

110
ENTIAT WATERSHED PLANNING UNIT MEETING
Entiat Grange Hall, Entiat, WA
April 1, 2009

Meeting Attendance: See Attendance List (**Attachment #1**)
See for detailed Agenda (**Attachment #2**)
Facilitator / Watershed Coordinator: Mike Rickel
Notes: Nada Wentz

Welcome / Introductions

Mike Rickel began the meeting at 9:10 a.m., asked if everyone was able to access the online minutes and attachments, thanked those in attendance, and started introductions.

Housekeeping Items – Mike Rickel

January 2009 EWPU Minutes: The January 2009 minutes were accepted as written.

April 2009 Agenda: The Agenda stands as written.

New Business: No new business.

Water Resources

(Decision Point 1)

(Attachment 3: Water Quality Sub-Committee – Draft Plan of Work)

(Attachment 4: Water Quantity – Draft Plan of Work)

(Attachment 5: Listings)

Water Quality Status Based on Ecology's 303 (d) List

Dave Holland: 3FD listings, nothing to be concerned about, get off state website. 4C listing for ISF, and 5B listing, 4B listing is for temperatures. See better on the website.

They are going by section line now. Not categorizing the whole river now. Category 1's is doing well.

Mike R: 4B is pollution plan in place.

(Attach 6: Focus on 2008 WQ Assessment)

Dave H: Handed out the Focus sheet by Ecology.

Phil A: How did DOE come up with 4C listing? I'm curious how they did that.

Dave H: Everything that includes the Columbia River and backs up to the Entiat River.

Phil A: It does go up to the section line?

Dave H: You can go to where the listing came from on website. There is a monitoring station there. It is a listing for pH.

Dave H: Are there any other questions?

Mike R: The listing of great concern for me is the pH level.

Dave H: Contaminates are not the concern. They are considered good for that perimeter.

Mike R: Category 1 is okay, category 2 is water of concern.

Phil A: The Planning unit encouraged the monitoring for pH excursions beyond the criteria.

Dave H: Phosphorous in the stream. A non point, I don't think they will want to do the work for the little amount of information.

Mike R: EPA accepted DOE's information and rational to continue the 4b designation for the Entiat River.

Dave H: Entiat has implemented and things look good. It will make it easier to get the 4B next time around.

Rick E: We should have a report sometime this summer.

John M: You said Entiat is looking good. The actions taken are to reduce the depth ratio. Those are typically done with salmon recovery funds, or BOR buy off funds, or Trib funds. Are there ways for the Planning Unit to access clean water funds, or assist with ongoing monitoring projects or help the CCD to plan the annual materials to document these implementations?

Dave H: Yes, there are funds available for active projects. There are funds available for water quality, administration costs for preparing reports, and maybe centennial grants. Are there any fish and water quality needs due by April 8 (which is short notice)? Guidance is unclear as to what they want. There are some other things out that are water quality and fish related. We can't give a straight answer, guidelines are not clear yet.

John M: Centennial, can you help the CCD with that?

Dave H: Ryan Andersen would be the best contact. I can advocate for you on that. Money is getting tight all around. Are there any other questions?

Status of Modeling of Entiat Basin Assessment of Gaged Flows

(Attachment 7a: WRIA 46 Entiat Stations Draft)

(Attachment 7b: Gage Priority Sheet)

Dave H: Gages (more reports were handed out) need to have adjustments made for prioritization. Question asked is, “Why do you need so many gages?” We keep giving them the same answer. On the WRIA 46 Entiat Stations Draft I handed out, the last page is reoriented packaging to show a priority column and a gage column, what the EWPU priority is, and the origin of the gage. I want to submit this to DOE one last time.

(Attachment 8: Stream Gaging Questionnaire)

On 13th of April, Brett Hopkins became involved with gaging workgroup with DOE. He will be in Wenatchee at 1:00. We would like folks from the Planning unit to be there, and make a questionnaire.

Mike R: My sense was the priority will not change with the questionnaire?

Dave H: No, there will be no changes. It does not have in it the GSA species. We have broadened it now to include our issues. Submit any association information that will help with the decision process. We have a good case for support to get the gages we ask for.

Mike R: My sense was that it captures the same information, just a different format.

Dave H: Yes. I don't know how they will judge the decision points.

Mike R: Items 3 and 5 will be flip flopped, as one change made before submission.

Dave H: We want to put our prioritizations in their hands.

Mike R: It was interesting to me to see the BPA funds put the gages in the water. How much per year to run a gage?

Rich M: \$12,000 per telemetry.

John M: And \$2500 per year for keeping it up.

