

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

Draft Meeting Notes

December 12, 2012

Yakima Arboretum, Yakima WA

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (YRBWEP) Workgroup

Welcome/Introductions and Agenda Overview *by Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA*

Ben Floyd, meeting facilitator, welcomed the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (YRBWEP) Workgroup members and public, led introductions, and provided an overview of the agenda. Wendy Christensen, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), introduced Clint Kyhl, U.S. Forest Service (USFS) representative on the Workgroup, to his first Workgroup meeting (Stuart Woolley has been attending as his alternate). Bob Hall, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance, attended in place of Sid Morrison. In addition, Ben announced that members of the Implementation Subcommittee would be presenting the Education and Outreach portion of the agenda on Mike Schwisow's behalf.

Ben noted that he would be leading a round table discussion at the end of the meeting, giving Workgroup members the opportunity to provide feedback on the Integrated Plan implementation activities and supplemental planning efforts, meetings and ongoing communications. The Workgroup was encouraged to provide feedback on the quality and timing of information exchanges, frequency of meetings, on the general progress of implementation, and other topics.

Framework for Implementation Report Update - Revisions *by Wendy Christensen, Reclamation*

Wendy provided an update on the Framework for Implementation Report. At the September 26, 2012, Workgroup meeting, Ernie Niemi and Ann Root presented an overview of the analysis conducted in the report. The report was updated based on the feedback received at the September meeting (available on the project website, posted with materials from the December meeting at <http://www.usbr.gov/pn/programs/yrbwep/2011integratedplan/2012meetings/index.html>). The report includes a summary of the "Four Accounts" analyses.

The updated analyses did not result in any changes to the overall outcomes of the report. Improved conditions are still anticipated under the "implementation" alternative in relation to the "no action" alternative. Wendy noted that modifications to the Environmental Quality (EQ) and Other Social Effects (OSE) accounts analyses were reflected in the final report. The EQ and OSE analyses were updated to reflect comments from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).



The updates were made by the same group of resource experts that had performed the original analyses, with consideration of the comments/discussion provided by resource agencies and others.

Applying these analyses framework to programmatic-level feasibility studies can be challenging. Feedback from the Workgroup has been helpful in completing these analyses.

Workgroup Comments

- John Easterbrooks – How is “sustainability” defined in the Framework for Implementation Report? *Sustainability benefits are intended to capture overall benefits of the integrated plan to water resource reliability and ecosystem resilience to climate change. The category is divided into two subcategories – improved water resource reliability and increased resistance of the ecosystem to climate change.*

NEPA ROD schedule by Wendy Christensen, Reclamation

Wendy provided an update on the schedule for the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), which is anticipated in January 2013.

Implementation Subcommittee Update by Implementation Subcommittee and Dan Silver, Consultant Dan Silver and the Implementation Subcommittee members/alternates (Mike Leita, Ron VanGundy, Derek Sandison, Michael Garrity, and Tom Ring) provided updates on the implementation process. The Subcommittee has been hard at work attending many meetings and briefings and providing presentations in efforts to build financial and political support to move implementation forward. A number of entities, including the Port of Grandview and the City of Sunnyside, plan to adopt resolutions supporting the Integrated Plan as a result of these efforts. It is important to maintain momentum.

In 2013, the Subcommittee will continue efforts to secure additional funding and support. The Subcommittee is mindful of the implementation schedule and the challenge of maintaining balance in funding among the seven plan elements, and regularly discusses how best to address these challenges as funding materializes from different sources.

A proposed State bill is currently being reviewed by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). The draft bill includes policy findings that the Integrated Plan objectives are in the public interest, and also includes measure to create a financial system for setting up funds, including taxable bonds (for use by private or federal entities) and non-taxable bonds (for grants) to help fund implementation. The bill does not specify funding for individual projects, but provides the funding to help enable the process to move forward.

The Subcommittee acknowledged Emily Washines’ (Yakama Nation) work in helping to publish the Opinion Editorial on the Integrated Plan in the Seattle Times (Celebrating and supporting the return of

the Cle Elum sockeye by Virgil Lewis, Yakama Nation Tribal Councilman), and also acknowledged the efforts of Cynthia Wilkerson with The Wilderness Society.

