act covers how lands convert from agriculture to residential development.)
- The Workgroup needs to better define the consensus decision-making process. Counties will need information in advance before being able to make a decision. Need clear, cogent statement on the decision to be made by the Workgroup. No decisions will be made at this August meeting; actions will be scheduled for September and action items will be sent out in advance. The Out-of-Stream Needs Subcommittee recommendations for Agricultural and Municipal and Domestic Conservation actions will be sent out to the Workgroup for review and comment.

Columbia River Pump/Yakima Storage by Stan Schweissing, HDR

Stan presented the background information on past studies and alternatives considered. He identified several different configurations that could be considered. He characterized the elements of a feasibility study and presented a feasibility study scope of work outline. The study would be a multi-year and multi-million-dollar effort. The following items were discussed:

- An important consideration is securing approval and configuring how a pipeline would cross the Yakima Firing Center Lands. The northern boundary on the powerpoint slide needs to be corrected to show the most current Firing Center boundary along I-90.
- The Yakama Nation remains opposed to pumping from the Columbia River; stay focused on in-basin opportunities.
- Why include this in the Integrated Plan when the Yakama Nation is opposed to it? The Preliminary Integrated Plan approved by the Workgroup included conducting a Columbia River Pump Exchange feasibility study, noting that including this action made some Workgroup members less supportive of the package.
- Can recreation be included in the feasibility study scope as a consideration? A feasibility study would include evaluation of recreation and other ancillary benefits or impacts.
- Reclamation will need a cost-share partner for the feasibility study.

Workgroup Discussion – Feedback and Support for Integrated Plan Development

Each Workgroup member was asked to provide feedback on the Integrated Plan information they had seen to date, including any issues that they felt were not adequately addressed. Workgroup comments:

- Charlie de la Chappelle – Will a Columbia River water supply action be included in the scorecard? This is not being included at this time.
- Max Benitz – Still looking for better definition of needs. The Reclamation/Ecology response to the Counties’ letter sent earlier in the year was inadequate. Need instream flow numbers and want to know how the groundwater issues will be addressed through the plan.
- Jeff Thomas – Has concerns about the schedule and whether there is enough time to do a good job on the plan. The basin interests will be asking for a lot of money and need to be sure this request is built on a solid foundation. Sage grouse habitat mitigation needs to be addressed as part of the Wymer project. This should also include a cumulative impacts analysis that considers other land uses such as wind turbines and possible Columbia River projects impacting sage grouse habitat.
- Urban Eberhardt – KRD supports Wymer and he is confident winter operational issues that would involve using the KRD system to convey water to Wymer can be worked out. The Workgroup needs to get an Integrated Plan approved. KRD is focused on in-basin solutions.
- Dave Fast – Also has concerns about schedule; members need to get information in advance of the meetings. Worried we may be running out of time to run model and make adjustments. Worried there will not be adequate information available in time to support negotiations and keep on schedule.
- Scott Revell – Keep “plowing ahead.”
- Phil Rigdon – Need more answers regarding the plan. Concerned with the Counties’ letter. Yakama Nation does not support Columbia River transfer. Concerned with how much time this topic continues to receive. The priority should be on making sure in-basin opportunities are studied before moving forward with a Columbia River exchange feasibility study. July and August are not the only months that Columbia River water would not be available. Other months have issues as well.
- Kirk Cook (attending on behalf of Tom Davis) – He supports increasing current storage and is concerned about conservation measure effects on groundwater conditions. Looking forward to seeing climate change information.
- Michael Garrity – Keeping everyone at the table and concentrate on the areas of agreement is the best way to move forward for fish and supply. Things will get more complicated but finalizing the plan is doable. Build some flexibility in the schedule. Encouraged by Kachess inactive storage potential. Could provide a lot of water for the cost. If the Workgroup desires environmental community support, this project needs to be implemented soon in order to integrate with I-90 mitigation opportunities and environmental group interests. Need more information on impacts and instream flow needs. Consider having an independent review performed by a group such as the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) to secure validation for the plan. Mitigation should improve conditions.
- Dale Bambrick – Good process so far. Need time to discuss how new water will be allocated. Integrated Plan will be hard to fund and easy to kill. Members need to put aside pet projects.

