

DRAFT Minutes

Dungeness Reservoir Work Group Meeting

Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2024, 10-12pm

Location: Online

Agenda:

1. 10:00-10:05 Intro and brief overview of agenda (County)
2. 10:05-11:20 Washington Water Trust updates (WWT)
 - a. Water Rights
 - b. WEAP (WWT/SEI)
3. 11:20-11:40 County updates (County)
 - a. FEMA RFI (the response packet was sent out for workgroup members in advance)
 - i. Overview of Attachment M (Anchor)
 - b. Parcel transfer update
4. 11:40-12:00 Workgroup comments/discussion

Attendees:

(City of Sequim) Meggan Uecker, Ann Soule
(Clallam County) Steve Gray, Rhiana Barkie, Rebecca Turner, Bruce Emery
(Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe) Hansi Hals, Shawn Hines, Randy Johnson
(Irrigators) Ben Smith, Fred Mitchell, David Howat
(WDFW) Danielle Zitomer
(Ecology) Mike Gallagher, Angela Johnson
(Anchor) David Rice
(WWT) Jason Hatch, Hannah McDonough
(SEI) Doug Chalmers

Water Rights Memo:

- Overview: Jason and Hannah (WWT) met with the Dept. of Ecology (Ecology) in January and February to capture Ecology’s comments on the water rights framework related to Off Channel Reservoir that have been shared at the DRWG meetings.
- Status: WWT drafted an 11-page memo documenting this information and then sent it to Ecology for review. WWT and Ecology met in early March to review the memo. After Ecology reviewed the document, WWT sent it to the Dungeness Water Users Association (DWUA). WWT and DWUA are currently resolving their edits. The next step is to send to Tribe and Clallam County, likely tomorrow afternoon (3/21).
- The categories included in the memo include:
 - Water Sources
 - Memorandum of Agreement
 - Highland Irrigation District and Eureka Company Water Rights
 - Storage Permit
 - Flow Restoration
 - Other Assertions by Ecology

- Timeline:
 - **February 15:** ECY Begins Review
 - **March 8:** Preliminary Comments ECY
 - **March 13-20:** Senior Water Right Holder Review
 - **March 21-27:** JST and Clallam County Review
 - **April 17:** Presentation to the DRWG

Presentation on WEAP model:

- Overview: Hannah (WWT) and Doug (SEI) presented an update on the WEAP model.
 - The purpose of the model is to provide a visual display of the Reservoir fill scenarios that will allow the work group to make decisions and plan the Reservoir operations. WEAP will incorporate climate-projected flow data so we can compare scenarios with and without the Reservoir in future scenarios.
 - Some of the questions the model will answer include what water availability can be expected under future flow conditions with climate change and how fast or slowly will the Reservoir fill given various streamflow scenarios?
- Status of the WEAP model:
 - The model currently includes the following scenarios:
 1. **Reservoir construction with paper water rights irrigation demands** Reservoir ON, irrigation demands = paper water rights, Irrigation turn-down rules ON, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements ON.
 2. **Reservoir construction with 2013-2017 observed demands** Reservoir ON, irrigation demands = 2013-2017 observed demands, Irrigation turn-down rules ON, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements ON.
 3. **Reservoir construction with representative historical year (2014) demands** Reservoir ON, Demands = representative historical year (2014), Irrigation turn-down rules ON, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements ON.
 4. **No reservoir, paper water rights demands** Reservoir OFF, Demands = paper water rights, Irrigation turn-down rules ON, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements ON.
 5. **No reservoir, 2013-2017 observed demands** Reservoir OFF, Demands = 2013-2017 observed demands, Irrigation turn-down rules ON, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements ON.
 6. **Unimpaired river** Reservoir OFF, Demands = 0, Irrigation turn-down rules OFF, and ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirements OFF.
 7. Each scenario can be run using the climate projected data.
- Preliminary Results:
 - *How much does the reservoir fill?* The model will estimate how much the reservoir will fill and how quickly.
 - *How much demand is not met?* The model will estimate how much of the irrigation demands are unmet from year to year.
 - *How much water is left downstream?* The model will estimate how much flow is at the Ecology schoolhouse gauge based on scenarios with and without the reservoir.
 - *What is the range of future climate effects?* The model will incorporate climate projected flows provided by Point No Point Treaty Council into the reservoir filling scenario and the unmet demand scenario.
- Model Assumptions:

