



MEETING MINUTES

PRCC Habitat Subcommittee

Conference Call
December 08, 2011
2:00 - 4:00 pm

PRCC Habitat Subcommittee Members

Dale Bambrick, NMFS
Chris Fisher, CCT
Lee Carlson, YN
Dennis Beich, WDFW

Kate Terrell, USFWS
Dave Duvall, GCPUD
Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Meeting Attendees: (*Denotes PRCC HSC member)

Chris Fisher, CCT*
Lee Carlson, YN*
Kate Terrell, USFWS*
Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Dennis Beich, WDFW*
David Duvall, GCPUD*
Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Action Items:

1. Rohr and Terrell will work on developing a project proponent information form letter for HSC review.
2. Duvall (with input from Beich) will develop criteria for future gaging station proposals.
3. Terrell will provide a spec sheet on the Trout Unlimited Icicle Creek Reach Assessment and Water Conservation Plan for HSC review prior to the January HSC meeting.

Decisions:

1. HSC members approved funding the Wenatchee Nutrient Enhancement proposal, subject to Bambrick's concurrence, using the Habitat Supplemental Fund 602.

2. HSC member's agreed that funding for the Entiat Stormy Reach Phase 3 Acquisition (Bremer) Proposal will be drawn from the Habitat Supplemental Fund (602).
3. HSC members approved Methow Sugar Dike Property Rental House language provided by Chris Johnson of MSRF that was distributed via email.
4. HSC members decided not to approve the Pateros Bridge Project.
5. HSC members approved funding of the Lower Wenatchee Flow Enhancement Project, subject to Bambrick's concurrence. HSC member's agreed that funding will be drawn from the Habitat Supplemental Fund (602).

Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** Rohr welcomed members.
- II. **Agenda Review** – There were no additions to the agenda.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - A. **November 10, 2011** – Approved contingent upon Bambrick's approval.
- IV. **Action Items Review** – Will be covered during today's meeting.
- V. **Habitat Funds Report** – Rohr will distribute upon receipt.
- VI. **Nason Creek LWP Flood Plain Reconnection Project**
 - A. **Review/update of status and recent Design Team meetings**

Lee Carlson provided the HSC with an update from Mike Kaputa, Chelan County Natural Resources. He said time ran out in order to make a decision, so neither the downstream project (YN) nor the B+ project will occur in 2012. Unresolved issues between BPA and BNSF still need to be discussed, and it's unlikely that they would be able to work issues out in time to do the work. If funding is secured, the hope is to conduct the work during the 2013 field season and to complete both the upper and lower projects at the same time. Because of the aforementioned issues, the Yakama Nation didn't budget for this project next year.
- VII. **Tyee Project** – Duvall reported that an appraisal is needed in order to complete the project spec sheet. Susan Dretke told Duvall that the appraisal would cost a few hundred dollars and take a couple of weeks.
- VIII. **Wenatchee Nutrient Enhancement Specification Sheet Proposal**
 - A. **Update from D. Duvall regarding the question of data sharing**

Duvall participated in a conference call on November 28th with Dr. Peter Burgoon, Water Quality Engineering, Dr. John Stockner, Eco-

Logic, LTD and University of British Columbia, Jason Hatch, Trout Unlimited/Washington Water Project, and Jason Lundgren, Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group, regarding questions Grant PUD had on this project (see attached meeting notes). In an effort to reduce the cost of the project by \$17,000, Duvall may propose the use of Grant PUD's water quality equipment.

- B. Review/Discussion of action to approve proposal** - The study is being conducted in hopes of receiving a permit from Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) to provide nutrient enhancement in the Wenatchee basin, although there is no guarantee that a MOA will be granted by WDOE at the end of the study. **HSC members approved funding for the study, subject to Bambrick's concurrence.**

IX. ORRI Phase II Specification Sheet Proposal

- A. Itemized Budget Request** – Fisher met with Mould Engineering to discuss the HSC's concerns regarding cost of the project. Fisher asked that the budget be reviewed and that an itemized budget be sent to him.

