RECLANATION *Managing Water in the West* **Yakima Storage Study- Fisheries**

Assessment

Joel Hubble June 15, 2006 Ellensburg, Washington



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation



•Improve fish habitat by restoring the flow regimes of the Yakima and Naches Rivers to more closely resemble the natural (unregulated) hydrograph.

•Improve the water supply for proratable irrigation water rights in dry years by providing not less than 70% irrigation water supply during dry years at diversions subject to proration.

•Meet future municipal water supply needs by maintaining a full municipal water supply for existing users and providing additional surface water supply for population growth to the year 2050.

Introduction

Current (no action) Operation Alternative = the way the river is currently operated following the guidelines of the Interim Comprehensive Operating Plan (November 2002).

Integrated 70% Operation Alternative = Bumping Lake enlargement, Keechelus-to-Kachess and Wymer reservoir alternatives were operated in an integrated manner.

The irrigation object was to provide a 70% minimum of the prorated entitlements.

The fisheries object was to improve the overall Yakima basin flow regime.



Bumping Lake enlargement



Keechelus-to-Kachess pipeline





The Riverware Hydrology Model:



CADSWES The Center for Advanced Decision Support for Water and Environmental Systems

•Provides a daily time-step of average river flow for several gage sites.

•A 23 year period of record (1981-2003) was used for each river discharge simulation.

The Indicator of Hydrologic Alterations Model:

Conservancy.

ECLAMATI

•Parameters used in the analysis:

- 1) median monthly flow (cfs)
- 2) annual 1, 3, 7, 30, 90 day minimum & maximum flow (cfs)
- 3) period (month) of peak & base flow.



Yakima River Basin Storage Alternatives Appraisal Assessment

A component of Yakima River Basin Water Storage Feasibility Study, Washington Technical Series No. TS-YSS-8



Bumping Lake

Wymer Damsite

Keechelus-to-Kachess Pipeline



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation Pacific Northwest Region

May 2006



Results

•7 river reaches were evaluated using the Riverware Model based on the following gage stations:

- Keechelus
- Easton
- Umtanum
- Bumping Dam
- > Cliffdell
- Naches at Naches
- > Parker

Keechelus



ECLAM

Δ

Keechelus gage:

•Flow regime was slightly improved.

- ≻Increase in the median April flow.
- > Decrease in the median July and August flow.

Easton



ECLAN

Easton gage:

•Flow regime remained essentially the same.

Umtanum



CLAN

Umtanum gage:

•Flow regime remained essentially the same.

Bumping



Bumping Dam gage:

•Flow regime was substantially altered.

- ➤Spring flows significantly reduced.
- Summer flows increased and created a "flip-flop" event.
- ≻Winter flows reduced.

Cliffdell



Cliffdell gage:

•Flow regime became less normative.

- ≻Spring flows decreased.
- Summer flows increased and created a "flip-flop" event.

Naches at Naches



L,A

Naches at Naches gage:

- •Flow regime less normative.
 - ≻Spring flows decreased.
 - Summer flows increased and "flip-flop" continued to persist.

Parker



ECLAM

Parker gage:

•Flow regime remained essentially the same.

- ➤March and June flows were slightly lower.
- Summer flows were somewhat higher.



Results

•5 river reaches were evaluated using the IHA Model based on the following gage stations:

- Easton •
- Umtanum •
- Bumping Dam •
- ➢Naches at Naches ●
- ➢ Parker ₀

Summary of hydrologic flow parameters comparing the integrated 70% operation scenario relative to the current operation scenario.

	Parameter	Easton	Umtanum	Bumping	Naches at Naches	Parker
Monthly Seasonal Flows	Spring	No Change	No Change	Worse	No Change	No Change
	Summer	No Change	No Change	No Change	Worse	No Change
	Fall	No Change	No Change	Worse	No Change	No Change
	Winter	No Change	No Change	Worse	No Change	No Change
Minimum & Maximum Flows	Minimum	No Change	Worse	Worse	Better	No Change
	Maximum	No Change	No Change	47% Worse & 47% Better	Worse	Worse
Peak & Base Timing						
	Peak Flow	No Change	No Change	Worse	No Change	No Change
	Base Flow	No Change	No Change	Worse	Worse	No Change

