



Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee

University of Idaho PO Box 443301

Moscow, ID 83844-3301

Phone: (208) 885-6429 Fax: (208) 885-6431

pbac@uidaho.edu www.uidaho.edu/pbac

July 16, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Moscow UI Facilities Services Center, Jack's Creek Meeting Room

Attendance

	UI: Michael Holthaus, Water Systems Manager	X	WSU: Mike Leonas, Project Manager, Capital Planning & Dev.
	UI: Joe Kline, Director, Utilities and Engineering	X	WSU: Rob Corcoran, Asst Dir, Arch, Engr & Const Services
X	Moscow: Tom Scallorn, Water Dept Superintendent	X	Pullman: Mark Workman (Chair), Director of Public Works
X	Moscow: Walter Steed, City Council Member		Pullman: Art Garro, Maintenance & Operations Superintendent
X	Moscow: Les MacDonald, Director of Public Works	X	Pullman: Barney Waldrop, City Council Member
X	Latah County: Paul Kimmell (Vice- Chair), County Representative		Whitman County: Mark Storey, Director of Public Works
	Latah County: Tom Stroschein, County Commissioner		Whitman County: Michael Largent, County Commissioner
X	Colfax: Carl Thompson, City Administrator		Colfax: Andy Rogers, Public Works Supervisor

Visitors and Others

Bob Haynes, IDWR; Mandie MacDonald, Landau Associates; Kathleen Warnick; Steve Robischon, PBAC

Call to Order

Mark Workman, PBAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:03 PM.

1) Approval of the May 21, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Draft May minutes with modifications were approved by consensus.

2) Presentations – None Scheduled

3) Unfinished Business -

Potential PBAC Research Projects – Framework Project

Workman summarized project status. The draft RFP was discussed by all with modifications proposed and approved by the group. A motion was passed to accept the RFP as revised and submit it to the Palouse Conservation District for advertisement. In

addition, Pullman will send copies of the RFP via postal mail to a list of consultants Pullman and Moscow have invited to propose on recent water-related projects.

FY10 PBAC Assessment Invoices

Robischon displayed a spreadsheet illustrating amounts and contact information for FY10 invoices. The WSU research invoice includes a \$1,400 credit for work it did attempting to establish a monitoring point at the agricultural research well on Airport Road. Corcoran reported that the well had been filled with concrete, which was not discovered until after workers had pumped the well house and cut the cover plate off of the well casing. Workers will now replace the cover and inquire with WDOE about the procedures involved in formally abandoning the well.

4) New Business –

FY10 PBAC Officers –

A motion was passed to elect Paul Kimmell chair, and Mike Leonas vice-chair, for FY10.

5) PBAC Projects Progress Report –

Robischon reported students have been identified (Katie Moran for basinwide aquifer testing, and Lauren Carey for tritium testing) to conduct the research on two new projects that will start this fall. Scallorn is testing the on-off event logger devices (for use on the basinwide testing project) on the Moscow wells.

6) Citizens Advisory Group Report

Robischon reported the July CAG meeting was cancelled. The June meeting did not have a quorum, but Allyson Beall presented materials similar to those presented at the May PBAC meeting

7) Budget Report

Robischon displayed the latest update to the budget.

8) Other Reports and Announcements –

PBAC/WoW Water Resource Visioning Tool (modeling) Project Workshop

Workman and Steed summarized the June 5 workshop. The next workshop is scheduled for August 14 (Jack's Creek, 9:00 – 12:00). Workman noted that all PBAC members are welcome to attend.

Pullman/WSU Wastewater Reclamation Project

Workman reported JUB Engineers has been selected to perform the project. An initial contract scoping meeting has been held, and contracting efforts are proceeding.

Moscow Surface Water Storage Feasibility Project

Les MacDonald reported the 6 submittals received have been shortlisted (to 3 or 4), and interviews will be conducted July 23.

Moscow Comprehensive Water System Plan

MacDonald reported a contract has been prepared and the Moscow Council will consider it on first reading July 20.

Water Summit Planning

Kimmell described the draft program agenda. Associated with a proposed panel discussion related to local solutions, the group engaged in an extensive discussion related to porous pavement.

Other

Steed distributed copies of a Lewiston Tribune article related to LOID approval of an MOU to pursue funding for a project to provide water supply for Lewiston Orchards from the Clearwater River.

Robischon reported a WDOE press release was issued warning residents and visitors to be careful when recreating in the South Fork of the Palouse River (fecal coliform).

Robischon reported USGS budget cuts have resulted in reductions to ground water level monitoring efforts in Idaho. The impact on the Palouse is minimal.

Robischon reported a WDOE press release was issued announcing an emergency rule closing all (including exempt wells) new groundwater withdrawals in upper Kittitas County.

