



YAKIMA TRIBUTARY ACCESS & HABITAT PROGRAM

CORE TEAM MEETING MINUTES

15 December, 2004 9am-Noon

USDA Agricultural Service Center (NYCD Office), 1606 Perry Street, Yakima

Attending: Stephen Kropp, Lisa Pelly, Suzanne Blakeney, Dave Myra, Ed Harrell, Jonathan Kohr, William Meyer, Henry Fraser, Jay Marcotte, Dave Nunn, Anna Lael, Carol Ready, Dave Brown, Mark Reynolds, Dueane Calvin.

1. ADMINISTRATION

a) Annual Report

Ed stated that the Annual Report has been completed and delivered to BPA. Jay Marcotte acknowledged that he had received a copy. Ed passed a copy around for everyone to look at. Dave Myra said we will put the Annual Report on the YTAHP Website so it can be readily accessed.

b) Materials Inventory Tracking

Ed explained that he would like to keep the Inventory sheets up to date so was just checking if there were any changes. Ed will contact Rusty G. who was not at the meeting.

c) News from BPA

Jay Marcotte explained that any funding "rescheduling from FY-04 to FY-05 needs to be completed by the end of December. (YTAHP is not rescheduling any funds this year) Jay also reported on progress toward implementing the Pisces computer system for tracking BPA Contracts. Contractors do not have access to the system yet. Pisces system training for contractors will take place sometime around mid January.

d) 2004 BiOp Reporting

Ed explained that we had received notice from BPA to report metrics and accomplishments for 2004 pertaining to RPA 149 and RPA 153 (Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives). Ed had passed the required forms to Anna and Dave N. and they were completing them. Stephen also had information that would be helpful. Stephen asked about the BiOp being reported on. Jay explained that it is the original BiOp under which BPA operates the Columbia system dams. It is different than the HIP BiOp. Jay explained that BPA receives off-site mitigation credits for accomplishments reported.

2. INVENTORY TEAMS

a) KCCD-

Anna reported that Abbi gained access to the Yakima Training Center and so has completed the upper end of Badger Creek.

Dave M. expressed the importance of the Inventory work. For years people have been preparing water related plans for the Yakima Basin but there has been very little on the ground data collected about Yakima tributaries. Through YTAHP efforts over 200 miles of tributaries have been methodically inventoried in Yakima and Kittitas Counties.

b) NYCD-

Dave N. reported that they are completing tributary reports on stream inventoried last summer. He has also received the Ahtanum Creek inventory data from WDFW. Using this he will work with George Marshall (AID) to develop projects.

3. TRIBUTARY TEAMS

a) Cowiche Creek

Dave N. reported that there has been no reason for the Cowiche Creek Trib Team to meet. When decisions are made regarding YTID and the Lust projects or the Snow Mountain project the Trib Team will meet to discuss these projects.

Dave N. asked Anna if she has provided her inventory data to WDFW. Anna said that she has not. It is in draft form and still needs to be reviewed by land owners. There was some discussion about the need for Final Inventory data to be accessible to everyone. Possibly on the WDFW web site.

b) Kittitas

Trib team will not be established until the Inventory Reports are completed and reviewed.

Carol took this opportunity to mention that the Bureau of Reclamation is asking for applications for Water 2025 funding. Carol is going to apply in hopes of funding some projects not funded by SRFB. Yakima is a "priority basin" for Water 2025 funding. For more information about Water 2025 funding Carol suggested searching the web using "Water 2025". (see: <http://www.fedgrants.gov/Applicants/DOI/BOR/D7810/05SF811067/Grant.html>)

In regard to applying for these BOR (federal) funds, Carol asked Jay if BPA money is considered federal money, therefore **not** available as matching funds for federal grants.

Jay said, "It depends." It depends on what federal agency the funding application is going to. Some federal agencies consider BPA money as

federal and some don't. It is best to check with the potential funding agency to find out how they consider BPA money.

4. Update on Current projects

a) KCCD-

Coleman Creek, Anna reported that the Coleman project was pretty much completed. The Little Nanum project is underway, the siphon pipe is being set in place. Forms for the concrete intake and outlet of the siphon are being built. Hank mentioned that the WCC did a good job on the re-vegetation work at the Coleman project.

KCCD received funding from SRFB for the lower Reecer Creek project. The engineers are also looking at land rehabilitation along portions of lower Reecer Creek. This is in relation to the City of Ellensburg's plans to relocate the dike and enlarge the floodplain on property the city owns.

Engineers are also looking at the culvert projects on Jack Creek and Indian Creek. It is hoped these projects can be done this year.