Mike R: Any objection for Decision 1?

John M: Who's maintaining the gages?

Dave H: These are just the DOE gages.

Dave H: The other question that will come up: if DOE is not able to fund the O&M, can someone else fund it? A question on the questionnaire, would the EWPU be able to pick up the maintenance for these? DOE's gage budget has been cut way back.

Rich M: Have these 3 gages been taken out?

Phil A: Those three have been taken out and decommissioned. I would like to discuss the gages that are being dropped; Potato, Tommy and Pope Creeks. What are the next rounds of cuts? We know we have to lose some gages. I suggest that the remainder; Preston, Stormy and Mud be removed from active to historical category. We are attracting unwanted attention. Staff gage only be cut. Keep real time gages in operation. Get DOE webmaster to go into the map and update.

Dave H: If there are ways the EWPU can work with DOE to operate and maintain the gages, maybe we can come together to negotiate more gages than what we already have. I think it has been one year, not two. There is real value in staffing it, more than most basins.

Phil A: Third step. Entiat assessment of gaged flows; in looking at Paul Pickett' records – he did a lot of good work. His recommendation of a bigger model that would work better but he is not going there. The regression model that he has worked with is River mile 21, Dill Creek. That would be the third recommendation.

1. Ask the state to drop the already decommissioned sites from the map;
2. Decommission 3 remaining staff gages (Mud, Stormy, Preston);
3. Incorporate regression model at Dill creek. Accept Paul Pickett's recommendation.

John M: Centennial grant.

Rich M: If we decommission those gages, where is the data going to go?

Phil A: The data would be archived on the website, but would not continue to include CCD data without funding.

Mike R: The CCD is to maintain the gages by whatever means we can.

Rich M: All that work in the Stillwater is important.

Phil A: The gage there is too close to the other gages but it is in the best place to have gage work done. It is important to the engineers and hydrologists doing work in that area. Keep the Dill creek as a real time gage. That gage does have the best correlation.

Mike R: Is there any other discussion?

Phil A: We do have a meeting set up, Monday April 13th at 1:00, downtown DOE #4, to prioritize 3 and 5.

John M: For the purpose of testing the regression model in Dill Creek.

Dave H: I would help Mike in implementing.

D-1 **Is there any objection to the proposed recommendation being forwarded to Ecology on behalf of the EWPU? (NO OBJECTIONS)**

Status of Entiat River Change Applications

Mike R: Taylor Horne has all the change applications in place now, and he will process and finalize them. Some newer ones were submitted in December. His recommendation to folks putting them in is to go to Conservancy board. Taylor will finish those, but budget cuts means his position will no longer be available.

John M: Has Taylor done work on regulatory water rights that would affect the reserve?

Dave H: No. The intent was to go to the next step.

John M: The first step was to have a staff person assigned to do change applications. The other two tasks were not started.

Dave H: The position was set up to do those, but the position got a very late start.

Rich M: We are almost done with all but two landowners and he will be done with the KW-HD changes.

Dave H: Those Taylor has worked on. Give him a call and ask him. There were one or two landowners with multiple changes. The Wenatchee will help take over some of the slack.

Mike R: We will take this up at the July meeting.

Dave H: The water resource program was the hardest hit with the funding cuts.

Mike R: We will have a report on that that at the July meeting.

Entiat River Pesticide Monitoring Study

Phil A: WSDA takes samples at Keystone, 27 weeks out of the year. This is a 3 year preliminary study; the Entiat looked good in 2007 and 2008. Of the 50 some known farming pesticides, only 2 were found. Good news for the Entiat.

Mike R: How does the Entiat rate compared to other monitored streams?

Dave H: I don't know. Typically with studies for any parameter, Entiat looks very good. It is consistently at the low end of listings.

Jon Small: Trying to stop the three year studies. If you are talking minute amounts, they will try to get that off the chart.

Mike R: Brender is such a small flow; the amounts found would seem to be a larger content than it is.

Jon Small: Growers will quit using it next year anyway, and farmers are required to have a cap on it. Endosulfan is used to kill pear psylla, but can't be used near the water.

Phil A: The timing of this and monitoring times can make a difference. When the press gets data, they put it in a neat little box. Everyone is participating on a voluntary basis – let's keep it as voluntary.

The Final Storage Assessment Report

(Attachment 9: Golder Associates – Work Plan for Groundwater Monitoring Spring 2009)

Mike R: The draft final report is available for review. If any one has comments please provide them to me within 10 days and they will be forwarded to Golder for inclusion into the final report. As you likely recall the work done to date to evaluate possible water storage sites are all cost prohibitive (costs outweigh the benefit)

Jon Small: Is the fire storage part incorporated in this?