Robischon reported a thesis on uncertainty in recharge to the Wanapum aquifer has been completed by Matt Reeves (MS – Water Resources). The thesis will be posted to the PBAC web site.

Corcoran and Leonas reported details of a new irrigation system being installed at WSU. The new system utilizes irrigation controllers that communicate with a centralized weather station and adjust water delivery to match crop needs. The first phase is being completed this summer and the second phase awaits further funding.

9) Next Meeting –

The next meeting is scheduled for August 20 in Pullman.

10) Adjournment -

The meeting was adjourned at 3:36 PM.

Submitted for review and approved at the August 20, 2009 PBAC meeting.

Steve Robischon, Executive Manager

DRAFT * Request for Proposals *** DRAFT**

Palouse Ground Water Basin Framework Project

Introduction

The Palouse Conservation District (PCD) is requesting proposals on behalf of the Palouse Watershed Planning Unit and the Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee for data compilation and synthesis, and development of recommendations for further characterization of the Palouse ground water basin (the Basin) water resources.

The purpose of the project is to compile, review, and evaluate the completeness of information on the ground water resources in the Basin in anticipation of conducting a future full-scale site characterization project.

The Basin underlies an approximately 500 square mile area of eastern Washington and north central Idaho. Significant studies have been conducted in the past, but there remain gaps in the knowledge of the hydrogeology of the Basin. This project will use existing studies and information to help focus on identifying key areas in which characterization work is needed and provide planning level estimates for potential follow-up studies.

Scope of Work

Project funding will be provided by the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) and the Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee (PBAC). PBAC will function as the lead organization for the project, PCD will act as contract administrator, and WDOE will provide technical and administrative oversight. The project is divided into distinct tasks and will be conducted on a work order basis. It is anticipated that funding for this project will be contingent upon sponsoring entity fiscal year (July-June) funding allocations, and project work orders will be phased over a two year period beginning mm/dd/yyyy. It is expected that 60-80% of the work orders will be completed during the first (2009-2010) fiscal year.

A portion of work under selective tasks may be revised based on data collected in previous tasks and will be developed jointly between the selected party and PBAC. At the direction of PBAC, PCD will issue a notice to proceed or task order for each defined work task before work under each task is authorized to begin. PCD reserves the right to not proceed with any tasks under this Request for Proposals. PCD requires that the selected party identify a project manager for this work, who will reside locally or be available to travel to the Basin approximately once per quarter and present a progress report or oral presentation at a regular PBAC or Palouse Watershed Planning Unit meeting.

The project will be divided into the following five tasks.

Task 1 – Project Management

Project administration and management, including regular coordination with WA DOE, Palouse Watershed Planning Unit and PBAC on project updates, draft report review and comments, etc.

- Facilitation of project meetings and other activities.
- Quarterly progress reports to Ecology, PBAC and WRIA 34 Planning Unit.

Deliverables: Regular communication and coordination with WA DOE, Palouse Watershed Planning Unit and PBAC.

Task 2 - Compilation

Compile, in electronic format, a detailed interpretive report of all known and available previous studies related to the hydrogeology of the Basin. Compile well logs, well locations, water use, water level, geochemistry, geophysical and other appropriate data into readily accessible spreadsheet or database formats. Also compile previous researchers' conclusions with respect to the physical characteristics of the ground water basin.

Deliverables: Forty (40) hard and twenty five (25) DVD (Adobe .pdf and native file formats accessible to standard Microsoft Office 2000 products) copies containing Draft and Final interpretive Reports and compiled data. The electronic compilation will include: a database containing metadata for all compiled studies and data, full text versions of all available previous studies, well logs, a (Shapefile formatted) well dataset including basic well attributes (including an attribute that enables linking spatial locations to pertinent logs/data), water use, water level, geochemistry, geophysical and other appropriate data. The Final Report will be accompanied by a technical memorandum summarizing compilation contents and include an evaluation of the completeness of the compiled materials. The Draft Report will be made available for review and comment and any comments received will be contained in and responded to in an appendix in the Final Report.

Task 3 – Synthesis

Produce an annotated bibliography of previous studies, structural cross sections, and contour and potentiometric maps of the Basin.

Deliverables: Forty (40) hard and twenty five (25) DVD (Adobe .pdf and ESRI-compatible dataset format) copies containing annotated bibliography, cross sections, contour and potentiometric maps. Three (3) large format hard copies of cross sections, contours and potentiometric maps.

Task 4 – Data Gap Identification

Evaluate reliability and quality of existing information, and identify key areas in which data gaps exist.