- Water enters in USGS, the demands withdraw water from the river, and then the remaining water in the middle is shown at the ECY schoolhouse gauge.
- Demands: the model has three options that can be used to represent the demand data:
 - Paper water right limit (Apr 15 – Sep 15)
 - Observed historical water use records (2013-2017, or 2014 only)
- Inflows
 - Historical USGS gauge data (2006-2022)
 - Future projected data (2006-2099) from 19 climate projections from Point No Point Treaty Council.
- Reservoir operations
 - Reservoir parameters:
 - Max reservoir storage = 1591 AF
 - Daily evaporation, seepage
 - Max release rate = 25 cfs
 - Main canal supply limits
 - Max diversion to storage = 25 cfs (Nov 16 – July 14)
 - No diversion if Dungeness flow >1,700 cfs at the USGS gauge
 - Diversions only allowed if ECY schoolhouse gauge flow requirement is met downstream
 - Fish bypass requirement:
 - 2 cfs from the main canal to fill fish bypass
- Supply Limits
 - Up to the paper water right limit, from Apr 15- Sep 15 only
 - Subject to the irrigation turn-down rules.
 - With the reservoir, the supplies are limited by:
 - Aug 15- Sep 15 only
 - Max release = 25 cfs
 - Used first before river diversions
- Questions
 - Why are the westside irrigators included in the model?
 - Based on the maximum allocation water requirements, the Schoolhouse gauge instream flows rules must be met. The reservoir can only fill if the instream flow rule requirement is met. Therefore, all the irrigation district/company demands need to be included have seniority over filling the reservoir.
 - Ben Smith recommends using the last 3-5 years of irrigation data as the demand amount in the model.
 - Ann Soule asks if the model could be used to graph benefits to the river that would be really helpful. Benefits to River flow from having the reservoir, given full vs partial fill years. Create a zoomed in graph that is easy for the general public to interpret.
 - Fred Mitchell suggests including a scenario where irrigation increases in the future not fully up to the paper water right. Possibly include a scenario somewhere between today's use and the paper water right.
- Remaining Tasks
 - Choose final agricultural demand data.
 - Input from work group on what scenarios you want to see and any other model refinements.
 - Finalize and document the model to present among work group.

- Train WWT to use the model going forward.
- Questions for DRWG
 - We assumed a consumption rate of 100% which means we assumed no return flows back to the river for other diverters or the Ecology gauge.
 - We used no inflows or outflows between the agriculture diversions and the Ecology gauge (instream flow point of compliance).
 - What assumptions should we make regarding off-season deliveries? Right now, we have no stockwatering or irrigation supply allowed outside of Apr 15 – Sep 15.
 - What other scenarios would we like to see?
- Suggestions from the work group for the model:
 - Hansi Hals: 30-50 year horizon in the future with 8.5 RCP ensemble, look at the worst case of the 8.5, looking at the individual model that is the worse case.
 - Ben Smith: 3 stage graph that shows:
 - max allocation water to fill reservoir
 - Additive if we're using HID excess water right
 - Those two scenarios and the through put water during irrigation water, so we know how much water we need to size the diversion to accommodate filling the reservoir and serving the Highland Irrigation water.
 - Ann: can the model estimate how much water from the reservoir would be remaining from high snowpack years that can be used for aquifer recharge?
 - Jason: is there a scenario when the water in the reservoir is used for direct flow to the river?

FEMA RFI:

- The County submitted RFI responses to FEMA on March 11. The response packet has been shared with the DRWG.
- David Rice: Schedule M portion of the FEMA RFI
 - Three main things that have slowed down the project: feedback from public, team partner identified seismic features that needed to be investigated further, limited field work until the property has been acquired to inform the design.
 - Seismic investigation: April – Dec 2024.
 - Design: Dec 2024 – Jan 2026
 - Permitting: Dec 2024 – Jan 2026
 - Construction: 2026
 - The unknowns in the schedule include the seismic investigation findings and the time required for permitting.
- Steve Gray: If we proceed with the FEMA award, we will need to do a NEPA process. FEMA would be the lead on an environmental assessment. We will have a public meeting in the spring to help refine the reservoir design.
- Rhiana Barkie: Update on the property transfer. County is reviewing draft PSA, which will need to go through the DNR Board approval in May before the transfer is final. The County hopes to have the property transferred by the fall.
- Hansi Hals:
 - Would like to see the cost benefit analysis redone. There are unknowns in this project. The water balance is still being developed. The weighted usable area calculation of 35% does not reflect reality.
 - The cost benefit analysis states that we have a clear understanding of the water balance.

- The operations maintenance schedule requires daily and weekly tasks that are not fully covered by a ¼ FTE.
- The size of the reservoir is presented as black and white in the FEMA submission as being 1,200 AF reservoir size.
- Ann Soule commented in the chat “In my experience with FEMA another cost-benefit analysis may be required after the final design and before construction money is granted.”
- Steve Gray: We are addressing many challenges of the project process. The exciting part is that FEMA offers a lot of money to support the project. The County would like to work with the Tribe to understand their concerns with the submission.
- Steve Gray: It’s an iterative process. The information that’s been provided is a good snapshot of the work that’s being done and where we’re going. The CBA was done with the best information available at the time. If we need to refine that or clarify it, we can provide that to FEMA.
- David: We are not certain on the size of the reservoir yet. We had to provide a size of the reservoir based on the requirement of the funding. We determined that it would be easier to submit a smaller size reservoir to fit with the \$30 million funding request. We were clear with FEMA that that size was driven by the funding request, not the actual size of the reservoir.
- Steve Gray: We submitted a budget that includes funding from Ecology. We submitted the four options in December that were submitted to the public. The grant money from FEMA doesn’t limit us to build a reservoir that’s bigger or smaller.
- Danielle Zitomer: Request for support in replying to members of the public related to the project.
- Steve Gray: forward your responses to Rhiana and me as we are the project lead.

Next Meeting:

April 17, 2024 10-12pm