

Rachael Osborn

From: Rachael Osborn <rdpaschal@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 11:42 AM
To: Mary Jo Sanborn (MaryJo.Sanborn@CO.CHELAN.WA.US); Dan Haller (dhaller@aspectconsulting.com); Mike.Kaputa@co.chelan.wa.us; Tebb, G. Thomas (ECY) (GTEB461@ecy.wa.gov)
Subject: Icicle Work Group data gaps

Hello IWG colleagues –

I believe the IWG has a SEPA coordinating meeting coming up soon, and I want to make sure you have CELP's thoughts about missing information for the Icicle projects. We are glad to see the process moving forward in any way that puts the IWG work out to the public.

Given what was revealed in some of the technical reports, including that IPID does not hold easements for the entirety of Eight Mile Lake, we think the probability for changing management there is unlikely. This would appear to mean that there is no reliable (uninterruptible) water available from the Alpine Lakes. There are other issues as well, that will be better understood once IWG has done its outreach to the wilderness advocacy community.

Under these circumstances, approaches involving demand management, conservation, pricing, markets, etc. look like much more viable options for resolving water supply and instream flow needs. The IWG has not given these options adequate consideration (as an fyi, we will provide feedback on the draft Conservation Report).

Pasted below please find our initial list for "data gaps" in the information presented to date. I would appreciate it if you would share this e-mail with the SEPA subcommittee. Feel free to contact me if I can provide more information.

~ Rachael Osborn, CELP

Icicle Work Group – Data Gaps

- (1) Water Demand – data and analysis regarding future water need by City of Leavenworth and other water users in the Wenatchee Valley, including elasticity of demand based on conservation and pricing measures
- (2) Water Conservation – data and projections about the potential for water savings to serve as a source of supply for future consumptive uses, including use of water pricing, limiting water use to indoor usage, and other aggressive measures as applied to all out-of-stream users (municipalities, COIC, IPID, etc.)
- (3) Reclaimed Water – analysis of potential for reclaimed water to supply future demand.
- (4) Water Transfers, Markets and Banks – analysis of potential for transfer of existing rights to serve new uses, including disposition of IPID water rights as agricultural lands convert to non-agricultural uses
- (5) Alpine Lakes – impacts of increasing or drawing down lake elevations on public uses in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, including recreational and aesthetic uses.
- (6) Alpine Lakes – scope of IPID and LNFH water rights, including analysis of potential loss of water rights for non-use
- (7) Alpine Lakes – scope of IPID and LNFH easements for all relevant lakes
- (8) LNFH – status, scope and results of all LNFH studies relating to 401 Certification (the version under appeal) and NPDES permit process
- (9) IPID & COIC – detailed analysis of POD alternatives that move diversions downstream with effect of increasing instream flows in Icicle Creek.
- (10) Process – understanding how SEPA and NEPA fit together for the various proposals, including the need for participation and decisions by USFS, USFWS and USBR, among others.
- (11) Funding – how much do these options cost, and who will pay?