Ron VanGundy also noted a question he received from the public, along with the response he provided:

- How many new acre-feet of water that will be created under the Integrated Plan. *While this number varies from year to year; multiple studies indicate that pro-ratable supplies of water will be 70 percent under the Integrated Plan.*

Education and Outreach Update

Derek Sandison announced that the American Water Resources Association (AWRA) recognized the YRBWEP Workgroup with its Integrated Water Resources Management Award for 2012. At the AWRA's national meeting last month in Jacksonville, Florida, William Battaglin, AWRA president, presented the award to Derek Sandison, Robert Quint, Reclamation, and Andrew Graham, on behalf of the Workgroup. Workgroup members were presented with their personal copy of the plaque presented at the award ceremony. Congratulations to the Workgroup!

Targeted Watershed Protections and Enhancements – Update *by Michael Garrity, American Rivers*
Michael stated that the Workgroup's Watershed Lands Conservation Subcommittee will be reconvening soon to develop updated recommendations to the Workgroup on recreation goals. The Subcommittee will consider findings from a group of environmental and conservation organizations that have been meeting this fall and winter to further refine recreation goals. A final meeting of these organizations will be on January 14, 2013. A summary of recommendations for recreation goals will follow in a report to the Subcommittee and Workgroup. The Workgroup will likely reconvene the Watershed Lands Conservation Subcommittee in January to consider the findings from the environmental and conservation organizations, and provide the Workgroup with updated recommendations by early spring.

Kittitas County - Economic Impacts from Watershed Protections *by Paul Jewell, Kittitas County*
Paul provided a presentation on the Kittitas County analysis of land use and economic impacts resulting from the Targeted Watershed Protections and Enhancements element of the Integrated Plan. Kittitas County had some concerns with acquisition of private lands in Kittitas County for public use and the potential for disparity of project impacts within Kittitas County. Specifically, the County was concerned about how this might cause a shift in tax burdens, affect future land use and land management/ownership, and cause other long-term, potentially negative impacts to the County. Kittitas County convened a citizen advisory group (CAG) of 15 members to represent a broad cross section of Kittitas County and County staff. The impact analysis looked at two main components: land use and economic impacts.

The land use and economic analyses considered impacts on a per-action basis and were based on existing land use designation, zoning, and ownership.

For the economic analysis, impacts were organized for consideration by major category (i.e. forestry, agriculture, recreation, land development, county revenues and expenditures, etc.) and the results were presented under two scenarios: with public investment and without public investment. The economic analysis also considered development potential under a realistic likelihood outside of the zoning context.

The analysis predicts new service-related costs that would be unique to Kittitas County. The analysis also predicts that benefits to the urban areas would far outweigh the benefits to rural areas. The County identified some recommendations for mitigating revenue impact on the County, which included:

- Federal Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) – increase of \$17,666.80 per year.
- State PILT – increase of \$36,296.00 per year.
- Maintenance Endowment Fund – \$15 million one-time payment recommendation (earning would be utilized as a revenue source for ongoing expenditures).
- Community Forest Operations and Forest Health Practices Fund.
- Investment Fund – \$5 million initial investment.

Paul stated that he would make a digital copy of the Kittitas County Impact Analysis available to the Workgroup.

Workgroup Comments

- John Easterbrooks – What types of projects/facilities would public investment funds be used to maintain? *Public investment funds would be used to develop/maintain recreational facilities like public trails (but not public roads).*
- John Easterbrooks – Would the maintenance endowment fund be used for additional law enforcement needs due to increase in recreational users? *These impacts were not considered in the analysis.*
- Scott Revell – The purpose of the Integrated Plan is to improve long-term water supply which should have a net economic benefit to Kittitas County; was this considered in the County’s economic analysis? *The scope of the economic analysis looked exclusively at the Targeted Watershed Enhancement component of the implementation action because 99% of the components are within Kittitas County. Other components in the Integrated Plan are distributed more evenly among the counties.*
- Scott Revell – Could we combine the Kittitas County Economic Analysis results with economic analysis results (benefits of the Integrated Plan) in the Framework for Implementation Report. It would be helpful in understanding the total economic effects of the plan to show the combined results of these two studies at an upcoming Workgroup meeting.

Early Actions/Technical Work Update by Wendy Christensen, Reclamation; Derek Sandison, Ecology; and Andrew Graham, HDR

Andrew Graham, HDR, presented updates on several early action projects, with assistance from Reclamation and others.

