

MEETING MINUTES

Trail Lake Advisory Committee Meeting

DATE: MAY 24, 2016
TIME: 1:00-3:00 PM PST
LOCATION: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION - EPHRATA FIELD OFFICE, ROOM 203
PM: SARA MILLARD (SMILLARD@USBR.GOV; 509.754.0232)
ATTENDEES:

RECLAMATION	QCBID	ECBID	SCBID	CBHP
TONI TURNER	DARVIN FALES	CRAIG SIMPSON	DAVE SOLEM	TIM CULBERTSON
SARA MILLARD	BILL STEVENS	MARK BOOKER	JJ DANZ	LARRY THOMAS
JAY HOVDE	ROGER SONNICHSEN		JOHN O'CALLAGHAN	

CONFERENCE BRIDGE INFO:

If you are at the Ephrata Field Office, please join us in Room 203. If you are unable to attend in person, or are joining remotely, please use the following conference bridge: No. 877.927.9949 Passcode: 99951581. No one joined us remotely for this meeting.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss the results of the ranking matrix. Ideally by the end of the meeting, the committee will agree with the preferred alternative selected.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

1. Review Status of Action Items from 4/26/16 (Sara)
 - a. A progress table was created and reviewed of all the action items. This will be updated regularly and reflect the progress and status of each item. At the beginning of each meeting the committee will review the action items.
 - b. Stelma Report Action Item
 - i. Presented 2007 Stelma Report – *Trail Lake Storage Reservoir Pre-Design Geologic Investigations and Seepage Evaluation*
 1. Reviewed rates of seepage (from 36 cfs in the 1940s to 5 cfs in the 1980s - no change since then).
 - ii. Action item still pending – 2014 Stelma Report
 - iii. Area/Capacity curve developed in early 2000s. Possibly might need to do another one.
2. Need to get a better handle on the seepage rates – will contact Jared Vauk from the Regional Office to discuss how his team (Geology, Drill Crew, RAS) could possibly provide support. (New Action Item)

3. Review and Approve Draft Meeting Minutes (Sara)
 - a. No comments were provided of the draft meeting minutes. If any comments arise please notify Sara by email.
4. Review of Estimates (Jay)
 - a. Pump Station
 - i. Original cost estimate used in the VE Study was \$2,550,000.
 - ii. Estimate did not reflect contingency and mobilization costs.
 - iii. Cost estimate was refined in September 2014 and the new estimated cost is \$3,400,000. Please see attached estimate.
 - b. Breach Alternative from the 2014 Value Engineering Study
 - i. Original cost estimate from the VE Study was \$2,651,000.
 - ii. Jay primarily looked at the two bridge costs and excavation costs.
 - iii. Concluded that the original VE Study estimate was a little low.
 - iv. New refined cost estimate is \$3,900,000.
5. Present and Discuss Matrix Results (Sara)
 - a. Discussed the top 3 ranked alternatives
 - i. Canal Breach – includes excavating a portion of the canal embankment to connect the lake with the canal at Sta. 324+80.
 - ii. Corrugated Metal Pipe Culverts – constructing 2 96” diameter corrugated metal pipe culverts through the embankment at Sta. 324+80.
 - iii. Breach Canal and Use Lake – abandons the canal and uses the lake to pass the water using 2 bridges to allow for access to the Bacon Tunnel outlets.

OPEN DISCUSSION

1. Open discussion on what the main problem and end goal of this project is (big picture)
 - a. Main goals:
 - i. To manage, develop and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner.
 - ii. To reduce the likelihood of damage or failure to the canal system.
 - iii. To improve reliability and the ability of the canal system to function properly and safely.
 - b. Find a solution that has the most value with the least O&M
 - c. Constrained by timeframe to do maintenance work
 - d. Everyone agrees that we need to be able to maintain access with heavy equipment to the Bacon Siphons
 - e. Discussed issue of rocks falling into the canal from rock bluffs and the possibility that it could have started the canal lining problem

2. Seepage
 - a. How much seepage loss is occurring?
 - b. More importantly, where is the seepage water going?
 - c. Does the seepage water get recovered in Potholes?
 - d. What is the value of the seepage water over time? Look at future value of water versus the current value of water
3. Trail Lake panel replacement
 - a. Approximately 3-4 panel replacements over the past 20 years
 - b. Panels are failing faster than they are being repaired
 - c. What has the budget been historically for the Trail Lake section? (New Action Item)
4. Access road alternatives
 - a. Road on River Right alternative
 - b. Steep current road alternative
 - c. Railroad grade alternative
5. Miscellaneous
 - a. How are costs split for certain options? (New Action Item)
 - b. Timeline/schedule? (New Action Item)
 - i. Will be created when alternative is decided

REVIEW ACTION ITEMS

1. Move forward on design on agreed alternative(s)

DECISIONS MADE

1. While the pump plant has its benefits, it is too costly both in the short-term and long-term to fully address the problems identified.
2. Move forward with hosting discussions with Geology staff from Boise Regional Office to determine needs for understanding seepage issues. Agreed do not want to study the issue, but rather use the information already developed to better understand where the water that seeps out of the Trail Lake area.
3. We need to maintain access to the Bacon Siphons whether it be by using the current access road or by constructing a new access road.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: 1:00-3:00 PM, TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 2016