Hank said that the Coleman and Little Nanum projects have revealed the need for a better pump screen to be used by contractors when they are trying to de-water the construction area. There was talk of getting a pump screen made at the Yakima Screen Shop. A problem is the size of pump may vary from job to job. Dave N. said a "pump right" screen may work. Anna suggested that we could provide the contractor with specs for pump screens and require that they provide appropriate screens.

b) NYCD-

Dave reported that there was some minor work remaining on the Pellicer project to improve the ramps to and from the bridge. In another location they are also working on some habitat fencing on Cowiche Creek and restoring vegetation. Dave said they are trying to increase landowners acceptance of electric fencing to control stock.

5 ITEMS OF INTEREST

a) WDFW (05-06 Projects)

Stephen handed out a fairly comprehensive list of projects and maps showing project locations. He identified the priority projects and said that the Technical Work Group needs to visit these projects. Stephen said that Lisa Pelly with the Washington Water Trust can be helpful in making a pre-assessment of potential water rights issues.

b) KCCD-

Anna said there will be BOR meetings on the Fogarty project later today and tomorrow. Tomorrows meeting is with the land owner. Hank said the meeting today (Dec. 15) is a TWG meeting at the BOR Yakima office to discuss only the Bureau portion of the Fogarty project.

Hank mentioned that the BOR meeting today will also discuss the Tucker Creek project. The Bureau is hoping to fit a new design into the same footprint as the previous design, which has already gone through most of the permitting process.

Dave M. said that YTAHP will need a contract with BOR in order to transfer the \$40,000 budgeted for the Tucker Creek project. We also need to have some information about what the YTAHP funds will be used for.

Carol mentioned that the KRD had received some funding for a project that has been postponed or abandoned. This funding (\$284,000) may be available for another project. She will learn more about it.

c) NYCD-

Lust projects: Dave Myra reported on his latest talks with the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District about what it might cost Lust et al. to buy into the YTID system thereby eliminating their need for the Lust diversions out of Cowiche Creek. He said YTAHP will prepare a proposal identifying what we can offer to the effort and present it to the YTID Board at their February meeting.

6. Manastash Project-Update

Carol presented the latest progress on the Manastash project. The engineers have settled on a couple of the project components. There is still some question about consolidating diversions or not. The question about re-adjudicating water rights when diversion points are changed is still a concern.

7. Other-

a) Water Rights and point of diversion issue-

Discussion of this issue kind of progressed out of the Manastash Project discussion. There is a conflict between what may be the best engineering solution to diversion problems (combining/moving diversions) and the reluctance of property owners about opening their water rights to re-adjudication. The landowners (and project proponents) would like to have some kind of confidential preliminary review of their water rights situation so they will feel more comfortable about DOE eventually getting into the act. Stephen has been working on this problem and explained a method he believes can provide the confidentiality needed. He proposes working with the Washington Water Trust to obtain preliminary, confidential reviews of water rights. The Water Trust, unlike DOE, is not obligated to take action should they find any areas of concern regarding the use of the water right.

Lisa Pelly, with the Washington Water Trust, offered to come back to our January Core Team meeting with a draft questionnaire that could be used as a tool to conduct a preliminary review. Dave M. suggested that if she could get the draft to Ed before the January meeting he can distribute it to the Core Team. They can then come to the meeting ready to comment on it. Lisa said she would try to do that.

- b) The Lower Naches River Coordination Partnership Plan; Mark Reynolds, DOT, Explained the coordinated effort by the City Of Yakima, Yakima County, and WSDOT to solve problems each entity has along the lower four miles of the Naches River. Mark said that YTAHP can provide a valuable service by reviewing and commenting on the draft plans as they are prepared for the different projects. He handed out preliminary plans for some early highway protection work. He would like to get comments back on these plans so that the SEPA process can be completed in February of '05.

Dave Brown, explained the City's future plans to correct problems with water diversions out of the lower Naches and Cowiche Creek. Dave explained that the County's Naches River concerns relate to the flood plain and improving floodplain functions to reduce future flood damage.

Dave M. said that it may also be helpful to the Naches River group if Stephen Kropp, WDFW/YTAHP permit coordinator, could look over the Naches River Projects permit matrix. Stephen can help determine if all the required permits are identified and if the time lines for the permit process are reasonable. Stephen said he would be glad to take a look at it.

William said there have been a lot of theories about the causes of the problems along the lower Naches. He asked if there has been any determination about the causes. Mark said, yes, the causes are fairly well understood. One of the big difficulties is that there is not much room between Highway 12 and the hills in which to correct the problems.

Dave M. invited the Naches River group back to the January meeting. He said that we will include, on the January YTAHP Core Team Agenda, more discussion of the lower Naches River projects and agency comments on the proposed plans.

- c) After the meeting Dave N., Jay, Hank, William, and Ed, went to see the completed Pellicer project.

8. Next meeting: January 19, 2004, 9am –noon, Location: Kittitas County PUD, 1400 E. Vantage Hwy. Ellensburg, Phone: (509) 933-7200

Minutes prepared by Ed Harrell