The Keechelusto-Kachess (K-to-K) Conveyance Project

The K-to-K Conveyance project would convey water from the Keechelus Reservoir to the Kachess Reservoir. A pipeline was proposed under the original proposal, but further investigation indicated that a proposed pipeline could potentially result in substantial natural resource impacts. Rerouting the pipeline to avoid the natural resources would be expensive and would pose some hydraulic challenges. Hence, a tunnel alternative is now under consideration. Field exploration is required to investigate rock quality along the tunnel alignment. State funding is available for field exploration, and Reclamation's Denver office has been working with the local office and consulting team to develop a field exploration plan. Boring locations are identified and special use permits obtained from the USFS; contracting for drilling has also been completed. One or two borings may be completed this winter, depending on snow conditions. Further borings are planned for spring 2013.

Kachess Inactive Storage Project

The Kachess Inactive Storage project would enable drawdown of the reservoir by an additional 80 feet to access additional water during drought conditions. Prior presentations to the Workgroup included a gravity-flow tunnel option and a pump station option. Although the tunnel and pump station alternatives are roughly comparable in capital costs, gravity-flow systems are generally preferred due to higher operation and maintenance costs associated with running the pump systems.

Further consideration of the alternatives recently identified a problem with the tunnel option. The outlet of the tunnel would be several miles downstream of Lake Easton, where Kittitas Reclamation District (KRD) has its canal headworks. Therefore, water released from the tunnel cannot be delivered into the KRD system. This is fine during most of the year because KRD can be supplied using releases from Keechelus Reservoir. However during the September "flip-flop" operation used by the Yakima Project to protect salmon spawning areas, the flow from Keechelus Reservoir is greatly reduced and would not be adequate to supply KRD. This issue is leading the project team to reevaluate whether the tunnel option is feasible. Because the system would be used only during dry years, this option may still be viable if adjustments to flip-flop operations during drought years could be made to enable the tunnel option to be viable. The conveyance system would likely be used approximately once every 5 years (not including climate change impacts).

For the pump station option, the pump station locations would depend on rock quality. Field exploration in the form of borings is anticipated in spring 2013 and would likely be conducted from a barge. Reclamation's Denver office has been working with the local office and consulting team to develop a field exploration plan.

Workgroup Comments

- Dale Bambrick – Would operation of the K-to-K conveyance allow transfer of enough water to Kachess Reservoir so the frequency of operating the tunnel could be reduced? This may help solve the flip-flop problem. *This can be investigated.*

Groundwater Infiltration

Potential groundwater infiltration pilot testing locations have been considered in the Wapato Irrigation Project, Moxee Valley, and Kittitas Reclamation District (KRD) areas. The project team is currently focusing on potential sites in the Kittitas Valley. Staff from Golder Associates has been performing reconnaissance in that area, together with Tom Ring (Yakama Nation) and Dave Nazy (Ecology) and Urban Eberhart (KRD). One potential pilot area has been identified near the KRD North Branch Main Canal. A temporary diversion from Naneum Creek is planned for this winter or spring to evaluate infiltration capacity in this area. The team has also been contacting well owners to discuss possible monitoring of ground water levels.

Workgroup Comments

- Tom Ring – Resource agencies would need to know when the water diversion would be proposed for infiltration pilot studies, and how much water is proposed for diversion.
- Tom Ring – For the groundwater infiltration project, the KRD North Branch Canal is not viable as a long-term option without a pump station. We should not commit to a pump system until we know what kind of infiltration capacity we are anticipating. *Funding is available to investigate whether the KRD delivery system would be a feasible means for infiltration. The KRD canal has limitations for conveying water, which vary at different times throughout the year. Pump sizes currently under consideration are within the 100 to 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) capacity. The appropriate sizing will depend on the capacity of the canal and potential benefit from infiltration.*

Cle Elum Fish Passage Project

Wendy Christensen and Joel Hubble, Reclamation, provided an update on the Cle Elum Fish Passage project. The concept shared with the Workgroup earlier in the year, a multilevel intake structure and juvenile conduit, has been abandoned after physical modeling results. Three additional conceptual designs are now under consideration: the ramp-along-bank concept, helix-and-inlet concept, and trough-ramp concept. These concepts were developed during a brainstorm session with resource agencies (Cle Elum Fish Passage Technical Workgroup) and Reclamation staff in November. The next steps are to look at costs, operation and management requirements, and then move on to selecting a concept and refining the design. This project is unique in that we are designing a system to move fish out of a fluctuating reservoir system.

