

Meeting 3/31/2016 – Krystall's Restaurant Leavenworth

Present

Dan Wilkinson – President, Brad Summers, Mary Scheibler, Tim Walsh, Norm Stoddard, Jackie Camp, Doug Gann, Dan Davies, Jerry Schneider

Greg McLaughlin – Support, and Dave Rice, available by phone.

NP – Marc Dilley, Ardie Gordon, Mike Barich, James Walker

Notes

DW – His interest is to establish a tone that this is an open process, still in the listening stage, and that there are no decisions yet. His desire is to come out of this process with a ballot that has an option to vote on – kind of like a ballot initiative. Shareholders need to have the assurance that it's a balanced proposal.

**Action Step – By the end of April, Advisory group will create a proposal that we all could live with if a set of conditions and/or contingencies or met.**

DG – Has lived at end of Shore Street 4 years. Him and his wife support projects, but have concerns that need to be satisfied, primarily about the financing questions. Lots of work is needed regardless – do nothing with no consequences is not an option. Agrees with the approach of building this proposal. He also thinks that the numbers provided about operation costs of the system do not pencil out, and one option would be to wait to move forward until we know more about these details.

TW – and Christine – Shore Street – 5 years

JC – Miller Street since 1977. Board member. Good friends with Tony Jantzer at IID, will ask him to come to next meeting.

BS – Wilson Street – Board member

JS – Wilson – here since 01/04. Existing system – nobody knows where stuff is. Leaks on his property. Likes this idea – a couple concerns from the report.

NS – Shore Street – 29 years. Open minded, but not totally sold because the system works just fine the way it is. "Steve Ballou" – will it drop peoples wells.

MS – Wilson Street – 1992. Carl Ritchie, who said they had an "extraordinary irrigation system". From SouthernCali to farm in Chumstick – Ecology meetings to maintain water rights at farm. Knows a good bit about water rights – needs more information. 3 year partnership with CCNR to remove barriers and support fish passage – water, fish, etc.

DD – Prowl Street – 20 year fish hatchery.

**Key issues to address and concerns:**

- DG - Shore Street – at end. He has heard from a lot of people who don't want the intake on Shore Street due to concerns about safety, noise, and aesthetic interference with the visual integrity of the area. Worried that the options presented miss opportunities for better locations.

**Action Step – Adopt a contingency that no COIC-approved plan moves forward to construction without additional approval by COIC on location of the pump station.**

- DG - Need a harder look at the operation and future replacement costs. Needs a detailed mathematical review of the project. He would like to see any operating costs remain within the \$45,000 in fees currently collected annually by COIC, within the current operations budget, and for the endowed fund to be fully allocated for replacement costs on the system. He would like additional information on the actual operating costs of the new system. Sees a \$60K--\$70k in the Alternatives Analysis, but needs a more realistic and detailed review of investment math and operating costs. Maybe costs are less, but this should be supported by more detail. There is no reserve that has been built up over time, and there is no external source of funds to pay for that. A goal would be to minimize any annual increases in operating costs over the current system.

**Action Step – Dan/COIC – provide a detailed, itemized estimate of current operating and infrastructure replacement costs**

**Action Step – COIC TAG – by end of April – come up with a budget for O and M of the proposed system, based on real world experience, that would match the current maintenance budget of \$45k/Year. Get Tony Jantzer, Dave Rice, and others to explain**

**Action Step – By the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, Greg McLaughlin or others will provide information from other projects that have real-world examples of operating costs.**

**Action Step – For the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, Dave Rice and/or Tony Jantzer (Jackie Camp to Contact) will provide additional detail on the costs of operating system.**

- TW – In general, if there are portions of the project that raise concerns, they need to be protected by the contracted agreement. We also need a better understanding of the Water Rights and how the water rights would work under the proposed agreement. Wants to get a better understanding of the trust and the water rights and how their interest works with this.
- TW – Knows there is a lot of resistance to the pump station on shore street in his neighborhood.

**Action Step – By the End of April, have a very clear list of contingencies and remedies that any preferred alternative must meet prior to agreement.**

**Action Step – Greg M to ask Ecology representative and/or Dan to ask COIC attorney to provide written review of the potential impact of the proposed alternative on the water rights.**

- DS – Want to know the impact on wells

**Action Step – Greg M and/or others to review the LNFH groundwater study to identify how COIC ditch piping would impact domestic wells.**

- JS – Also agrees with the necessity to protect the water rights.
- JS – Stated that he notes the difference in Alternatives 1 or 2 is potential impact of fire protections. Discussion followed to clarify that original concerns were for forest fire protection rather than domestic fire protection. Can loss of fire protection from the open ditch be mitigated by valves? In the discussion, one member of the TAG said that their discussion with Leavenworth Fire Department indicated that COIC system is not needed for domestic fire protection. There was less certainty about whether it was needed for USFS forest fire protection. Greg M said that the system could easily add gate and valve systems to allow tie in with USFW fire protection efforts if needed, and that pressurized water at each property would further help for fire prevention.

**Action Step – Greg M to Contact USFS to invite them to share with COIC about their needs for the COIC system.**

- NS – Location for new intake. Shore Street might be the best possible location for the diversion. Other pump houses along there are not that intrusive. Maribel Marsten owns that property – good deep hole. Good access, county property. Other spots – right over the dam. Or past the Wilson near Fromm’s Property. **Action step listed above.**
- NS – Wants projections for how much replacement costs are under the current system. What are the projections for what needs to be done. Pencil out the costs of doing nothing, and propose an alternative plan for COIC-funded system maintenance. **Action step listed above.**
- DG – we need additional information on replacement costs for the existing system– Dave Reyfield – his idea on what needs to be replaced and when – Everything between ditch and icicle on cemetery and east Leavenworth – Prowell and Wilson needs replacement.

**Action Step – Dan and/or COIC board to work with DG and Reyfield to identify long-term costs of maintaining/replacing the current irrigation infrastructure as a “do nothing option”.**

- DD – He said the previous estimates for the COIC Drum Screen replacement are \$300,000 and that it’s possible that COIC’s portion of the LNFH intake rebuild would be 20%+ (11.9 cfs/54 cfs) of a multi-million dollar construction project, and that the timelines for completion is sometime in the next 10 years. He also said siting of pump station was an important issue, but that LNFH would be up for working with COIC on this.

**Action Step – include potential COIC’s share of LNFH intake rebuild and fish screen in the “do nothing option”, but include as an unknown (not certain) cost item per Norm’s comment below.**

- NS – Has lot of questions about whether LNFH is responsible for maintaining the system to COIC, and that maybe the costs for the drum screen and intake should be LNFH’s because of the previous agreements.
- MS – We need to continue to understand how the water rights will fit into the project, and that they will be protected – wants to talk to Tony J at IID about direct experience.
- MS – ½ share – rates could be increased in any case. We can raise rates without any trouble. She would be happy to pay more. Wants a presentation from IID. Intake location is important – a lot of people don’t want it in their back yard. The bridge over the Wenatchee near where people park their cars – **Action step listed above.**
- NS – Interception of runoff on the ditch. **Action step listed above as part of the report on the groundwater study.**