Deliverables: Forty (40) hard and twenty five (25) DVD (.pdf and Office 2000 compatible) copies of Draft and Final Reports summarizing existing data, evaluating data quality and applicability to utilization in follow-on studies, identification of additional data required for complete Basin characterization, and an assessment of the potential for acquisition of proxy data or information from like study areas. Data quality information will be added to the metadata database delivered in Task 1, and an updated database will accompany the Report. Draft Reports will be made available for review and comment and any comments received will be contained in and responded to in the Final Report.

Task 5 – Conclusions and Recommendations

Develop conclusions and recommendations for necessary follow-up characterization studies, including planning level study scopes. Included will be a draft report presentation for PBAC/Watershed Planning Unit members prior to a 30 day review and comment period.

Deliverables: Forty (40) hard and twenty five (25) DVD (Adobe .pdf format) copies of Draft and Final Reports summarizing work completed in previous tasks and detailing overall conclusions and recommended planning level scope details (including degree of necessity and optimal staging strategy) for follow-on characterization studies necessary for full Basin characterization. Draft Reports will be made available for review and comment and any comments received will be contained in and responded to in the Final Report.

Proposal Requirements

Interested parties must submit ten (8) hard copies and three (3) electronic (Adobe .pdf format) copies of a proposal containing the following minimum information:

- A. A description of your firm, including work history on similar projects, and hydrogeologic experience in the Palouse Basin.
- B. A proposed approach to each task.
- C. An estimate of time required to complete each task and proposed overall project phasing.
- D. Estimated costs to complete each task.
- E. The names, qualifications (including professional geologist/hydrogeologist certification) and utilization of key personnel who will be assigned to this project.
- F. A description of project management procedures that will be used to assure adherence to the budget and delivery schedule.
- G. A description of the procedure for internal quality assurance/quality control.
- H. The name, title, address, and telephone number of individuals with authority to negotiate and execute contracts and who may be contacted during the evaluation process.

The proposal shall be limited to 15 pages, not including the cover letter, resumes of key individuals, or section dividers. To be considered for award of this work, sealed proposals must be received at the PCD offices no later than ??????. Late proposals will not be considered.

Proposals should be mailed to:

Palouse Conservation District
Attn: Framework Project
1300 NE Henley Court #6
Pullman, WA
99163

A pre-proposal conference will be held mm/dd/yy, beginning at hh:mm, at the PBAC main office (University of Idaho, Steele House, Room 110), at which time background information will be available for review and questions posed will be addressed. Individual requests for site visits/interviews outside the pre-proposal conference are discouraged during this phase of the selection process. Information requests received prior to the date of the conference will be addressed at the conference.

Special Conditions

A. **General Terms**

This request for proposals does not commit PCD to enter into an agreement, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of the proposal or subsequent negotiations, or to contract for the project. All information furnished in this request for proposals was gathered from sources deemed to be reliable. No representation or warranty is intended as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and PCD reserves the right to alter or cancel this request for proposals.

B. **Reservation of Rights by the Committee**

The issuance of this request for proposals does not constitute an agreement by PCD that any services agreement will actually be entered into by PCD. PCD expressly reserves the right to:

- Waive any immaterial defect or informality in any proposal or procedure.
- Reject any or all proposals.
- Reissue the request for proposals
- Invite additional respondents to the request for proposals.
- Complete the services contemplated by this request for proposals by any other means.
- Request additional information and data from any or all respondents.
- Extend the date for submission of proposals.
- Supplement, amend, or otherwise modify the request for proposals and cancel this request with or without the substitution of another request for proposals.

C. **Negotiation Rights**

The acceptance of a proposal and invitation to negotiate an agreement does not commit PCD to accept any or all of the terms of the proposal. Final terms of any agreement will be agreed upon during negotiations. Negotiations may be terminated for failure to reach mutually acceptable terms.

D. **Right to Disqualify**

PCD reserves the right to disqualify any respondent who fails to provide information or data requested herein or who provides inaccurate or misleading information or data. Further, PCD reserves the right to disqualify any respondent on the basis of any real or apparent conflict of interest. By responding to this request for proposals, the respondent agrees that any finding by PCD of any fact in dispute related to this request for proposals or the responses thereto shall be final and conclusive except as provided herein.

E. **Preparation Costs**

Each respondent will be responsible for all costs incurred in preparing a response to this request for proposals. All materials and documents submitted by the respondents in response to this request for proposals will become the property of PCD and will not be returned. As such, they constitute public records which may be delivered to a person making an appropriate request for public records. The selected respondent will be responsible for all costs incurred by it during negotiations.

F. **Affirmative Action Requirements**

Respondent, by submission of a response, agrees to not discriminate against any worker, employee, subcontractor, or any member of the public because of race, creed, color, religion, sex, age, marital status, national origin, sensory or physical handicap, or otherwise commit an unfair employment practice and further agrees to comply with all Federal or State equal employment opportunity requirements.

