PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 *of* CHELAN COUNTY
P.O. Box 1231, Wenatchee, WA 98807-1231 • 327 N. Wenatchee Ave., Wenatchee, WA 98801
(509) 663-8121 • Toll free 1-888-663-8121 • www.chelanpud.org

Rocky Reach Meeting Minutes

To: Distribution List

From: Gene Yow

Subject: Erosion Working Group Issues

Date: May 8, 2003

Location: Engineering Services Conference Room, Chelan PUD Headquarters, Wenatchee, Washington

Attendees: Joe Kastenholz, US Forest Service (USFS)
Joe Rumble, Monitor Community Council (Monitor)
Gene Yow, Chelan PUD (PUD)
Chris Hall, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

Meeting Purpose

To reach consensus on what protection, mitigation, and enhancement (PME) measures are appropriate and acceptable for the Project to undertake. These are outlined below, along with some details that were mentioned in relation to each.

The meeting started with introductions since Chris (WDFW) was new to the group and had not previously met Joe R (Monitor).

Demonstration Projects

The first proposed PME measure discussed would take the form of demonstration projects to illustrate and explain permissible erosion control methods currently favored by WDFW and Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE). For an initial cost estimate, Gene (PUD) had assumed four sites, each about 100 ft long, with a sign to explain the method(s) used at each area. The anticipated cost for this was about $115K. Signs, including replacement signs to cover the 50-year license term, would cost about $80K.

Chris (WDFW) pointed out that it would be important to pick sites that vary in type and treatment to show how to address problems, for example, on steep, high banks as well as on gently sloping banks. One important type of site to address may be a gentle slope with a lawn being undercut, since that fits a pattern observed at several erosion sites around the reservoir. Chris (WDFW) said she understands such erosion is not so much an effect of the Project as it is a result of development and people wanting lawns down to the water. A key idea for addressing such sites was to show how sedges and other native vegetation, possibly with some large woody debris (LWD), could be used to stabilize the area at the water's edge without resorting to "hard" fixes such as riprap or rock walls.

The time frame for selecting sites and preparing demonstration projects would be spread over the first 10 to 15 years of the license. Chris (WDFW) suggested that taking several years to find appropriate sites would be fine as long as it is known that the work is in progress and will get done.

Joe K. (USFS) suggested that the amount of "traffic" at a site should be taken into account in picking sites and that it might be worth considering doing some of the work at heavily used parks on the Rock Island reservoir, simply because more people would see them.

Chris (WDFW) suggested that signs would not have to exhaustively explain what was done at a site, but could include links to Web sites or other contact information that would allow people to follow up and learn more. That would allow us to simplify the signs while still giving access to all the relevant details.

Joe R. (Monitor) suggested that more than one technique could be included on a single site. This might make better use of funds while illustrating a greater range of repair techniques.

Erosion Monitoring

The second PME measure discussed was monitoring shoreline erosion over the new license term. This could be done by updating the erosion inventory at 20-year intervals, using the methods in the initial study plan.

Chris (WDFW) suggested reviewing shoreline erosion after large flow events, rather than strictly according to a schedule. For example, the review could be scheduled to be done every 20 years, or sooner in the event of a 100-year or 500-year flood event. A review after a flood would "reset" the normal interval for updating the inventory. The appropriate magnitude of flow used would have to be evaluated. Joe K. (USFS) suggested it might also make sense to do more frequent reviews in areas affected by more localized events such as large thunderstorms.

The other suggestion made was to select representative sites for more frequent monitoring and to measure erosion rate at those sites. This would require setting up reference monuments so that measurements could be made repeatedly in the same location.

Information Distribution

The third PME measure discussed consists of assisting landowners by distributing information on erosion control. The information could be similar to that presented at demonstration projects, including links to useful Web sites and other contact information which landowners could use to obtain helpful information on permissible techniques and the permitting process.

Ways to successfully distribute the information could include:

- Send information to landowners with erosion sites after events that cause significant erosion on their property. This could be done as part of updating the erosion inventory.
- Send information to developers working along the reservoir, encouraging them to include necessary erosion control work in their development plans.
- Place information at places where landowners must go to get building permits.
- Work with the customer service and "retail" groups within Chelan and Douglas PUDs so people trying to obtain new electrical service along the reservoir are given information.

Other Issues Discussed

Sedimentation and reclaiming riprap were mentioned in letters for WDFW and WDOE regarding the preliminary draft environmental assessment (PDEA).

Chris (WDFW) noted that she didn't see sediment as a water quality issue, but wondered how much more enters the river due to the Project and where it accumulates in the reservoir. Chris (WDFW) wondered if sediment is perhaps deposited at the dam or at some deep spot in the reservoir upstream of the dam. By filling spaces between rocks on the river bed, finer sediments could change the available habitat. She would like to know what sediments are present, including gradations. Also, she would like to know what pesticides the sediments may contain.

Gene (PUD) pointed out that a strong argument could be made that, since Project development, less sediment enters the reservoir because the lower flow velocity along the shoreline picks up less. Also, there is evidence that very

little sediment accumulates in the reservoir. For example, there is no significant sediment buildup at either the Rocky Reach powerhouse or the spillway.

With respect to riprap or rock walls, Chris (WDFW) thought it would be appropriate to evaluate ways to "reclaim" riprap in some way that would make it more beneficial as habitat. This could include starting plants among the rocks or anchoring LWD on top of the rocks. It could also include replacing the rock with some other type of repair, but this is likely to prove impractical. Chris (WDFW) suggested that the PUD consider what locations are available in this regard.

Gene (PUD) noted that most of the riprap along the reservoir does not belong to Chelan PUD, so it would not be within our authority to make changes in it. It was suggested that any riprap owned by the PUD could be evaluated to see if there is a feasible way to improve its habitat value. Gene (PUD) also suggested that if a feasible approach is developed, it could be included as one of the demonstration projects.

The group briefly discussed our goals. The items mentioned include:

- minimize shoreline erosion,
- address erosion,
- protect ratepayers,
- practice good stewardship and efficiency by spending funds wisely
- assist with education and/or erosion awareness
- repair or control erosion on PUD land

Action Items

- ✓ Gene agreed to draft meeting minutes and descriptions of the PME measures for review by the rest of the group. At that time we can arrange another meeting, if needed.

Reference materials are posted on the Web site, www.chelanpud.org/rr_relicense. Please contact Rosana Sokolowski, (888) 663-8121, Extension 4175, if hard copies are required.

- ✓ Sign-up Sheet
- ✓ Distribution List