- B. Report of Project Participant's Meeting of November 15th**

Fisher reported that a short presentation and project timeline were presented at the meeting. Fisher made several attempts to contact Kari Long, ONA, but was not able to get the revised budget before the PRCC Habitat conference call. Upon receipt Fisher will forward it to Rohr for distribution to the HSC. Duvall reported that Grant PUD is strongly in favor of completing this phase of the project.

- X. Entiat Stormy Reach Phase 3 Acquisition (Bremer) Proposal** – Duvall and Rohr (Rohr participated via telephone) met with Mickey Fleming, Chelan Douglas Land Trust (CDLT), to notify her of the HSC's decision at the November 10th HSC meeting to approve acquisition of the Bremer property, with three caveats. Duvall provided Fleming with a copy of the three caveats.

Rohr explained that in order for HSC's votes to be official, meeting minutes must be approved, and the account the funds will be drawn from needs to be identified. **Accordingly, for this project, HSC member's agreed that funding will be drawn from the Habitat Supplemental Fund (602).**

Caveat #2 states that the PRCC HSC will approve all restoration projects. Carlson noted his concern with the HSC wanting to approve restoration designs for future projects. However, rather than spend time discussing it today, he requested it be included as a topic for future discussion.

Additionally, in an effort to keep project proponents informed of the HSC's action on their proposed project, Rohr stated he and Terrell had discussed

the possibility of developing a form letter that could be sent to project proponents that would provide information regarding the status of their proposal. **Rohr and Terrell will work on developing a form letter for HSC review.**

- A. Chelan Douglas Land Trust Project** – Duvall gave a brief update on other HSC-CDLT ongoing projects.

In order to make payable immediately, task authorizations for initiation cost of two projects agreed upon last year, will be looked at as a means of contract management by Grant PUD contracting staff.

The appraisal for the Nason View property on the White River is complete. CDLT budgeted \$500,000 for the land but the appraisal came in at \$685,000. Because it came in higher than was originally budgeted, a second opinion was requested. Because the estimated shortfall is \$185,000, CDLT will look for other alternatives, potentially with donations first, and then if needed, a request from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board or the HCP Tributary Committees. This is an acquisition, not a conservation project.

XI. Methow Sugar Dike Property Rental House

- A. Discussion Regarding Renting of the Vacant House** –The language provided by Chris Johnson (MSRF) regarding the rental house was discussed (see attached). Johnson confirmed that a private renter would not be sought, but the house could possibly be used for storage, field crews, etc. **HSC members approved language of the rental document distributed via email. Bambrick approved the language with an email vote to Rohr prior to the meeting.**

- XII. Pateros Bridge Project** – Beich distributed a project specifications sheet via email regarding this project. Total cost of the project was estimated at \$350,000; the HSC is being asked to fund \$205,000 for six acres of the lower bench in order to protect it from development. \$150,000 has been pledged by WDFW and the Columbia River Salmon Endorsement Fund for the upland portion of the property, for boat access. Water rights for .75 cfs go with the property. Duvall asked Beich about the potential opportunity to sell the uplands portion with funds returning to the PRCC in order to reduce the overall costs and Beich responded that different funds were being used to purchase the uplands and therefore that approach was not applicable. After discussion, Fisher and Terrell were not in favor of the project although a formal vote by each representative was not recorded.

- XIII. White River Gage Station proposed Spec Sheet** – The specifications sheet was distributed via email, the Project Sponsor is Public Utility District #2 of Grant County. Because funding for the White River gaging station and site operation will be terminated by the Washington

Department of Ecology (WDOE) at the end of the 2011 water year, the HSC is being asked to fund annual operating cost of \$11,000, for five years (total cost, \$55,000). Because other gaging stations in the area have been pulled, Terrell and Duvall believe the benefit of five additional years of historical reference data is valuable when restoration issues are being discussed. Beich didn't agree that funding should be paid for over 5 years because of the precedent it sets. Duvall echoed Beich's concerns, and therefore, Duvall specifically added "temporary" funding for this station in the spec sheet and explained that WDOE would need to find other funding in the future. Future funding requests will be evaluated on a site specific request. **Duvall, with input from Beich, will develop criteria for future proposals.** Discussion will occur at next month's meeting.

