DRAFT - WALLA WALLA BASIN INTEGRATED FLOW ENHANCEMENT STUDY

PRELIMINARY PROJECT PROPOSAL TEMPLATE

1. Title:	**2. Proposal Preparer(s):**
On Farm efficiency within WWRID	**Brian Wolcott**

3. Project Status: *Identify whether the proposed project is a past, ongoing or new project and briefly explain the status of the project, including the requested role of the Flow Study in further consideration of the project. If past project, some of the questions below may not be applicable.*

a. NEW PROJECT b. ON-GOING PROJECT X c. PAST PROJECT

4. General Description of Proposal: *Identify the category(s) and briefly explain the proposed project (e.g. location, infrastructure requirements, maintenance requirements, connection to other new, ongoing or past projects, other stakeholders, various sizing or phasing, etc.).*

X a. Water Conservation & Infrastructure □ b. Aquifer Recharge & Aquifer Storage and Recovery
□ c. Surface – Groundwater Source Switch d. Surface Water Storage □ e. Pump Exchange
□ f. Water Right Transactions □ g. Point of Diversion Transfers □ h. Other

This irrigation efficiency project improved water quality, temperature, and ESA fish passage and habitat issues. OWEB funding $141,198, BPA $231,494. Property owners cost shared projects on a 50/50 basis, typically doing, or paying for, pipe and sprinkler installation, with grant funds paying for materials. On some of the farms, temporary water storage reservoirs were installed, and some small lateral ditches were piped, such as the Lydell Ditch, Lefore/Stiles Ditch, Scudder/Baird Ditch, Rand Ditch, Carter Ditch, Arnzen Ditch, and Lana Ditch.

On Farm (within WWRID) conserved water

CW 7 Marvin Sams 1999 Approved	.0233 cfs
CW 11 Vern Rodighiero Approved	0.0349 cfs
CW 15 Betty Anspach Approved?? 79.96?? gpm =	0.17816 cfs
CW 45 Leibbrand Approved	0.335 cfs
CW 27 Brown & Sons 2003 on admin hold remapping 319.72 gpm =	0.712388 cfs
CW 32 Sam Lefore on admin hold re mapping 101 gpm =	0.225 cfs
Total	1.307 cfs (0.23636 approved)

5. Source of Produced Water: *Mark all applicable and identify (water right number, shallow or deep basalt aquifer, stream name).*

X a. Existing Water Right

□ b. Groundwater

X c. Surface Water

□ d. Other

6. Quantity/Timing/Location of Produced Water Instream: *Estimate average amount of water, when and where. Can project be considered at various sizes(flow outputs) and/or considered in phases?*

a. Acre-feet and/or Cubic-feet-per-second:

1.307 CFS March 1 through October 31 each year. Milton-Freewater (Cemetery Bridge at RM 45.7)

b. Timeframe(s):

Spring Summer Fall

c. Stream Reach Location(s):

Milton-Freewater/Nursery Bridge

d. UNKNOWN - Need more work (engineering/design/modeling, etc.) to estimate potential instream flow outputs of project. Will results of this work be concluded within one year to inform potential project flow outputs? Describe additional work needed and cost estimate.

No additional work needed.

7. Ability to Protect Produced Water Instream: *Briefly explain how the produced water will be quantified, monitored and protected instream or why it is not currently protectable.*

□ a. YES - protection under existing regulations expected to WW River mouth or in limited reach?

□ b. NO or X c. UNKNOWN – Results and implementation of flow protection study likely necessary to ensure flow protection.

Protection is unknown. Much of the saved water has senior dates (pre-1900)

8. Cost Estimates: *Provide known and estimated costs to develop and implement the project.*

a. Project Development and Design:
Project completed.

b. Project Construction:
$

c. Construction cost per AF and/or CFS:
$/CFS and $/acre foot based on total water conserved
$/cfs based on actual portion of water rights transferred to instream through Conserved Water Program

$/CFS.

d. Project Annual O&M:
$0 public (WWRID will cover O&M as part of their annual operations)

□ c. UNKNOWN - Need final engineering/design work to estimate costs

9. Secured Costs: *Has any funding been secured in the past or currently and what is source?*
Project completed
10. Other Potential Project Advantages: *In addition to helping address flow targets and basin-wide flow issues (Endangered Species Act, Tribal Water Rights, Clean Water Act, etc.), briefly explain other potential benefits (e.g. reduced O&M costs, restores/mimics ecological processes, cropping flexibility,)*
Reduced O&M costs. Pumping costs reduced for farms lower on the pipeline. Eliminated a fish passage problem at the Milton Ditch Diversion.
11. Other Potential Project Disadvantages: *Briefly explain potential drawbacks of the proposal (e.g. reduced GW supply - recharge mitigation need, increased O&M costs, legal implications)*
Reduced GW supply requires recharge mitigation from existing and planned sites. Some of the upper Milton Ditch water users have struggled to find an alternate water source.
12. Estimated Time Frame to Implement Project?
Project completed