MEETING SUMMARY

Schaake Property Habitat Improvement Project November 5, 2015 Stakeholder Meeting – Presentation of Preferred Alternative and Preliminary (30 Percent) Design

PREPARED BY:	CH2M
MEETING DATE:	Thursday, November 5, 2015
MEETING TIME:	1:00 PM to 3:30 PM
LOCATION:	Hal Holmes Community Center, Ellensburg, WA
PRESENTERS:	*Bureau of Reclamation* – Jeff Graham, Rob Hilldale, and Tim McCoy *CH2M* - James Woidt
ATTENDEES:	See final page for list of attendees

Meeting Overview

On November 5, 2015 the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and CH2M presented the Preferred Alternative and Preliminary Design (30 Percent) Package for the Schaake Property Habitat Improvement Project. Approximately 30 people were in attendance for the meeting that was held from 1:00 to 3:30 pm at the Hal Holmes Community Center in Ellensburg, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for Reclamation to update the attendees on recent developments pertaining to the Schaake Property Habitat Improvement Project (Project), particularly the incorporation of technical criteria and stakeholder feedback that resulted in the Preferred Alternative. In addition, the meeting was intended to introduce attendees to the Preliminary (30 Percent) Design Package to solicit constructive feedback from meeting attendees that will be considered in subsequent design steps.

Presentation

Dan Speicher/CH2M opened the meeting and introduced himself as the meeting facilitator. Dan reviewed the meeting agenda, summarized the purpose of the meeting, and facilitated the self-introduction of both the presenters and the attending members of the audience. Jeff Graham/Reclamation then welcomed the members of the audience, shared some opening remarks, and conveyed the vision for the Schaake property and the Project. Jeff also reviewed some of the history of the Project and re-iterated the importance of feedback provided through similar previous meetings and that while some have expressed opinions that the Project should have been built by now, the schedule and opportunity for stakeholder meetings have been beneficial and resulted in a better Project than those previously proposed.

Rob Hilldale/Reclamation then reviewed the specific goals for the Project and some of the improvements that have already been made to the design. Rob then reviewed some of the previous alternatives that have been developed and presented at various stakeholder meetings from 2003 to 2014; as part of this review, Rob also identified where key stakeholder feedback was incorporated to refine the project alternative. Rob also discussed that one alternative is the "No Action Alternative," and conveyed that with "no action" the Yakima River has, and will

continue to, change. Rob then presented the technical criteria that were recently identified as part of the Preliminary (30 Percent) Design and how those criteria culminated in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 3).

Following several questions and answers on the Preferred Alternative (provided in the next section), James Woidt/CH2M introduced the Preliminary Design Package that was developed for the Preferred Alternative and reviewed the intent of a preliminary design and what documents compose the Preliminary Design Package. James then reviewed the project timeline, summarizing the key milestones and dates associated with a summer 2017 construction date. James then reiterated that a normal result of a preliminary design is identification of areas that need "special attention" and discussed some of the issues and potential solutions at one such area, the "90-Degree Bend," near the northern end of the Property.

Tim McCoy (Reclamation) then provided some closing thoughts and shared that Jeff Graham will be retiring at the end of the calendar year. Until a replacement candidate for Jeff's position is selected, Tim will be the point of contact for the Project. Tim conveyed that the Preliminary Design Package will be available on Reclamation's website for the Project and requested that written comments and feedback regarding the Project be provided to Jeff Graham by Wednesday, November 25. Dan Speicher then concluded the formal presentation and recommended a 5-minute break before a question and answer session.

Questions and Answers

Question and Answers during Presentation

The following questions and answers (italicized) were discussed throughout the presentation:

Q: Clarify the meaning/purpose of "levee connections"?
A: *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requires the levee to start and end at competent ground that provides a suitable tie-in. For example, a levee generally cannot terminate in the middle of a flat floodplain.*

Q: Is there private property on left bank?
A: *Yes, Ed Stroh. (Post-meeting clarification: Skip Mynar also owns property on the left bank)*

Q: Is current [Schaake] levee in the Public Law 84-99 (PL84-99) program?
A: *Yes*

Q: What is Tjossem Ditch? Not familiar if it is a government ditch?
A*: Tjossem Ditch is a privately-owned irrigation ditch that is not owned, operated, or maintained by the government, a portion of which is located on the Schaake Property. The Project would improve water delivery to the ditch diversion.*

Q: Will Side Channel 1 have year-round flow?
A: *Yes, a fisheries goal for the side channels was to provide a surface water connection at a mainstem river discharge of 700 cubic feet per second (cfs).*

> Follow-up Q: This year [2015] we have had less than 700 cfs flow in the main [Yakima River], will this mean it [Side Channel 1] will dewater?