Roza Reach Smolt Survival Study

The purpose of the Roza Reach Smolt Survival Study is to identify which factors influence smolt survival: flow, temperature, and/or migratory disposition. Under the Study, three smolt releases were conducted in 2012 as a part of the 3-year study (2012 – 2014). One release was made early in the season, during low-flow (<600 cfs) conditions, and two releases were made during late season, high-flow conditions (>3,000 cfs). Early, low-flow survival rates were at 61 percent and late, high-flow survival rates were at 96 percent and 98 percent.

The study direction for the next 2 years will focus on test releases in the 1,000 to 2,500-cfs range between mid-March and mid-April, in order to collect data that minimizes the effects of confounding explanatory variables, so that flow effects on migration survival can be quantified independent of these other influential factors. The smolt study will include avian predation monitoring and dam passage survival evaluations.

Workgroup Comments

- Dale Bambrick – Appreciates the study being done, but he’s concerned that the necessary agreements with Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) related to power subordination are not being addressed.

Manastash Creek Project

Walt Larrick, Reclamation, provided an update on the Manastash Creek project. Manastash Creek irrigation diversions have blocked fish passage for the past 100 years. The proposed project will enclose one of KRD’s laterals with a piped and pressurized system, and provide for increased flow in Manastash Creek. The project is queued and construction is scheduled to start in early 2013.

Workgroup Comments

- John Easterbrooks – How soon can the project be operational? *Construction is anticipated to begin in 2013; however, Manastash Creek is not expected to have additional water until the next (2014) irrigation season.*

Other Early Action Activities

Andrew provided updates on the status of the other early action activities.

- Wymer Reservoir is slated for geotechnical exploration, and value engineering and temperature modeling, and members of the consultant team are working with Reclamation’s geologists and geotechnical experts in Denver to scope the field investigation. Additionally, an alternate pump station site on the Yakima River is being considered, in order to address concerns by the Eaton family regarding use of their land.

- Bumping Reservoir is also slated for geotechnical exploration, and members of the consultant team are working with Reclamation’s geologists and geotechnical experts in Denver to scope the field investigation.
- The K-to-K Conveyance project is slated for additional alternatives evaluation and environmental screening analysis.
- Teanaway Property and Eaton Ranch, potential land acquisitions, are going through the land appraisal process.

Workgroup Comments

- Jim Trull – What is the estimated volume of water that would be transferred via the K-to-K Conveyance? *Data was extracted from the RiverWare model runs that were performed previously. The runs look at hydrologic conditions over the years 1981-2005, with the Integrated Plan project features in place. The table below (prepared by HDR and emailed out after the December 2012 Workgroup meeting), shows the modeled transfers of water through the K-to-K Conveyance, in acre-feet.*

Transfers through K-to-K, as modeled for Integrated Plan analysis

<i>Water Year (Nov-Oct)</i>	<i>Volume (AF)</i>
1981	75,480
1982	117,146
1983	115,190
1984	123,173
1985	96,575
1986	106,204
1987	59,318
1988	51,322
1989	79,818
1990	124,115
1991	100,727
1992	95,644
1993	47,381
1994	12,276
1995	73,308
1996	127,965
1997	134,992
1998	122,259
1999	132,278
2000	126,641
2001	43,565
2002	116,308
2003	88,302

Water Year (Nov-Oct)	Volume (AF)
2004	78,762
2005	55,806
Median	96,575
Max	134,992
Min	12,276

Workgroup Comments

- John Easterbook – Why does K-to-K tunnel require a vertical “portal,” as discussed in the presentation? *The portal is a vertical shaft that is needed in order to ensure the end of the tunnel is constructed in a high-quality rock formation, without excessive jointing or weathering.*
- Scott Revell – What is the length of the K-to-K tunnel? *Approximately 5 miles.*
- Bob Hall – The K-to-K Conveyance project is estimated to cost \$200 million for a system only meant to be used in water short years. *K-to-K could provide benefits in other years besides drought years; Kachess inactive storage would be used as supply only in drought years.*
- Dave Brown – The City of Yakima has an aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) system ready to go. Is there room to consider some of the city’s pilot ASR sites? *ASR for municipal water systems was also included in the Integrated Plan and should be considered. The presentation earlier today was focused only on the infiltration approach using the irrigation supply systems.*

Operational Guidelines for Additional Storage–Status by Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA

Ben discussed the operation guidelines for additional storage (filling in for Bob Montgomery, Anchor QEA, who was unable to attend). Ben stated that an Operational Guidelines Subcommittee was convened to assist in developing these guidelines. The Subcommittee (which includes most of the same members that were on the Workgroup’s Instream Flow Subcommittee) is developing draft guidelines for how to operate and manage the additional storage facilities that would be constructed per the Integrated Plan. Operational guidelines include considerations for additional flow for fish, and irrigation and municipal water supply.