Phil A: It was not included in this report.

Jon Small: We still need a bigger system to of storage sites for fire fighting efforts. The funding is not there. We've tried a couple of different ways with the Forest service, but it is not developed yet.

Mike R: The fire district would still like to pursue this. Has an application been submitted to do that?

Jon Small: I don't think so, I think it was dropped.

Mike R: I will work through the CCD to follow up and work with you on that.

The contract with Golder expires in June of 2009. They show Ground water may be a viable means of storage but the volume is likely limited. That is contained as a planned work to be completed from now until June. The CCD will carry it out should they have funding, which will complete the contract with Golder. Are there any questions?

Entiat Water Exchange/Banking Update

(Attachment 10: Water Exchange/Bank Survey)

Aaron P: In January - February we worked with CCD and EWPU on a survey. We were successful in receiving feedback. The intention is to follow up with another letter to the landowner to get more feedback. There were 3 or 4 points that people agreed on. We want to use the water in the best possible way. We were encouraged by the response and intend to take the results to the subcommittee.

Mike R: We had a tremendous response. People want to keep their water rights and they are willing to share with neighbors. We want to have a follow up letter explaining what the results were, further explain what we can and can't do, and what the next steps will be.

Aaron P: The bill has gone through the Senate and is sitting in House of Representatives now. Washington Rivers Conservancy is pushing for this water banking bill to be allowed statewide.

Mike R: It looks to be driven by the landowners. The landowners do not want an outside entity to run their water rights.

John M: It is not just a good idea, it is the law.

Karl P: Some of the questions didn't get answered at the water exchange bank.

Aaron P: People are asking for more information. We need to have a follow-up meeting and explain it further.

Mike R: We definitely need to have public meeting and explain it further. We will have an update on this at the July meeting.

Jon Small: The question for the exchange was the focus. We talk about water trust and banking all the time. It needs to be a part of the plan. We don't need to utilize the information as a part of this.

Ray S: It is water right preservation.

Mike R: To maintain water rights for the water right holder.

Jon Small: The work being done for outreach could be used to provide information for water trust and rights. Keep it at the forefront.

Mike R: Make sure that it is focused on in the letter.

Aaron P: If anyone needs a copy, let me know.

Mike R: We are working with the steering committee and will bring it to July meeting.

Habitat Farming Enterprise Program: IRIS

(Attachment 11: HFEP power point)

Nancy W: This project started in this room with regulations for buffers and pesticides, habitat, and habitat farming instead of trees. I have the feasibility study report and can provide it to Mike. The feasibility study combined conserving soil, water, growing habitat, prioritizing and paying for it. We hope to bring some successful people to come and help with the planning. After a feasibility study we tried to get grants. Two places did not work out. We succeeded in talking with Chelan County. With money from Chelan County, we found a contractor to define a scope of work and develop a model. We want to get some real numbers to see what it will cost. It contains data on this region and from this watershed to be used as a tool in the tool box. Ideally it will provide another option to the current Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) program called the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) which was set up for row crops of wheat rather than fruit trees as the rental rates are too low to justify farmers to take out trees for riparian vegetation.

Design a new incentive program that would serve the growers in the high value riparian areas.

The report we got, were \$20,000/acre for cherries and pears. This report is not the whole picture. It does not consider water storage and banking. It provides us with something to move forward with tree fruit growers. We would like to look at some property in the Entiat Valley to try some of these ideas on farms and residential areas, and share with the Wenatchee watershed too, showing the feasibility.

We are trying to schedule a meeting with landowners to look at this plan, and see if people want to move forward with it. If interested, then we want to pursue a couple of grants, and have a person come in with a concentrated eye towards funding. We would start with two short term grants to focus on a business model. The next step would be, assuming we want to continue, an advisory group meeting to bring in some of the success stories from around the country. And then, generate support from potential funders. When we contacted the Montana Research, they came back with some recommendations. Take a look at the report. It is a valuable piece to look at.

Dave H: Will that be sent out?

Mike R: We will get out.

Phil A: Put it on the website.

Dave H: What about Shoreline mitigation plans?

Nancy: Have you been talking about that at the city meetings?

Don Olin: We have not talked about that yet. The whole planning unit is going full tilt on everything, but has not focused on that.

Dave H: It may not work as well in Entiat as in Wenatchee.

Nancy: The potential beauty is there are some fundamental pieces that can be adapted to Entiat.