Evaluation and Selection

Selection of the party shall be based on the following evaluation criteria:

1. Capability to perform the work including party's history, areas of expertise, address of office where work will be performed, and party's commitment to provide necessary resources to perform and complete the project within the expected project time frame (150 pts);
2. Relevant project experience including similar work performed by the party and clients for which similar work has been performed during the past five years (include name and phone number for appropriate contact persons) (200 pts);
3. Qualifications of project team including experience of key personnel to be assigned to the project and subcontractors, if any, team organization, roles of key personnel, and location of assigned personnel (150 pts);
4. Project approach including how the party proposes to execute each task required to complete the scope of the work, unique aspects of the proposed approach, and alternative approaches that PCD may want to consider (200 pts);
5. Estimated cost and project management including hourly rates for all personnel proposed, breakdown of hours for each person assigned to complete Tasks I, II, III, and IV of the work, and an itemized estimate of other reimbursable costs and equipment costs, with a total cost for each task, and demonstrated ability to manage the financial and schedule aspects of the project (200 pts); and
6. Completeness of proposal (100 pts).

A pre-selected evaluation committee will review and evaluate each proposal based on consideration of those factors set forth above. The evaluation committee may request an interview with the top two finalists. An additional maximum of up to 300 pts will be awarded to each party interviewed, if interviews are conducted. Upon selection, a contract will be developed between PCD's administrative representative and the selected party.

LOID board backs Clearwater water source

Proposal has many bureaucratic hoops to jump through before becoming reality

By **ERIC BARKER**
OF THE TRIBUNE

The Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District board of directors approved a broadly outlined concept Wednesday to seek a water source from the Clearwater River.

On a six to one vote, board members adopted a memorandum of understanding that commits the district to work with the Nez Perce Tribe, city of Lewiston, Nez Perce County and the Lewiston Chamber of Commerce to prepare a package that would go to Congress for funding. If the pumping station is built some day, it would help threatened steelhead and avoid frequent summertime water shortages and rationing.

The MOU outlines replacing the district's Craie Mountain water source with 8,500 acre feet of water pumped from the Clearwater River, obtaining congressional funding to construct and operate the system and transferring the old water diversion system and associated water rights and reservoir storage rights to the Nez Perce Tribe.

According to an initial engineering study, it would cost between \$11.5 and \$19.8 million to construct the pumping station and \$481,000 to \$730,000 to operate it each year.

Board member James Raffety was the lone dissenter. Although Raffety said he supports the idea of getting LOID water from the Clearwater, he thinks the MOU gives too much to the tribe.

"We are giving the tribe a multi-million system and what are they giving us? They are going to support us verbally (when the proposal goes to Congress)," he said. "I think the MOU would have been a great idea if it had been properly written."

In 2007 the tribe sued the federal government charging its biological opinion, which said operation of the LOID system did not harm wild steelhead, was in error.

The system diverts water from Webb and Sweetwater creeks that flow into Lapwai Creek and eventually to the Clearwater, all of which are home to threatened steelhead.

A federal judge agreed, and the

parties reached a two-year settlement agreement to allow more water to stay in the creeks and to also commit to work on a long-term solution. About the same time, a citizens group led by the Lewiston Chamber of Commerce, started similar discussions between interested parties. Both efforts led to the MOU.

In addition to seeking congressional funding, the parties will seek long-term power contracts from the Bonneville Power Administration to offset pumping costs that would otherwise be passed on to LOID patrons. If the pumping station is funded and built, the parties would then pursue the transfer of the LOID water diversion system above Mann Lake, including water rights and reservoir storage rights to the tribe.

The tribe would control management of the Mann Lake fishery and could require anglers who fish there to purchase a tribal fishing license. However the tribe would not be able to restrict nontribal members from fishing at the lake unless it also restricted tribal members from fishing there.

The tribe and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game would develop an agreement to manage the fisheries at Soldier's Meadows and Waha reservoirs where either state or tribal licenses could be used.

The MOU is not legally binding, and any of the parties can drop out at any time. Many agreements still have to be completed before the proposal would go to Congress. For example, the parties will work to complete any environmental analysis that may be required under the National Environmental Policy Act. And long-term agreements spelling out how water levels and maintenance will be managed at Mann Lake will have to be worked out between the tribe, LOID and Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

Earl McGeoghegan, LOID's attorney, said LOID patrons would have to vote the proposal up or down before it moves on to Congress.

"It's not going to happen overnight," LOID manager Barney Metz said.

Barker may be contacted at atebarker@intribune.com or at (208) 848-2273.