In the last two Subcommittee meetings, the following potential early flow enhancement opportunities were discussed:

- Keechelus Reservoir – 120 cfs (over 12 months)
- Cle Elum Reservoir – 300 cfs (October to March)
- Tieton Reservoir – 125 cfs (November to March)

In future meetings, the Subcommittee will follow-up with modeling scenarios in order to evaluate the potential for meeting the flow enhancement goals and continue to develop and fine tune operation guidelines. The Subcommittee’s recommendations will also be evaluated to identify legal issues and constraints needing resolution.

Workgroup – Roundtable Discussion by *Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA*

Ben opened the floor up to the Workgroup for a roundtable discussion.

- Dave Brown – The Implementation Subcommittee has been doing a great job in building momentum in implementing the Integrated Plan, and it is greatly appreciated.
- Clint Kyhl – It would be interesting to learn more about the environmental and conservation groups' recent meetings/work on the Targeted Watershed Lands Protection and Enhancement actions, once the Workgroup has reconvened the Watershed Lands Subcommittee.
- John Easterbrooks – I haven't been aware of the Operational Guidelines Subcommittee. I look forward to participating and becoming more involved in this Subcommittee.
- Kirk Cook – I'm happy with degree of information and frequency of exchange. I am pleased to see progress on early implementation projects. Development updates from the work of the Watershed Lands Conservation Subcommittee is a continued areas of interest. Additionally, the Workgroup members should continue efforts to correct misinformation being shared at times among stakeholders, and to help advance the plan.
- Alex Conley – I am glad to see that the Operational Guidelines Subcommittee is making progress. It will also be interesting to see how programmatic habitat restoration also fits into the larger program element (Targeted Watershed Lands Protection and Enhancement actions).
- Michael Garrity – I would like to see additional information on how the programmatic habitat restoration will work, and how funding can be leveraged on habitat floodplain restoration and management.
- Ron VanGundy – In relation to the Operational Guidelines Subcommittee, legal questions are currently under consideration in parallel with initial development of the operational guidelines. It will take a fair amount of time to develop legal solutions. I would suggest involving the legal group early.
- Urban Eberhart – It is exciting to be a part of the only basinwide implementation plan in the country. Once we finalize the ROD, it will be exciting to see the Implementation Plan projects start to quickly progress.
- Paul Jewell – The Watershed Land Conservation Subcommittee will probably make a lot of progress over the next year and it will be helpful to stay apprised on their progress. Additionally, it would be very helpful to have presentations on early action projects occurring in the County, e.g., projects that will soon be conducting field explorations or moving into construction. The Kittitas County Board of Commissioners needs to be apprised of what is happening on the ground as projects move forward. I would like more direct lines of communication regarding projects that will be active in the field and details on the nature and status of work in order to keep the Board of Commissioners informed.
- Mike Leita – We may wish to adjust our public outreach plan to specialize an outreach component to parties affected by early implementation project activities.

- Jeff Thomas – The information provided during the Workgroup meetings has been good but timing of information feels somewhat sporadic. A monthly update outlining planned projects and the status of those projects would be helpful to keep members up-to-date. On another note, the Implementation Subcommittee has been doing a great job.
- Dale Bambrick – I would like to thank to Urban for his work with the KRD. I am not convinced that Reclamation is making progress on the Roza Dam Subordination project identified in the plan. If action doesn't happen through implementation of the Integrated Plan, then NMFS could seek a potential remedy through an Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation, which would likely result in a jeopardy effect determination in a biological assessment (BA).
- David Fast – Progress is moving faster than anticipated; therefore, it would be helpful to see more frequent updates, possibly in the form of a monthly newsletter. Also, I would like to see the details on the scope of the habitat projects identified in the early actions funding request table (\$5 million budgeted).
- Bob Hall – I would like to see reporting of fatal flaws.