Tom G: You mentioned SRFB application. There are other programs out there. New need to get the appraisers involved. This envisions mostly riparian, with the lower Entiat flood plain and restoration, how does that work out in the picture?

Nancy: It would be a site specific thing for appraisals. One recommendation is zoning, putting it into a rating system. What we are looking at is to ask for funding to basically do outreach for further development. We could reach out to the whole upper Columbia. We are not just looking at Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) we are looking at diverse funding groups.

Tom G: As we do other things with project implementation schedules, you might be able to include, side channels, easements, and instream structures as part of the value. There are multiple things that can be done for habitat.

Nancy: One thing as a next step is to do this master plan for a few representative properties.

Tom G: You mentioned treefruit landowners, what about non treefruit landowners?

Nancy: You are data rich. It is good to look at how this program can leverage habitat programs. Use this as a community tool. Keep the farmers on their land, provide habitat helps, as in innovative crops, tourism crops, fishing crops. There are other crops to enhance. We are looking at a whole system, agriculture system and business.

John M: Are you looking to include a request for an outreach part, or a master planning piece? Or, are you looking at other funding sources for the master plan. You talked about water scale, regional scale and state wide scale.

Nancy: Want to start small and show success, then we work it to a larger scale. Wenatchee is interested in the low and high elevations.

John M: Sounds like the NCW area. Is there interest in the Okanogan area, or the Yakima area? They have questions as well. DOE has done remuneration in Yakima valley. There is other documentation that may help as well.

Nancy: There is documentation of exploring other options, covered in this report. It shouldn't be a big deal to employ it in other areas. Use it in NCW as a model, then move it on out to other areas. It will take a few years. Once implemented, it could have some good impacts. It will take some development.

Ray S: Make sure everyone understands what this is, and is not. We have come up with this idea, keeping landowners on their land as opposed to development in other ways. We are hoping to develop habitat. We need to have a study site, to provide study and data gathering. It provides information to see if it is good to implement. At the next habitat farming work group meeting – since we have several remunerations to work around – we want to take this information and share it with other landowners in other areas give them opportunity to see how it can apply and work for other areas. It is not just a monetary help. Look at how the title to property is held. If it is a Living Trust, how these things affect it as well. To get broad acceptance of this, we need a larger exposure of this. We don't want get ahead of ourselves in funding and implementation before we have acceptance of the program. There are things yet to be explored. As you look at the report, remember that it is a work in progress.

Nancy: Thank you, Ray, John and Jim, for working with the team in this report. John accessed other data from other tree fruit growers in a different region. Before this is posted on the website, make sure the appendices do not have all the data. Want to make sure it is okay to post it.

Ray: Some appendices are not needed as it contains personal data that should not be on website.

Nancy: Want to make sure it does not divulge confidential data.

Mike R: Send out sooner than later, and give out meeting date time and place.

Nancy: We really want the landowners at this meeting. If you don't doodle back, I'll be calling.

Habitat:

Project Summary

(Attachment 12: Habitat Projects)

Mike R: Rather than go through the projects, we are giving out a handout. If there are any questions, contact Rich or myself.

Rich M: Phylisha is looking for new project for Fish and Wildlife services. We have funding. If you know of anyone looking for assistance let us know.

Rich is leaving us in a couple weeks, going to St. Petersburg, Florida, and working with NOAA.

Ray S: I appreciate what you have done Rich. You are a tremendous asset to the CCD.

Jim Small: I quite agree, he's kept his cool and helped the landowners. Thank you!

Ray: I recommend a letter of appreciation to Rich be prepared from the EWPU.

Mike R: We will look for more opportunities to show appreciation to Rich.

Status of Public Access Map

Mike R: This was not pursued as permission for fishing season was not yet clear. We have not made progress. The finalized Annual Report is out. Look for the access map in July meeting.

Ray S: The final draft will be in July?

Mike R: It will be at the July meeting.

Ray S: Parking is a big contingent.

Mike R: I will work closely with you folks on the maps and access points.

Rich M: Can you contact the Chelan City with parking signs?

Craig Eaton: If the fishing opens up in May, we may need something before the July meeting. Can we have something before then?

Mike R: Hearing that, I will commit to getting that out early in May so you have that answer.

Craig E: It may open up before July.

Ray S: Have 'No Fishing from the Bridge' and 'No parking' signs.

Mike R: Okay, signs for bridge.