XIV. Lower Wenatchee Flow Enhancement Project – Previously, the HSC approved \$300,000 funding of this project with three conditions:

- There is a 1:1 match from non-fish-specific funding sources confirmed by HSC
- HSC funds are expended by December 31, 2012, or an extension is approved by HSC
- Trout Unlimited and Pioneer Water Users Association support HSC proposed restoration efforts in side channel and/or canal downstream of diversion.

A memo from Aaron Penvose, Trout Unlimited (see attached) and the Project Sponsor for the original Specifications Sheet dated August 10, 2010, was distributed via email. The Penvose memo states that a non-fish funding source (Washington State Irrigation Efficiency Grant Program) has been found, and requested that \$200,000 be used for funding irrigation improvements, with an extension of time to 2013. \$100,000 would be used for removal of the diversion dam.

The memo stated that \$200,000 would be saved by not having to dig through Confluence Park (a reduction in pipe), and changing the point of diversion.

Rohr noted that during a conversation with Penvose, he told him that this project will have an 8.8% budget cushion for contingency which is less than the 15% he prefers. Penvose wanted Rohr to let HSC members know that the contingency is a tight projection on this project. **HSC members approved funding of this project, subject to Bambrick's concurrence. HSC member's agreed that funding will be drawn from the Habitat Supplemental Fund (602).**

XV. Trout Unlimited Icicle Creek Reach Assessment and Water Conservation Plan – At last month's meeting, Kate Terrell explained this proposal and asked if HSC members would consider reviewing a specifications sheet from Trout Unlimited (TU) for a tributary and reach assessment on Icicle Creek; from the confluence up to the wilderness

boundaries, along with a water conservation plan. TU has submitted a proposal to the Icicle Fund to help fund this project. They have also applied for a \$10,000 grant from the local TU chapter. Support from Cascade Orchards is also being sought. Proponents plan on attending a Leavenworth City Council meeting work session to inform them of this study.

The HSC would be asked to fund from \$110,000 to \$125,000. Terrell explained that during last month's meeting, Dale Bambrick was interested in the reach assessment, but was concerned with the water conservation plan. She explained that TU said they could remove that portion from their request if need be in order to have the other portion funded. If HSC approval is given, the tributary reach assessment could start in February or March.

HSC members agreed to review a specifications sheet on this project.
Kate Terrell will draft for HSC review prior to the January HSC meeting.

XVI. Project Updates

A. McIntyre Dam – Fisher reported that during a recent meeting with Okanogan Nation Alliance (ONA) and Bob Newberry, preliminary jump efficiency results for McIntyre Dam were shown to him. Some of the results were problematic because of variable gate changes. During 2010 and 2011, gate operations were not consistent and the many variables resulted in inconsistent jumping efficiency rates, particularly at Gate 4 (second gate from the west side of the river). Fish had greater interest in passing at Gate 1 (most eastern side of dam). To get more consistent results, a gate operation protocol should be implemented so that one variable at a time is tested. Cameras will be installed to look at all gates at the same time. Fisher suggested the following be considered when trying to optimize fish passage at McIntyre Dam: different light penetration could be causing different utilization of openings, be consistent at all openings, and then tweak each gate so you can tell which variable made the most difference.

Fisher requested a protocol of how fish jumping efficiencies will be evaluated in 2012 for HSC review. HSC input can then be provided back to ONA.

B. VDS -13 – Fisher reported that he talked to ONA and the project is scheduled to happen in 2012, depending on August river flows. ONA is trying to confirm if their cost share (\$120,000) is still available. The HSC committed to funding half of that amount. Fisher will provide updates as they become available.

