1. **Introductions, Opening Remarks, Agenda Review (9:00 a.m. to 9:10 a.m.)**

Attendance - See Attachment A. Note some agenda items were moved around to accommodate late start due to poor weather. Ray spoke about the preliminary water availability and reliability analysis indicating a shortage of water in the Walla Walla basin to fill a reservoir option. Ray supports some short of exchange to have the best chance of long-term success.

2. **Project Pairing Group Update (Work Product, Approach), (9:10 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.)**

Dan provided an overview of the planning process, flowchart, project pairing workflow and considerations. Also, reviewed the current meeting objective and to select a flow alternative to advance (along with the other alternative) into environmental review. Brain W. also gave a background of the project, need for broad public support, to advance the overall process.

3. **Funding Discussion (2:00 p.m. to 2:20 p.m.)**

Brain W. gave an update on the Bureau of Reclamation grant, including the need to formalize the Steering Committee for grant management, facilitation, and implementation. Brian also gave an overview of the Pine Creek Reservoir scope of work and award. A discussion followed on how to proceed with the Pine Creek project without a vetted water availability analysis and accounting of senior water rights and peak environmental flows. There was broad consensus in the group on the importance and Brain W. will work to modify scope of work to include the availability analysis.

4. **Climate Change Update (1:30 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.)**

Steven P. gave a presentation on the Integrated Water Flow Model (IWFM) used to determine the water balance of the alluvial aquifer in the Walla Walla basin. The model was used to establish a baseline and climate change (50-year) scenarios. Results indicate precipitation will increase with significant increases in temperature (first half of year). In addition, ET, Agricultural Water Demand, and Total Water Applied increases. This will place additional stress on groundwater to meet increased demand and flow at most main-stem management points and tributaries will decrease. The Flow Study will also include summaries of other climate change modeling, including OCR’s Columbia River Supply and Demand Forecast.

5. **Discussion of Alternatives by Steering Committee (9:45 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.)**

An overview of project pairing process, including the short- and long-term stream flow goals and criteria.
Anton presented on the modeling on defining the flow deficient and timing from Walla Walla gaging station data which was compared to flow targets and summarized in a water balance spreadsheet in two week increments. This model was used to evaluate five alternatives.


Brian and Chris both comment on project pairing analysis, including the need to use the basin’s groundwater – surface water model to further refine alternative effectiveness and secondary down-basin results.

Judith expressed concerns about flow assumptions, especially in Mill and Yellow Creeks. Gary better explained some of the background assumptions.

A detailed review of each alternative package was then discussed (see Attachment C – Package Summary Forms), including project component and comparison of project criteria, including capital and annual O&M cost. Significant discussion occurred over funding and cost burden of O&M.

**Working Lunch Break (Pizza/Vegies Provided, or bring your own) (11:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.)**

**Finalize Discussion of Alternatives (Acceptable Short Term Data Gaps, Preliminary Voting, Timing and Process for Leadership/Governmental Actions, Flow Study) (12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.)**

Dan reviewed the flow study objectives and the integrity of the overall project with respect to the adopting the hybrid target flows. Vote taken (all green) and motion carried to adopt the hybrid target flows.

Teresa asked about the protected voluntary bypass flows (25 or 12 cfs) and if they were included in the baseline condition. About 13.1 cfs is currently protected; 3.92 cfs inchoate, including 5.394 cfs from Hudson Bay. This numbers have been characterized by the TWG. The protected flow was not accounted for in the spreadsheet water model, and would be considered an escalator is flow predictions. To summarize: if water is protected, it is in the baseline. If it is not protected water and there is discretion, the water is not part of the baseline, but could be a part of a future project.

Anton will provide updated accounting by email for group consensus.

**Legal TWG Update (1:45 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.)**

Chris M gave an update on developing a legal scope of work. Ecology and OWRD have since had a discussion, and Chris now recommends not proceeding with the scope until the Ecology/OWRD

Guy Gregory – WA and OR agencies meet to discuss trust water issues, including similarities/differences between state water law. Next step: potential MOU between the states on
how they work together on this (and other) projects. Identified actions that could be taken that would not require statutory change, but need to confirm with attorneys. Telemetry will be key, along with sharing of data (groundwater). The agencies will again meet after legislative session and see if they can advance a pilot project. Mike Ladd – Reiterated Guy’s comments. The agencies will require monitoring and staff to make a pilot project successful.

Outline Timing to Complete Flow Study (GANTT chart critical paths, subcontractor assignments, Reclamation Water Planning process, future meetings) (2:20 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.)

Additional funding discussion on what is the most appropriate use of the remaining funds. Legal is no longer necessary. Additional projects include:
- Alternative groundwater modeling
- Identifying telemetry needs on tributaries and diversions
- Additional facilitating/reporting needs
- Additional storage study to address availability analysis, including environmental flow requirements.

Vote taken to fund the following: Total Modeling (8k), Telemetry (2k), Facilitation (5k), Availability (5k). All green.

In addition, an alternative should be developed that includes a reservoir and a Columbia River pump exchange to increase reliability. This alternative could have ESA issues with straying of Steelhead.

In the end, it was group consensus that an additional alternative (Alternative No. 6) should be developed to increase reliability of a reservoir (i.e., pump exchange to Alternative No. 5).

CTUIR proposed to advance certain components and flexibility in the packaging of these components into a more informed, preferred single alternative, based on the outcome of the studies outlined.

Near the conclusion of the meeting, an informal poll was taken on preferred alternative(s). The vast majority of the group preferred a storage based solution. Additional support for a storage based solution with projects (pump exchange) to increase reliability during period of low water availability. The major concern with a pump exchange based alternative was the ongoing funding burden of annual O&M.

Dan’s closing observations:
- Expense. If not least expensive, then there will be critics. Expense of each project will then be scrutinized and the group must be prepared;
- Lots of storage advocates inside room; some anti-storage advocates outside room, which creates a need for justification of in-basin storage as a preferred alternative; and
- There is a lot of history represented in the room. During environmental review, new voices will emerge with new ideas and skepticism of pre-cooked alternatives. We’re doing our diligence now and our goal is to lay out a scientifically-supportable argument for the alternatives presented.
Proposal to add Washington Water Trust to Steering Committee (2:45 p.m. to 2:55 p.m.)

Susan Adams gave a brief introduction and overview of Washington Water Trust and examples of work around the state. After some discussion on voting members, including local vs. regional entities, it was concluded that WWT would be an advisory member for now, and reevaluate under the Reclamation process.

Roundtable, Next Steps, Closing Remarks (2:55 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.).

Another meeting is needed before a formal vote on the flow package is possible (target mid to late April). Guy will allow money to be moved around and a reasonable time extension to accommodate an additional meeting.