ISEMP: Effectiveness Monitoring & Entiat IMW

John M: The Entiat IMW project is moving forward with evaluating how it could be implemented. Key items to be addressed were identified. If we continue to move along with a couple restoration projects here, a couple projects there, it will take a very long time to determine, through the current monitoring, if the work that is being done is actually doing what we expect. ISEMP and IMW are evaluating a couple of experimental designs. There are different ways of implementing habitat restoration projects through timing and intensity of monitoring to get the results we are looking for. We are looking for an alternative proposal to take back to the habitat subcommittee at the July meeting, and form a condensed version of that alternative plan to be brought to the July 1 EWPU meeting. This proposal will likely suggest increasing the number of projects implemented in a shorter time frame in order to detect a biological response through the current ISEMP monitoring. There were institutional challenges preventing us from moving forward in a timely manner with funding, permitting, etc. We have made great strides, but more work is to be done. This is a very daunting challenge coordinating monitoring and implementation in the Entiat. Endangered species, and other implementations to proving we are doing something. Phil, many of you have helped with this.

Derek VM: It is important to be able to do this in the EWPU. It is not appropriate in all watersheds, but it is here.

Mike R: We want to position ourselves to do these things. Are there any other discussions on this? As wrap up then, the Entiat IMW proposal will be brought to the Entiat habitat SC for consideration and a recommendation will be brought to the EWPU at the July 1st meeting for action.

5 Year Management Plan for the Entiat National Fish Hatchery

(Attachment 13a: 5 Year Plan)

Mike R: I now turn the meeting over to Corky Broaddus and Craig Eaton.

Craig E: I am a manager at the Entiat Hatchery. Corky is from Leavenworth.

(Attachment 13b: Strategic Plan for EWPU - Power Point)

(Attachment 13c: USFW Questionnaire)

Corky B: Self assessment, how are we doing as partners? What can we do more of?

Craig E: We came up with 7 focus areas. Is there feedback for partnership?

John M: Fish & Wildlife has been with EWPU since the beginning, and continues to be an important part of the group.

Craig E: The 2009-2013 plan Emphasis Area will be based on the some of the feedback from these questions.
Climate Change: addressing impacts to Aquatic Resource
Supporting State Wildlife Action Plans
Implementations of Hatchery Review Team Recommendations
Connecting People with Nature (Kids fishing pond for kids in community.)
Leading or Engaging in Native Fish and Habitat Restoration Initiatives.
Ensuring Federal Agency Mitigation Responsibilities are met.

Rich M: Thank you for being so cooperative with the rocks and the other things CCD needed. F&WL have been there.

Derek VM: Recommendations, what are discussions on Habitat scientific research?

Craig E: HSRG came with information on that for our hatchery review team.

Last 8 months met with BOR, BEF, BPA, Colville Tribe, and Yakama nation. What is the best species to raise at Entiat? We wanted to have a fishery here in the Entiat – which narrowed the ideas. Look at what the mitigation responsibilities are – to raise a fish we can catch. The two species left are Coho and spring Chinook. What is the timing when the least fish come up river? By the time Coho get here, they will be pretty battered. Summer Chinook salmon is what Entiat Hatchery is shooting for. Trying to find out what permits are needed. Will summer Chinook affect native fish in the area? In the study last year, samples of dead fish bodies were collected to see if these salmon are any different than what is found in the Columbia. If they are not on the endangered species – that is what will be reported to the State. We hope to do a small run of 100,000 salmon. Coming up this fall, we will get some eggs from Wells dam and bring them to Entiat and raise them here. By 2010, we hope to go into full production. Will have answer to that then.

Also, help the Yakama Nation raise the Coho, take eggs to Entiat and raise them to a few inches. We are going to raise around 240,000 Coho for the Yakama Nation. Coho did well in river water, summer Chinook didn't do well. We may be raising Coho.

Another program HSRG, have a Kelt reconditioning steelhead. Steelheads are trout. The Tribe wants to collect steelhead, take them to Yakama, rear them by feeding them 3 weeks to 3 months, get the reserves built back up and release them at Bonneville.

There are a lot of plans, just nothing happening yet.

Tom G: Will we be raising Coho?

Craig E: This will be the last year. If the eggs are taken from summer Chinook this fall we will have nothing to show.

Mike R: Handouts mail back or hand back today. Or email.

Corky B: If looking for report, go to fws.gov

Craig E: If there are any questions, stop in.

12:00 p.m. BREAK FOR LUNCH

Meeting resumed at 1:00 p.m.

Bonneville Environmental Foundation Agreement Status (BEF)

(Decision Point 2)

(Attachment 14: BEF Email Follow Up)

Todd R: Review history of vision between partnerships:

BEF agrees to provide support for up to 10 years.

Todd R: Reading from paper. The question before us is: how are EWPU & BEF to systematically continue the funding of this vision?