XVII. Next Meeting – January 12, 2012. Meetings will continue to be held the second Thursday of each month.

Questions from David Duval and discussion from Wenatchee Nutrient Enhancement conference call

11/28/2011 1pm-2pm

Participants on Conference Call:

Dr. Peter Burgoon, Water Quality Engineering, Inc.

Dr. John Stockner, Eco-Logic, LTD, and University of British Columbia

David Duval, Grant County PUD

Jason Hatch, Trout Unlimited/Washington Water Project

Jason Lundgren, Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group

The main discussion items are:

1. Is there a way that the sampling already done by the YN and Grant PUD in the Wenatchee basin will suffice for the sampling in the proposal, thereby reducing the sampling costs?

- The objective of the Wenatchee Nutrient Enhancement Assessment (NE) is to organize existing information and evaluate how much additional sampling will be needed.
- WA DOE requires a strict sampling protocol in order to obtain the data which enables them to make a regulatory decision. We do not know the “quality” of existing data and have assumed that all new data will need to be collected. It is possible that the budget may be reduced if existing data is high enough quality to meet WA DOE regulatory needs. If less collection is necessary then there is a corresponding reduction in our “sample collection” budget. This can only be known once all the data and programs are organized and evaluated which is one of the first tasks of our project.
- We have assumed that the best data set will be obtained if water samples, periphyton, and macroinvertebrates are all collected at the same time, versus trying to use old water data to understand C:N:P ratios in periphyton. In addition we will be able to guarantee the quality of our data by having control of the collection and analysis procedures.
- We will be able to reduce costs if sampling can be coordinated with existing sampling programs.
- To the best of our knowledge periphyton sampling probably is not being done by others in this watershed yet it is a critical component of this project.
- We will utilize existing data to reduce work where data and information is appropriate and fills in data gaps
- In general the proposal is organized with the understanding that other sampling work is being done in some of our target streams, and that this data needs to be organized and used to help develop a coordinated sampling plan.

2. Is the sampling protocol robust enough to ensure that DOE will not come back at the end of the 2-year study and suggest that more sampling needs to be done before they can sign the MOA.

- WA DOE has read and supports our overall approach to developing a QAPP and an MOA as outlined in our Grant proposal – see WA DOE’s letter of support.
- Dr. John Stockner, one of the fields leading experts in nutrient enhancement, reviewed and recommended the sampling parameters for the periphyton and water quality.
- The project is budgeted to be robust enough to meet WA DOE standards set during the TMDL and also to provide critical information on primary and secondary productivity and fishery benefits.
- The periphyton sampling will be more rigorous than the sampling completed by WA DOE during the TMDL. The WA DOE was strongly criticized for the paucity of periphyton data used in the TMDL model.
 - For example, TMDL had four periphyton samples for the entire TMDL study although periphyton is the main driver of pH and DO issues in the Wenatchee River and the best indicator of primary productivity. The NE project assumes that sixty periphyton samples will be collected over the two year project. Samples will be analyzed for species types, edibility, and nutrient content. Nutrient content helps determine what nutrients are lacking for primary productivity and how best to resolve an imbalance.
- The periphyton samples will also be collected during the same season as the water samples to assure the best data to analyze nutrient limitation on productivity.
- This project will determine if nutrient enhancement will benefit the fishery as well as comply with water quality standards.
- If nutrient enhancement is determined to be beneficial, the project will work with WA DOE to develop a protocol to be followed for approved NE projects in the watershed,
- The protocol for compliance with state water quality standard will serve as a model and will be useful in other watersheds in the state with (or without) water quality issues.

3. Regarding the QAPP, there was one done in the lower Wenatchee by DOE, can the results of that be used to eliminate or lower the costs for a new QAPP?

- In general the QAPP is a study plan that helps assure: clear objectives, organization of existing information, sampling and analysis methods, and well defined goals. The Nutrient Enhancement project has different goals than the previous WA DOE TMDL study, yet both will have been completed in overlapping study areas. Therefore the lower Wenatchee QAPP will have a lot of useful information to inform our project; however, a unique QAPP must be prepared for the Nutrient Enhancement Project.

