

From: Graham, Andrew [<mailto:Andrew.Graham@hdrinc.com>]
Sent: Friday, November 05, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Paul Jewell; mike.leita@co.yakima.wa.us; Max Benitz; blover@ci.yakima.wa.us; Brown, Dave
Cc: Ben Floyd; Derek Sandison; Wendy Christensen; Underwood, Keith D.
Subject: FW: Proposal for allotting M&D supply

To: City and County representatives to YRBWEP Workgroup

I've been following up with Paul Jewell regarding his suggestion that new water intended for municipal and domestic needs be allotted, at least in part, to different sub-areas of the Yakima Basin. This would ensure the water would be there when they need it and not get used up by faster growth somewhere else in the Basin. This email suggests an approach, and Paul has told me he thinks it addresses the concern he had identified. **Please let me know if this looks satisfactory. If we could receive feedback by Tuesday, close of business, we could get this into the decision document Ben Floyd is preparing for the Workgroup.**

I've provided some data below from the technical memorandum we prepared on "Water Needs for Out-of-Stream Uses" (Draft, August 2010). The numbers show current population estimates for 2010 by County, and show the forecast population each decade to 2060 as developed for the Integrated Plan. Please note the Benton County number represents only residents located within the Yakima Basin. For Kittitas County, the numbers make the simplifying assumption that 100% of the County population resides within the Yakima Basin (not quite true, but pretty close).

	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Yakima County	256,000	303,000	343,000	379,000	419,000	462,000
Kittitas County	44,000	50,000	56,000	62,000	68,000	75,000
Benton Co. (w/in Basin)	26,000	32,000	39,000	43,000	47,000	53,000
Total	326,000	385,000	438,000	484,000	534,000	590,000

Taking the growth from 2010 to 2060 (264,000 additional people) by county, I get 10% of the new people in Benton Co. (27,000); 12% in Kittitas Co. (31,000) and 78% in Yakima Co. (206,000). I suggest this breakdown of population growth could be the basis for the allotment.

Here's the formula Paul and I have discussed: Take half of the water supply that is designated in the Integrated Plan for municipal and domestic uses. Allot that half using the percentages above. The other half would remain in an open pool that is not allotted. As growth occurs in the Basin over the years, Reclamation (as the presumptive agency managing this supply, if authorized by Congress) would track how much municipal/domestic supply was contracted to users in each county. In a given county, once the allotted portion was all contracted, Reclamation could begin issuing contracts from the unallotted pool. However at such time as a county's own allotment and the unallotted pool was used up, there would be no additional supply for users in that county from the new storage designated for municipal and domestic uses.

EXAMPLE

Here's an example: suppose the Workgroup recommends 50,000 acre-feet of supply for future growth in municipal/domestic uses, consistent with the water needs analysis. One-half of this or 25,000 AF would be allotted, leaving the other 25,000 unallotted. Using the percentages of new growth calculated above, contracts for the water would be distributed as follows.

Allotted to Benton Co. 10% of 25,000= 2,500 acre-feet.

Allotted to Kittitas Co. 12% of 25,000 = 3,000 acre-feet

Allotted to Yakima Co. 78% of 25,000 = 19,500 acre-feet

Unallotted Pool: 25,000 acre-feet (open to all three counties, first-come first-served, once their allotments are used up)

Basically what this does is "guarantee" that at least half the water that is forecast to be needed in each county will be reserved for users in that county. But it also preserves flexibility since I'm sure some of the growth will occur at different rates or in different places than currently forecast.

By the way, the 50,000 acre-foot total isn't written in stone. I chose to use the figure from the "medium" forecast, after adjusting for expected conservation and land-use conversion of farm lands (Table 36 of the technical memorandum). At least one Workgroup member has said that number may be too big; while others think it's not big enough.

If this approach looks satisfactory to you as the affected counties, I would ask Ben to circulate it to the rest of the Workgroup. Let us know what you think. - Andrew

Andrew Graham

HDR Engineering, Inc.

P.O. Box 976 | Olympia, WA | 98507-0976

Phone: 360-570-4409 | Fax: 360-570-7272

Email: Andrew.Graham@hdrinc.com

Notice: All email sent to this address will be received by the Kittitas County email system and may be subject to public disclosure under Chapter 42.56 RCW and to archiving and review.

message id: 38eb45916c6dcbdac24bb8719d004a14