- Ron VanGundy – Others have expressed his concerns. Engineering information still needed. Explain linkages among projects. Stay focused on plan elements and key issues. Roza Board focused on in-basin opportunities for now.
- Dawn Wiedmeier – Agrees with what Ron and others have said.
- Rick Dieker – Focus on in-basin solutions.
- Paul Jewell – Still learning.
- John Easterbrooks – Address mitigation for Wymer and other projects. Strengthen bull trout mitigation plan. Real projects need to be included. Habitat Subcommittee should spend some time discussing mitigation.
- Wendy Christensen – Hydrologic and other modeling will support the Workgroup decision process but not make the decision for the Workgroup. At some point, the information has to be “good enough” to move forward.
- Jerry Kelso – The Counties’ letter includes a statement on the middle of page 2 that says the Columbia River has to be included or you do not have an Integrated Plan. If this is not resolved, then time has been wasted and we have missed an opportunity.

Public Comments

The Workgroup meeting was opened for public comment. The following comments were received:

- The group needs to address how much new water supply is needed: 400,000 acre-feet or 800,000 acre-feet? Need more transparency on agreements among Yakama Nation, Ecology, and Roza Irrigation District. Can the Yakama Nation support its position on Columbia River?

Previous Studies Validation: Wapatox by Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA

Bob presented background information and the canal improvements summary, and described three alternatives including associated benefits and challenges. He identified recommendations for further evaluation and next steps. Workgroup comments:

- Naches-Selah Irrigation District (NSID) has another alternative that should be considered which has a lower operational cost.
- NSID Board open to pumping from Wapatox Canal. Energy costs are the main concern.
- Is canal lining a cheaper alternative to piping in some project areas?
- There may be an opportunity for power generation. Also consider summer operations only.
- Eliminating the NSID diversion will provide fish benefits.
- Consider pumping right below Wapatox screens using low head, lift-pump system.
- Consider split diversion with supplemental pumping plant at Wapatox. See CH2MHill 1997 Feasibility Study.
- Combine Alternatives 1 and 3 into a new Alternative 4. Bob will proceed with costing Alternative 4, which will include eliminating the NSID diversion the City of Yakima diversion and the Glead Ditch diversion.
- This project can be implemented within the existing program. Reclamation should move forward with this as a high priority regardless of the Integrated Plan.

Previous Studies Validation: Cle Elum 3-Foot Pool Raise by *Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA*

Bob presented a summary of this project, which would increase the maximum pool elevation at Cle Elum reservoir. Project would include acquisition of 56 acres of land and require protecting 8,300 feet of shoreline from erosion. He identified project challenges and next steps. Workgroup comments:

- Reclamation ownership is unclear. Pool may have been operated at the 2,243 elevation before the Teton Dam failure, which would be the new elevation with the proposed raise.
- For armoring, rip-rap would not be allowed by NMFS. Use bio-engineered solutions.
- Camp sites at the north end are primitive and cost impacts for inundation would be limited.
- Re-visit congressional purpose in authorization. Should be broadened to multi-use (in- and out-of-stream uses). This would also apply to Keechelus-to-Kachess pipeline which was authorized for irrigation only.
- Explain at a future meeting how this project would fit in with Wymer.

Previous Studies Validation: Kittitas Reclamation District Modifications by *Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA*

Bob presented the proposed modifications summary, which includes piping high-loss laterals in Main and South Branch canals, applying savings to Manastash and/or Taneum Creek users, and pumping to Manastash Creek. He identified water savings and next steps. Workgroup comments:

- Providing water to Big and Little Creeks not currently included, based upon feedback from Instream Flow Subcommittee. Reconsider, as there is available capacity to serve these users, and this would require a water transfer.
- Consider smaller pump station for Manastash, in the range of 7-8 cfs instead of 25 cfs. An 8-to-10-cfs flow improvement for Manastash is reasonable.
- Consider gravity feed to Manastash water users instead of pumping from Yakima River; also consider the potential for a re-regulation reservoir downstream to better manage spill fluctuations.

Yakima River Water Resources Characterization by *Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA*

Bob presented information on Yakima water resources. The Columbia River water resources characterization is still being developed. Workgroup comments:

- All efforts should be put into in-basin opportunities for now. Columbia River should be left on back-burner in case in-basin opportunities are not adequate.
- Districts are not receiving their entitlements.
- Are the water needs for idle lands on the Wapato Irrigation Project (WIP) reflected, i.e., are we planning for all lands included in legally irrigable entitlements compared with what is currently irrigated? The consultant team used the summary of the adjudication findings described in the Ecology Final EIS for the Integrated Water Resource Management Alternative (Ecology 2009), as the basis for characterizing water rights and requirements.

Hydrologic Modeling Results by *Steve Thurin, HDR*

Steve presented preliminary hydrology results. These results are in the ball park, but further refinement will occur. Workgroup comments:

- Change “non-structural scenario” to a better descriptive name. Some “structural” projects are included in this scenario.
- Need to better understand how new supply is being allocated to meet needs. Consultant will prepare a document identifying operating assumptions used for incorporating the projects in the model and applying their supply benefits.
- Characterize what happens to supply benefits if one or more of the projects are not included, i.e., if they stall out.
- Will there be any adjustment to flood control rule curves and carryover storage assumptions? Not planning to make any changes to these operating rules at this time.