- Information and methods from the QAPP for Lower Wenatchee (from outlet of Lake Wenatchee to confluence with Columbia) will be used to develop QAPP for work on upper Wenatchee and tributaries.
- More specifically,
 - i. Methods for water sampling (grab and continuous) in the WA DOE QAPP will be used to assure that data to be collected is acceptable for WA DOE.
 - ii. WA DOE QAPP does not provide information for sampling periphyton or macro-invertebrates. We will use USGS or other acceptable procedures.
 - iii. WA DOE QAPP has limited information on White River and Little Wenatchee.
- Organizing existing information from fisheries organizations (i.e. Yakama Nation Fisheries, Chelan and Grant County PUDs, Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, etc.) was not done by the WA DOE QAPP. This information will need to be organized for the Nutrient Enhancement QAPP in order to understand how to coordinate with existing sampling programs and utilize existing data. This data review will take significant time and effort.
- The budget was developed assuming the WA DOE QAPP would be integrated into the NE QAPP. The budget is conservative to help assure that a good sampling plan is put together and understood by decision makers.

4. Based on some recent work Grant County PUD has done, the phosphorus analysis with the AM test and water testing (\$28,000) seemed a little high.

- Sampling for the NE project includes grab samples and continuous monitoring of water quality. There is about \$11,000 for grab samples and also about \$17,000 for use of Sondes for continuous monitoring of pH, temperature, and DO at five stations for one week each year. The sondes are expensive but are at the core of the water compliance issues.

We hope that the above noted information as well as our phone conference provides you and the PRCC sufficient responses to your questions regarding our Nutrient Enhancement project proposal. If you need further clarification, please let us know.

Thanks again for considering this proposal.

From: chris@cjohnson.icdiv.net [mailto:chris@cjohnson.icdiv.net] On Behalf Of Chris Johnson
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 7:36 AM
To: Dave Duvall
Subject: Re: Rental House Statement/Language

Thanks Dave,

Sorry for the delay, it has been a busy couple of days.

MSRF has secured the home on parcel # 3322070149 (AKA Stanley) which is currently vacant.

MSRF is requesting agreement from the Committee for allowance of interim use of the home structure for uses supportive and consistent with MSRF's goals for long-term restoration of the site and adjacent properties. These interim uses could include:

Office use for salmon recovery programs;
Housing use for program staff - seasonal field workers;
Storage of equipment for salmon recovery programs.

MSRF would be responsible for any costs associated with use of the structure for these purposes.

MSRF would use any income associated with rental to offset costs of ownership including taxes.

Thank you for your consideration,

Chris Johnson

MEMO

TO: Priest Rapids Habitat Subcommittee
FROM: Aaron Penvose, Trout Unlimited, Project Manager

RE: Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Enhancement Project -Funding request, clarifications and project update

DATE: December 5th, 2011

First and again, thank you for the time commitment and consideration the Priest Rapids Habitat Subcommittee (HSC) continues to give to Trout Unlimited's (TU) Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Project (Pioneer Project or Project). The Pioneer Project continues to offer one of the most implementable solutions for addressing instream flow augmentation in the lower Wenatchee River. The valuable support of the HSC is much appreciated and is instrumental in achieving the goal of increasing water quantity and quality in the Lower Wenatchee River.

The HSC has agreed to provide \$300,000 towards the Pioneer Project, given three conditions:

- 1) There is a 1:1 match from non-fish-specific funding sources confirmed by HSC
- 2) HSC funds are expended by December 31, 2012, or an extension is approved by HSC
- 3) TU and Pioneer Water Users Association (PWUA) support HSC proposed restoration efforts in side channel and/or canal downstream of diversion.