Edit View Insert Selection Tools Window Help

Easton Habitat Model: YKFP acclimation site to I-90 crossing





Edit View Insert Selec	tion <u>T</u> ools <u>W</u> indow	<u>H</u> elp						
Q XX XX 🕅 🥥	🗭 🔺 🖏 🗮 🖨	M ≟ ≸)>	Tools Pro 💌 📗	188	🗄 🗄 • 🚯			
🖻 🖬 🎒 👗 🖻	®× ∞ ∝	+ 1:14,424	- 🧟 💰	🍓 🗖 🕅				
	E 🕞 🕞 100%				1			
×	11	CONSTRUCTION OF	Se Neg	No.		Contraction Contraction		
🛛 e250_n 🔼	le la	C		1. S. A. C. C. S.		Shift The State	A COL	
2 e500_n	1-au	N. T.	Service .		500 cfs	simulation	States -	
] e700_n	4 ~	1 mg	and an and	and a state of the		ennalation	CTA HALLER	
	han	F		Head 3		ALL TRAD	AP Patrona	- Lane
_ e1100			10.00		1. 1. 1. 1.	A State Show		
	1	J m				XI. Seal	The Constant of the second	
	State of the second							
] e1500_i			Low	230	The second	and the second second		100
] e1750_i	. At alla	a the second second	Report	AL	C. COMPERS			
	the is the		Read	517		Sec. 15.25	o the	145
	Miller B			UP (~	(main)	AN D	24
_ e2000_i _ e250_2i				R	A		er of	3000
] e250_21	a the first			- <u>\}}</u>	1	R Contraction	5 A	S
sym	Star Part	7. A.S. (P	Card and	10	20		F 1	- C
ide side		(10)	A. A.			and Charles		
		States and the second			J			
				The second	1-19-1		10 million (1990)	
Selection	2114	The t		and the	and the first of			
ving 🔻 🕨 🖓 🖓		- Arial	→ 10	• B / U	J A - 3 -			
				-				
	a may may may a		I Taxarta I					
Editor	Task: Create New	reature	I larget:]		<u> </u>		1016 22 East	
						14/3023.09 099	TOTO, 23 FEEL	





Edit View Insert Selection Tools Window Help			
Q ;;; ;: 🕅 🌒 🖛 🛸 🖗 🕨 🖨 🚣 🐔	XTools Pro 👻 📗 🥒 🐼	🗄 🗄 = 🚯	
😂 🖬 🎒 👗 🖻 🛍 🗙 🗠 🗠 🚸 1:14,424	💽 🛒 🔕 🖸 🕅	2	
	eo		
e250_n		S - The second	No.
		1100 cfs simulation	
	Provide States		Martin Martin
e1100_r		15.23 B. 2 1 1 1	The Par
			1 Parts Street and
		A starter and	
	20130	Course of the Course	the state of the
] e2000 r			and
■ =2000 µ	208		Nº D
e250_21	Sector Selfer		A. C.
e250_21			JA V
side	In the	S.S.	1 lance
ide side	and a state of		
	-	The second second	
Selection	X I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		
ving 🗸 📐 🖓 🖓 🗖 🕇 🗛 🕇 🖾 🚺 Arial	▼ 10 ▼ B Z	<u>u</u> <u>A</u> • <u>A</u> • <u>•</u> •	
「ヨート」/名見参臣を口の			
Editor Task: Create New Feature	Target:		
		1479742.92 6	89508.73 Feet

Next: Develop a habitat to river discharge regression equation for each EDT (Ecosystem Diagnosis & Treatment) habitat type.

RECLAMATIO

Example of Habitat to flow regression

Habitat Model Status:

>2-D models complete for Easton, Ellensburg and lower Naches.

>2-D Union Gap model nearly completed (run simulations being conducted).

≻2-D Wapato model is scheduled for completion by year's end.

Next step complete GSI habitat amount to flow analysis and build the habitat-flow regression equations.

Incorporate the habitat-flow regression equations into the Data Management Model (DMM).

HEC-RAS (1-D) Model Status:

Study Reaches: Easton Reach; Town Dam to Wilson Creek; Roza dam to Prosser dam; Chandler Power Plant reach and Tieton River to Naches River confluence.

≻ Field survey work completed.

>Model construction scheduled for completion by fall.

Temperature Model Status:

- ➢ Focus on the Roza Dam to Prosser Dam reach.
- >Data collection continuing through fall 2006.

Draft model nearly completed and will be updated after the 2006 field season.

Sediment (SIAM) Model Status:

> Field sampling and gravel analysis completed in 2005.

>Awaiting completion of the HEC-RAS model to proceed.