Follow-up A: *This year [2015] was an exceptionally dry year. In general, we do not want to take the lowest flow because at higher flows, there is a higher risk of coarse sediment depositing within the side channel, which could lead to failure. Additionally, the side channels are intended to intercept groundwater, which will prevent dewatering.*

Q: What stops the sprayfields and City [of Ellensburg] outfall from being inundated near south end of levee?
A: *What is shown on the screen [Preferred Alternative Concept Map] is only the proposed setback levee. The southern portion of the existing Schaake levee would be retained and be a "continuation" of the proposed setback levee. The design of the proposed setback levee would not increase the frequency of inundation of these sprayfields, but it is important to note that these features would be inundated eventually at very high discharges, as they would be now. Damage to land is more likely under existing conditions.*

Q: What is the condition of the property?
A: *There are high concentrations of phosphorus as a result of past land uses. Side channel alignments have been modified to avoid the areas of highest phosphorous concentrations, but they will still need to be permitted.*

Q: Is the plan to lower or remove the Schaake levee?
A: *Except where the existing levee will be retained near the Tjossem Ditch headgate, the existing levee will be lowered to existing grade*

Q: What is timeline?
A: *The project timeline will be presented in subsequent slides if it is okay to wait until then.*

Q: How is Tjossem ditch controlled during a flood?
A: *A slide gate would be provided on the upstream end of the pipe crossing that would convey Tjossem Ditch through the proposed setback levee; the slide gate would have to be closed during floods.*

Follow-up Q: What is a slide gate?
Follow-up A: *It's a type of control gate commonly used for irrigation. The gate slides up (open) and down (closed) using a hand-operated corkscrew-like control. (Post-meeting addition: slide gates are used at the current Tjossem headgate structure to control diversions.)*

Follow-up Q: Who is responsible for closing the slide gate during a flood?
Follow-up A: *Likely Kittitas County flood control [the local sponsor for the Schaake levee], or whoever is currently responsible for closing the slide gates on the Tjossem headgate during a flood.*

Q: Will deposition occur in Tjossem Ditch during a large flood?
A: *Yes deposition could potentially occur in Tjossem Ditch during a large flood, as it does currently, but expected floodplain velocities are not expected to erode sediments that could redeposit in other locations on the floodplain.*

Q: Whose job is it to maintain Tjossem Ditch?
A: *Maintenance of Tjossem Ditch would remain the responsibility of downstream water users.*

Q: Where is the [fish] screen on Tjossem Ditch?

A: *In the lower-right corner of the Concept Map, just northwest of Hansen Pits.*

Q: When does construction start?
A: *Summer 2017; the next slide will address further details.*

Q: Do you have funding for this timeline?
A: *Construction funding requires Congressional approval and has been requested over three years; current approval provides funding for design and start of construction. Highly unlikely that construction would be stopped once started.*

Q: Is this a six month construction project?
A: *Potentially this is a 3-year project, but landowners will not be exposed during flood season. The proposed setback levee would be completed within a single construction season, before November, when heavier winter precipitation historically begin.*

Facilitated Question and Answer Session

Dan Speicher/CH2M facilitated the questions from the members of the audience throughout the presentation and encouraged that any remaining questions be asked in the open roundtable.

Q: If there is a problem with your project and we can prove it, (photos and other items) when and who will fix it?
A: *Reclamation will stand behind the Project; however, a huge flood is a different issue. The responsibility to address the problem depends upon the cause: design, construction, maintenance, or natural disaster.*

Q: Who do I call if something needs to be fixed?
A: *Kittitas County or USACE*

Q: Will you reach out to us [Kittitas Public Utility District] to start coordinating relocations [of existing power poles and transmission lines]? We have not seen this [the Preliminary Design Package] and this could be substantial in cost and effort.
A: *We have not had anything substantial to have a real conversation until now. The Preliminary Design Package provides the detail to begin a serious conversation; PUD input is requested on the Preliminary Design Package and Reclamation will continue to coordinate with the PUD.*

Q: There is an underlying confidence issue, will the finished levee remain under PL84-99?
A: *Yes, Reclamation is working with USACE and Kittitas County to design the proposed setback levee to be eligible for the PL84-99 program.*

Q: For the Bureau, what is the driving reason for this project?
A: *Fish habitat restoration driven by partnerships between irrigators, fisheries agencies, and Yakama Nation.*

> Follow-up Q: Is this driven by a legal requirement?
> Follow-up A: *No, by partnerships. The Authorization for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project (YRBWEP) authorizes Reclamation to evaluate and implement projects in the basin to enhance fish and wildlife.*
>
> Follow-up Q: Can the Indian [Yakama] Nation come in and stop this?
> Follow-up A: *Yakama Nation is a stakeholder and is represented today.*

Q: Where is the 90-degree bend on the project?
A: *At the north end of the property, near the former Schaake slaughterhouse and rendering facility.*

Q: Doing nothing at the 90-degree bend may be best and cheapest alternative.
A: *Yes, it is one of the alternatives being considered at this high risk area. Advantages to this alternative include the fact that the existing armoring is working and that it is likely to reduce construction costs.*