This memo is intended to provide you three items for your consideration;

- 1) Project development update - TU and PWUA are considering a change in scope to the project
- 2) Project budget update of the current funding picture
- 3) Funding modification request, approval and task reallocation of PRCC funds for the project, with a timeline extension to October 1, 2013

Project Development:

Change in Scope Summary

As part of our work to change the point of diversion (POD) on the lower Wenatchee River to the Columbia River, TU worked for over 6 months to get an agreement to cross Confluence Park. In October, TU received a signed agreement with the terms and conditions for TU and PWUA's access to the park. After review and consideration of the final terms, and with concerns about the implications of certain terms, PWUA and TU asked contracted engineer Forsgren and Associates (Forsgren) to take one more look at the PWUA property. The PWUA property sits on river left just upstream of the Highway Bridge on the Lower Wenatchee River (Exhibit A). Forsgren determined that with some

PRCC Habitat Subcommittee
FINAL Meeting Minutes
December 08, 2011

excavation for a landing for the pumphouse, the conditions of the river channel adjacent to the bank would allow for enough withdrawal to service PWUA (Exhibit B) at the PWUA property location.

This change has numerous benefits from a project implementation standpoint; most importantly there is approximately \$200,000 savings in overall project cost.

Budget Update and Funding

With the proposed change in scope of work, TU asked Forsgren to revise the total project budget with a POD on the Lower Wenatchee. In June, when TU last updated the HSC with the total budget a POD on the Columbia River was estimated at \$2.8 million. With the change in scope, the new budget is estimated at \$2.6 million.

Below is a table of the current funding picture:

Total Project Cost	\$2,602,848		
Funding Source's :		Status	Fish/Non Fish
Department of Ecology, Columbia River Salmon Recovery Funding Board	\$1,000,000	Contracted	NF
HCP Tributary Funds 2009	\$372,500	Contracted	F
BPA	\$167,500	Contracted	F
USFWS	\$204,960	Contracted	F
Priest Rapids Habitat Funds	\$100,000	Contracted	F
	\$300,000	Pending Match	F
Yakama Nation	\$388,107	Pending	F
Conservation Commission-Cascadia CD	\$300,000	Pending	NF
Total Confirmed:	\$2,833,067		
Balance:	(\$230,219)		

The table shows project savings combined with additional funding sources; if the HSC accepts the new match from the Commission then the project is fully funded and will move towards implementation in 2012. If the Regional Technical Team’s review of the scope change on December 14th is approved then we would have about an 8.8 % budget cushion for contingency; currently Forsgren only has 10% already included in the cost estimates above.

Funding and Match Consideration

As previously discussed with PRCC, with due diligence, we have sought and explored many sources of funding to make this project successful. With the reinvigoration of the Washington State Irrigation Efficiency Grant Program and with the PWUA POD change projects Fall 2012 implementation timeline, we are fortunate to have found funding that meets the PRCC's first condition of funding. TU and PWUA hope the PRCC agrees.

As for condition 2 and 3, in light of the overall budget decrease and with the funding picture for the project nearing completion, TU would like to ask the HSC to consider funding \$200,000 towards the irrigation improvements on the project and \$100,000 towards removal of the diversion dam at the current PWUA POD. This proposal would allow TU to fully complete decommissioning of the water delivery system for PWUA. It would also create a free flowing side channel which would allow for fish to move unimpeded up and downstream in the existing side channel. TU thinks this is a valuable, efficient use of funds, and would create the most habitat benefit set in condition 3.

TU has already included and will include diversion removal in the side channel in all of the permitting submissions to date, so we are set up to remove the diversion upon completion of the new irrigations pipeline. This work would require a timeline extension, and considering the work window for instream projects, it may not be viable to remove the diversion in 2012. If the HSC feels like the current proposal is feasible, then we would like to extend the funding timeline for a diversion removal work window for fall 2013.

Thank you for your consideration, and please don't hesitate to inquire with any questions.

Respectfully,

Aaron Penvose

Exhibit A

Pioneer Water User's Association Project



Legend

- ▲ PWUA Proposed Point of Diversion
- PWUA Property