At this point, Ben Floyd referred to a scenarios handout in the meeting packet that characterizes scenarios being analyzed for hydrology, economics, habitat and climate change. There are two primary scenarios – (A) Future without Integrated Plan (no-action) and (B) Integrated Plan. Other partial scenarios, such as nonstructural, will also be analyzed for illustrative purposes. The climate change scenario will include a least effect, most effect, and median effect for the year 2040, based upon Reclamation climate change modeling. Workgroup comments:

- Will a stochastic modeling approach be used for climate change? This is not part of the current approach.
- Regarding water supply demand updates affected by climate change--the State will be performing 5-year rolling updates to reflect any changes in physical conditions, population trends, or other potential effects.

Groundwater Infiltration Update by Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA

Ben informed the group that Bob Anderson with Golder Associates will present results on this action at the September meeting. Two pilot areas are being targeted: Lower Kittitas Valley and WIP service area. Workgroup comments:

- Be sure to consult with Urban at KRD as he has some ideas on opportunity areas for infiltration. Bob Anderson will follow up with Urban on this.
- Infiltration water would come from pre-storage control supplies. This action would not take water from other projects or impact ecosystem needs.

Meeting Wrap-up

Ben noted that Reclamation received comments on the benefits matrix from Larry Vinsonhaler. Wendy pointed out that many of his suggestions will be addressed through more detailed tables that will support the summary comparative benefits matrix.

A conference call is planned for Monday, August 30, with NMFS, BPA, Reclamation, and the Yakama Nation to discuss how to scope Columbia River water availability analysis for the Columbia River Pump Exchange/Yakima Storage Feasibility Study scope to be included in the Integrated Plan.

Ben gave an overview of topics that will be presented at the next meeting.

Workgroup Members in Attendance

Dale Bambrick, NMFS
Max Benitz, Benton County Commissioner
Dave Brown, City of Yakima
Kirk Cook, Washington Department of Agriculture
Scott Revell, Kennewick Irrigation District
Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Reclamation District
Rick Dieker, Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District
David Fast, Yakama Nation – Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project
Michael Garrity, American Rivers
Joel Freudenthal, Yakima County Commissioner
Charlie de La Chappelle, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
Phil Rigdon, Yakama Nation – Natural Resources
Derek Sandison, Washington Department of Ecology
John Easterbrooks, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jeff Thomas, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Ron VanGundy, Roza Irrigation District
Dawn Wiedmeier, Bureau of Reclamation

Other Attendees

Melissa Bates, Aqua Permanente
David Bowen, American Forest Land Co.
Tom Carpenter, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
David Child, Yakima Basin Joint Board
Wendy Christensen, Bureau of Reclamation
Joe Cook, University of Washington
Stuart Crane, Yakama Nation
Adam Fyall, Benton County
Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA
Chuck Garner, Reclamation
Don Gatchalian, Yakima County
Sean Gross, NMFS
Bob Hall, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance/Yakima Auto Dealers
Justin Harter, Naches-Selah Irrigation District
Ken Hasbrouck, Kittitas Reclamation District
Elizabeth Heether, Bureau of Reclamation
Joel Hubble, Bureau of Reclamation
Eleanor Hungate
Jerry Kelso, Consultant to Bureau of Reclamation
Edwin Lewis, Wapato Irrigation Project

Barb Lisk, Office of Representative Richard Hastings
Chris Lynch, Reclamation
Steven Malloch, National Wildlife Federation
Tina Mayo, US Forest Service
Tom Monroe, Roza Irrigation District
Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA
Brian Myre, Yakama Reservation Irrigation District,
Tom Myrum, Washington State Water Resources Association
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation
Ann Root, ESA Adolfson
Elaine Smith
Steve Thurin, HDR
Bob Tuck, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
Keith Underwood, HDR
William Woods

Next Workgroup Meeting

The next meeting will be held September 23 (Note: this is a change from what was announced at the last meeting) at the Arboretum. A meeting notice and agenda will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

Where to Find Workgroup Information

Meeting materials, notes, and presentations from the Workgroup meetings will be posted on the project website (<http://www.usbr.gov/pn/programs/yrbwep/index.html>). A bibliography of information sources, many of which are available online, is also posted on the website. If anyone needs help finding an information source, contact those listed at the top of page 1 or Ben Floyd at Anchor QEA, Richland office, (509) 392-4548, or bfloyd@anchorqea.com.