Q: Currently we [downstream water users] maintain the access channel, with Side Channel 1 as the new inlet, who will maintain the longer channel?
A: *Ideally, it will be self-sustaining and Side Channel 1 will be an additional inlet, not the only inlet.*

Q: How many feet of new side channels are being provided? How many feet long is the new [proposed] setback levee?
A: *Approximately 1.9 miles worth of new (1.0 miles) or re-connected (0.9 miles) side channels will be provided. The proposed setback levee would be approximately 1 mile long.*

Q: What additional permits/restrictions will be imposed on spray fields? This is a big concern
A: *Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) is responsible for permits and restrictions on the spray fields; that question is best discussed between Twin City Foods and Ecology.*

Q: Log jams were used elsewhere and the first flow took them out and swept them downstream. I have concerns with those.
A: *No log jams are currently proposed as part of the project, but may be incorporated to address issues at the 90-degree bend. New laws have been enacted to increase the design standards for log jams and appropriate engineering measures can be undertaken to restrict the mobility of log jams.*

Q: Is there a possibility of a land swap to prevent Twin City from being moved out by the river?
A: *Timeline is a big issue, so a land exchange is not currently being pursued. Also, at this time, there is no indication that the Project as proposed would impact Twin City Food's spray fields. The greatest risk to losing spray field acreage is the erosion that is currently occurring just west of the unprotected spray field.*

Q: What is the plan for the landside of the property and weed control?
A: *Reclamation is currently planting native species on the property; establishment of native vegetation will be a long process.*

Q: What is the floodplain activation frequency?
A: *On average, approximately once every 10 years.*

Q: Have you delineated wetlands? How are you going to mitigate and how much are you disturbing?
A: *Two wetland delineations have been conducted. Preliminary estimates using the footprint of the Preliminary Design are approximately 0.4 acres of permanent wetland impact resulting from the proposed setback levee. An additional approximately 1.5 acres of temporary wetland impact during construction of side channels and alcoves is estimated; however, new side channels will provide perennial/full time water to wetlands which is expected to enhance wetlands.*

Q: Do Side Channel 1 and Side Channel 2 connect?
A: *No.*

Q: How much flow will there be in Side Channel 2?
A: *It depends on discharge in the mainstem [Yakima] river, but would be sufficient to provide the water right to Tjossem Ditch.*

> Follow-up Q: Can we move Tjossem headgate to Side Channel 2?
> Follow-up A: *Re-location of Tjossem headgate would not be a part of the Project, but it is possible to re-locate the Tjossem headgate to other locations, with coordination.*

Q: What level of protection is provided by the [proposed] setback levee?
A: *Same level of protections as the current Schaake levee, approximately 24,000 cfs which occurs approximately once every 25 years.*

Q: Will wetlands receive more or less water after setting back the Schaake levee?
A: *Wetlands are primarily supplied by groundwater behind the existing levee; the Project would increase the frequency and duration of surface water connection to the wetlands.*

Q: How is the [proposed setback] levee protected at the overflow section? I have seen another attempt and that failed at the toe.
A: *The overflow control structure will be protected with articulated concrete blocks (ACBs), which have successfully been used to control erosion on large dam spillways. Furthermore, the landside slope of the overflow control structure will be decreased to a 5:1 [horizontal-to-vertical] slope.*

Action Items

Table 1
Action Items from November 5, 2015 Schaake Project Stakeholder Meeting

Task	Responsible Charge	Timeline
Provide review comment form and link to Schaake website with Preliminary (30 Percent) Design Package deliverables	Reclamation	*Completed*
Upload meeting presentation and draft meeting summary to Schaake website	Reclamation	*Completed*
Provide review comments on Preliminary Design Package	Stakeholders	Wednesday, November 25, 2015

Meeting Attendees

ATTENDEES: *CH2M* - Todd Cotten, Hans Ehlert, Todd Hunziker, Mark Pacold, Dan Speicher, and James Woidt

Reclamation **-** Steve Cummings, Jeff Graham, Rob Hilldale, and Tim McCoy

Kittitas County **-** Mark Cook, Doug D'Hondt, Angela San Filippo, and Christina Wollman

City of Ellensburg - Ryan Lyyski

Twin City Foods - Grant Craig

Kittitas Public Utility District (PUD) - Brian Vosburgh

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) - Lesli Olson

Landowner - Mike Moeur, Betty Moeur, Kelly Moeur, and Rob Stewart

Downstream land user - John Eaton

U.S.Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) - Debbie Knaub

Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) - Sanjay Barek, Michelle Gilbert, and Cathy Reed

NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) - Sean Gross

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) - Jennifer Nelson and Brent Renfrow

Kittitas County Conservation District - Mark Crowley

The Trust for Public Land - Ann Welz

Yakama Nation - Kelly Clayton