Mike R: My understanding is an annual plan for work of outreach.

Todd R: What resources make a strategy to put this money where it will be most beneficial in the future?

Is there feedback, now or down the road?

Mike R: The four points you speak of are the bullet points.

Derek VM: Bullets 3 & 4; important area for EWPU. I look at BEF funds in helping in 3 & 4, both in getting word out of what has been done, and what does it mean towards recovery. That requires information on two levels, on the Entiat and the Columbia. It is very critical that folks in each of the basins be able to have the information and be able to help us out. I see 3 & 4 being critical to keeping the momentum going forward.

Todd R: That is how many see it. If 3 and 4 are areas that can be improved on, what other developments can be made to enhance and improve 3 & 4?

Derek VM: The larger communication network, we are working on institutionalizing a trial this fall to get the scientific information out. We should be in a good position to plug into that.

Mike R: the fall workshop is a matter of getting that information to the landowners. I am asking the landowners here, what is the best means to get info out? Why they should continue to support and care about the work going on?

Todd R: Scientist to landowners / stakeholders how to get the information out?

2. How to circulate this information?

Mike R: Tactics?

Jon Small: Still not getting people to come to the meetings, so that may not be the best.

Mike R: Meetings may not be the best method.

John M: Something requested, is mailing the best way?

Jon Small: Mailings get ignored. Maybe deliver them differently.

John M: The annual report template was to set up something that would be able to carry around and look at. Phil, do you feel you have a product that you can carry around with you now?

Phil A: I still need that thing to carry around with me to give to people. The Annual Report is that thing. It may not be all the way there yet, but it is a start. After all the years of talking about it, it is now complete; we will mail it out and pass it out. It is designed to do just that, inform, invite, and inspire participation from landowners.

John M: The strategic question is: what can we do to evaluate, if in fact it is doing that?

Phil A: A way for landowners to listen to their neighbors and report back to us. How we capture the response from the community is not determined yet, but needs to be tracked somehow.

Mike R: Define a way to track feedback on what John gets, or Phil.

John M: A way talked about before, if it is in a plan between BEF and CCD, what is next? Next came out to be an annual scientific workshop for landowners state of the watershed session. Have a BBQ and celebrate the success of the last year. Phil and Todd would pull information from there and bring it back to the landowner. Tell the landowners what the scientists are seeing. Ask them how they thing the EWPU is doing. What do they want to see happening? We had intended to set this up. Possibly set up an award to hand to the landowner that is supporting the EWPU.

Mike R: What was initially envisioned, annual BBQ, community event after the scientific review and present their findings with the community, and see what the community thinks. I like the face to face idea of enhancing partnerships. I think this is very worthwhile tactic to pursue.

Todd R: I'm not here to second guess. That sounds like a good idea.

Mike R: One of several ways to include in next planning. Workshops were included in that matrix.

Todd R: One more questions, I don't have a good sense of this. A question, if you have an annual event, or report, are those connected to personalities?

John M: We want to hear your response to people who interact with folks, are you anticipating that people will receive that in the mail and wonder what the report means and why?

Jon Small: The community is aware of what is going on. The annual report would be something they receive and look at. It would not be a surprise as we have talked about it for 15 years.

Hal Hawley: BBQ is not as effective as what is going on with firemen's, Entiat Days in June, come up with 4 or 5 more things already on the calendar. During those events we could be there with free balloons and the report, and answers. We'd reach more people.

Mike R: I like that.

Hal H: There is a swallow festival coming, we could get their attention for a while.

John M: Hal's suggestion is good, so if there are 6 to 8 existing community events, it may be better to engage the ones existing, then to get one single minded event and hope they come to it.

Mike R: Because most of these events occur in the evening, I am willing to attend, but in-between is what I'm concerned about. It would be good to have the same face before them to bring the same message. We are lacking in that area for now.

Todd R: What about hiring a person full time that would be with the people every day, bringing up the work being done, getting the people to respond. Want to step back and consider all the options before we jump in with this. What that person could accomplish with this idea.

Rich M: That was Sarah's position before she left, and with that empty space, the WRIA funding is also going to be gone. Where will the funding come from if the BEF funding would not support that one person to live and be in with the people of Entiat?

Mike R: The Yakama Nation is interested in EWPU support. Maybe some of that would help. The funding would potentially be there. What else would we look to be accomplished in that position?

John M: To Don, John and Hal, there is a lot going on in the Entiat, you guys get information about that through the meetings, talking with Phil, Mike, Rich, and Tom, folks involved in the bits and pieces of it. Are there other sources of information that you have? Are there things that would help enhance the information level, and are there other ways to get other folks in Entiat involved?