Ben thanked the Workgroup for the feedback. Based on the roundtable discussion, it appears that Workgroup is interested in more frequent communications on the status and progress of various projects, and there is high interest in the upcoming work of the Watershed Lands Subcommittee. Andrew stated that details on these upcoming subcommittee meetings will be shared soon. The first meeting of the group will likely occur early in 2013, and take two to three meetings to process the updated recommendations. Those recommendations would then be presented to the Workgroup for discussion.

Public Comment

- Chris Maykut asked that Friends of Bumping Lake's comments be considered in any changes made to the final Implementation Plan. He respects the overall objectives the Workgroup is trying to accomplish. Chris also shared an article titled "*A sense of betrayal*" in the *Yakima Plan*, by Karl Forsgaard (posted on the Reclamation website). Chris noted that the article states that there isn't necessarily 100-percent consensus in support of the Implementation Plan. He also noted that if cost becomes an issue for the Integrated Plan, elimination of the Bumping Reservoir enlargement would save \$500 million.
- Rick McGuire provided a copy of the Green Scissors 2012 report, co-produced by Friends of the Earth. A copy of the report is posted on the project website. Rick also requested that a response to the Friends of the Earth March 21, 2012, comment letter on the PEIS scoping process be provided.
- Chuck Klarich asked if the environmental process for each project would also include a benefit-cost analysis for Federal funding. *Once viable project configurations are identified, we will conduct environmental review, which will occur concurrently with feasibility studies. During the environmental review process, cost and engineering review will progress, which will allow us to proceed with an economic analysis of project costs.*

- Paul La Riviere, WDFW, expressed personal appreciation for the outreach process and thanked Mike Schwisow for preparing the list of briefings, which helped illustrate efforts made to move the Implementation Plan forward.

Workgroup Members in Attendance

Dale Bambrick, National Marine Fisheries Service
 Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board
 Kirk Cook, Washington State Department of Agriculture
 Rick Dieker, Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District
 John Easterbrooks, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Reclamation District
 David Fast, Yakama Nation
 Michael Garrity, American Rivers
 Bob Hall, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
 Paul Jewell, Kittitas County
 Clint Kyhl, U.S. Forest Service
 Mike Leita, Yakima County
 Scott Revell, Kennewick Irrigation District
 Derek Sandison, Washington State Department of Ecology
 Jeff Thomas, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 Jim Trull, Sunnyside Valley Irrigation District
 Ron VanGundy, Roza Irrigation District
 Dawn Wiedmeier, Bureau of Reclamation

Other Attendees

David Bowen, American Forest Land Co.
 Dave Brown, City of Yakima
 David Child, Yakima Basin Joint Board
 Wendy Christensen, Bureau of Reclamation
 Stuart Crane, Yakama Nation
 Warren Dickman, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
 Beneitta Eaton, Rancher
 Jack Eaton, Rancher
 Ben Floyd, Anchor QEA
 Joel Freudenthal, Yakima County
 Don Gatchalian, Yakima County
 Andrew Graham, HDR Engineering, Inc.
 Ken Hasbrouck, Kittitas Reclamation District
 Lynn Holt, Bureau of Reclamation
 Joel Hubble, Bureau of Reclamation

Eleanor Hungate
Chuck Klarich, Yakima Basin Storage Alliance
Paul La Riviere, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Walt Larrick, Bureau of Reclamation
David Lester, Yakima Herald
Barb Lisk, Office of Representative Doc Hastings
Mike Livingston, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Chris Lynch, Bureau of Reclamation
Chris Maykut, Friends of Bumping Lake
Samantha Maykut, Friends of Bumping Lake
Tim McCoy, Bureau of Reclamation
Patrick McGuire, Kennewick Irrigation District
Rick McGuire, North Cascade Conservation Council
Jim Milton, Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District
Tom Monroe, Roza Irrigation District
Bryan Myre, Yakama Reservation Irrigation District
Scott Nicolai, Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project
David Ortman, Sierra Club
David Reeploeg, Office of Senator Maria Cantwell
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation
Mary Ellen Robinson, League of Women Voters
Teresa Scott, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Vivian Shin Erickson, Anchor QEA
Dan Silver, Facilitator
Tom Tebb, Washington State Department of Ecology
Cynthia Wilkerson, The Wilderness Society

Next Workgroup Meeting

The next meeting will be held March 13, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. at the Yakima Arboretum. A meeting notice and agenda will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

Where to Find Workgroup Information

Meeting materials, notes, presentations, and materials submitted during public comment for 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.