Don Olin: Put something in the Entiat Leader, you will get feed back. Maybe write a monthly column.

Hal H: The Entiat school district newsletter is another option. They have a section for community news. Gives dates and times. I would look at this annual report as something to hand out a little at a time - over a 12 months period. If you put out information that people have an opinion on, they will comment on it. We could get a paragraph in it.

Don O: And they do read them.

Mike R: Seems like a reasonable way to get the word out.

Jon Small: I think it would be good to get it out in a one time blanket mailing, then have extra copies with us at all times, and pass them out at these functions.

John M: Everyone sees the strong involved land owner group.

Mike R: Empowering landowners to involve their neighbors would be one tactic.

John M: One thing that impressed me early on is that the landowners involved here are leaders within the community with the different groups. You guys are plugged in to many different smaller group outreaches.

Rich M: If you are going to empower them, take them around and teach them how to respond to the community.

Phil A: It would be better to gather the feed back from the landowners. Is there a way to track hits on the website, and hits to the Entiat portion of the website?

John M: Should we have a slot on the July planning unit meeting where landowners have a say as to how many landowners they have talked to and what they are saying? (To tell us what is working and not working.)

Hal H: Whoever shows up can share for 10 minutes, every 3 months. That way it is a little bit all the time, and keeps it going.

Mike R: To be fair to the Landowner Steering Committee, explain what we are hoping to track – share their concerns for the community – hear what they are saying. Provide them tools to be interactive.

Rich M: I think it would work. Have those representatives at the school district PTA's, divide it out more definitively?

Phil A: Keep it focused on watershed business. Maybe a subcommittee should spread out to other small groups.

Rich M: The dedicated Entiat person to go to all the meetings and bring it to the EWPU meeting.

Phil A: With the CCD maxed out in work load, and now a member leaving, it makes more sense to hire someone as a designated person.

John M: Water resource exchange water banking; from the survey letter, Washington Rivers Conservancy. A lot of people knew what was going on, and second appreciated the value of water to fish. People are aware of what is going on, and care. How to continue to inspire, invite, engage and inform.

Rich M: About a 30% response?

Mike R: Nearly a 50% return from respondents. Are you aware of the Entiat watershed plan? I'm guessing 80% are aware. We touched on 4 or 5 ways to do just that. So I place a lot of value on that, and help in answering #3 and part of #4.

Todd R: It accomplished what we hoped. From my end, I will follow up with you and consider how this should go forward. Come to common agreement on what action to be taken in 2009 and 2010.

Mike R: I would like to broaden that to include the steering committee.

Todd R: I couldn't hear all. What about the capacity and the support?

Mike R: There are some of both.

Derek VM: Our board is very interested into plugging into that form/idea. They were already funded by March. Recent conversations have been around how to step up and fund that. I don't think our board would be interested in funding that position. But the roll they would play would be to help find funds. That is the level of the conversation right now.

Mike R: Upper Columbia Recovery Board has been supportive of my role.

Phil A: Right now, it is not a good expectation for the CCD to take on this role. Where will the capacity come from or belong to? The CCD, the forest service, the planning unit, can't do it. Who can the individual belong to for a paid position? Nothing has popped to the forefront.

John M: A non-profit economical way to do so, a government place to be grant driven. Maybe it is time now to look into that.

Phil A: Has the IMW feasibility grappled with it, or has a recommendation?

John M: It is bigger than the fish and habitat. This goes beyond the fish and habitat realm. IMW has an interest. I actually think it would be irresponsible for the IMW and ISEMP to push their way on the Entiat. IMW and ISEMP should be expected to be partners.

Phil A: Has IMW come up with any ideas on how do handle this idea, without being particularly responsible?

John M: They are working on it, but nothing now.

Derek VM: I think you have dug up a nugget to research on.

Phil A: Create the ground work for us to hire a person and take on these responsibilities.

John M: Chelan County said at the January meeting that they were actively looking into this. That would be a good thing to follow up on.

Derek VM: I would encourage you to look into this, and think it would be timelier to not go through the legislature.

Mike R: The CCD board thinks highly of the EWPU considerations.

D-2 **Is there any objection to the Conservation District refining the Draft Plan of Work with interested EWPU members and having that serve as the basis of a new contract with BEF? (NO OBJECTIONS)**

Mike R: Todd, thank you for hanging in there for this discussion. Some good ideas have come from this. It certainly produced more ideas than I anticipated. Looking forward to working with you on Thursday afternoon at 1:30.

Entiat Watershed Annual Report

Mike R: Wanted to make sure and hand this out to people. They will be going out to every box holder, mail box and post office box. These will be sent out early next week. I will report back at the July meeting how many calls I get on this.

John M: Is there a PDF version of this available on the website?

Derek VM: Send me the link, and I will send it to all the teams.

Mike R: Any other thoughts on who else should be included?

Phil A: Include Dave Holland.

Rich M: How about the Tributary funds, Priest Rapids, and Rocky Reach?

Derek VM: Chamber of Commerce, City Hall, and real estate offices are other places to distribute copies.

Phil A: Send me about 20-30 so I can have some at the front office.

Mike R: Hal, any thoughts of other groups to send this out hard copy to?

Hal H: Council members.

Mike R: Is there any other discussion?

Rich M: You did a good job.

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update (USCRB)

(Attachment 15: Citizen Update Publication)

Derek VM: Our Board does a small part to uphold the salmon recovery. We went to WA DC. The folks in DC are pleased with the actions going on here. We spent a lot of time with decision makers in Congress. There again, by and large a very supportive delegation. The congress is dealing with a lot financial issues right now, so endangered species is still on the radar.

The other part on the economic stimulus funds, funds were going through NOAA fisheries. We have 5 projects going through the governor's office right now. If we move through that process, then it will go on to the NOAA office. The Governor has a mandate to produce a report on what is going on in Washington State. There are extra copies on the table.

Mike R: It is on the back table and it reflects a long laundry list of projects that could take place in the Entiat. I don't know that the CCD can do all this as listed in the report. This will be used to shop for funds to implement these projects, should everything line up.

Derek VM: This is what has been implemented and what we hope to implement. It will be available on our website.

Rich M: We need to remove all persons names, all formal names need to be removed. Personal names need to be removed. General names may be used example: Keystone Canyon is okay, Keystone Ranch is not.

Derek VM: It is encouraging to see the work between partners. I'm happy to see that.

Jon Small: The MacKenzie Ditch, have they contacted you about closing the ditch?

Phil A: Yes, they are looking for reassurance. We will spend a couple of hours talking to them, that this is voluntary, what their interests in it are, what the agencies interests are. If you want to join that meeting, you are welcome to come too.

Mike R: So anything Jon told them didn't dissuade them.

Your landowner support has helped Tom make all this happen. Thank you!

Is there any other discussion?

Jon Small: Structure in front of my house, it is frustrated to go out and see all the wash out and the rock. It has been in long enough to make a point. I think it needs to have a way to be maintained.

Rich M: This happened with Bob, we didn't get into the other three. It is something to be addressed.

Jon S: F & WL complained about woody debris. It was to be an example, I think it isn't the kind of example we want to represent.

John M: Those were put in 8 years ago. I would encourage these things be

Phil A: We have to be careful on wording. Any reason to label one a failure, and will hurt the effort to do any permits. We will keep you posted.

Rich M: Is it reasonable to say we need to check on it every 10 years.

Mike R: It is on the radar now, and we will work on it.

Jon S: There are times when the flows of the river can move those big rocks.

Rich M: Now we are doing 3 layers with bigger rocks.

Meeting Close-out And Evaluation

Mike: The next meeting is Wednesday, July 1st, 2009 at 9:00 am, in the Entiat Grange Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

***** End 04/01/09 Meeting *****

NEXT EWPU MEETING: WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 2009, 9:00 AM, ENTIAT GRANGE HALL

Standing quarterly EWPU meeting date/time – first Wednesday of every third month, 9 am (unless changed)

List of Attachments

<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Contents</u>
1 pp 1-2	Attendance List
2	Proposed Agenda for 04/01/09 EWPU meeting
3 pp 1-3	Water Quality Sub-Committee Draft Plan of Work
4 pp 1-4	Water Quantity Draft Plan of Work
5	Listings
6 pp 1-5	Focus on 2008 WQ Assessment
7 a pp 1-5	WRIA 46 Entiat Stations Draft
7 b	Gage Priority Sheet
8 pp 1-6	Stream Gaging Questionnaire
9 pp 1-2	Golder Associates - Work Plan for Groundwater Monitoring Spring 2009
10 pp 1-2	Entiat Valley Water Exchange/Bank Survey
11 pp 1-31	HFEP power point
12 pp 1-2	Habitat Projects Summary
13 a pp 1-8	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery 5 Year Plan
13 b pp 1-16	Strategic Plan for EWPU power point
13 c pp1-3	USFW Questionnaire
14	Bonneville Environmental Foundation email
15 pp 1-12	Citizen Update from UCSRB

*** Starred items are available upon request.**