

**110**  
**ENTIAT WATERSHED PLANNING UNIT MEETING**  
**Entiat Grange Hall, Entiat, WA**  
**January 14, 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**

**October 2008 EWPU Minutes:** The October 2008 minutes were accepted as written.

**January 2009 Agenda:** Edits to the January agenda included congratulations to Doug England for his new position on the Commissioner’s seat. Mike said if the agenda items run ahead of schedule, a few more items may be added before lunch. The modified agenda was accepted.

**New Business:**

**1. Reflecting on 2008 Accomplishments and Kick Off 2009**

**Mike Rickel:** Accomplishments for 2008 are the implementation of Watershed plans such as the Harrison Slide Channel Project and the Knapp-Wham Diversion Project, of which both saved a lot of water. The ice flows made a significant dent in some of the riparian planting areas, but this could be a good example for agencies to see first hand what ice flows are capable of. We are eagerly anticipating forward momentum with Knapp-Wham and the Below the Bridge projects in 2009.

**2. Acknowledging Karin Whitehall**

**Mike R:** Karin is very committed to the Watershed Plan, and to the implementation of it. Her retirement was January 5<sup>th</sup>. I was hoping to see her here today so we could thank her in person. She has been a tremendous supporter of the Plan.

**John Monahan:** Karin has been a quiet leader behind the scenes. She enabled access for Phil and Rick Edwards to write a lot of the Plan.

**Phil Archibald:** Tom Graham is the acting Forest Service Ranger for a few months. Bobbi Scopa will serve as Deputy Ranger and possibly report to the Chelan and Entiat Ranger Districts. Becky Heath said there are currently no plans to combine the Entiat and Chelan Ranger Stations, and both will remain open. Karin will be missed. She allowed me a long leash to research public and private lands to make the Plan for the Entiat.

**3. Honoring Jon Soest’s Contribution**

**Mike R:** Jon Soest passed away last fall from brain cancer. He was active in the Audubon Society and a strong player for the Watershed. We will miss him and acknowledge his contribution to the plan. We have a sympathy card to send to his wife, and it is here for all who wish to sign.

**John M:** Jon became involved with the Audubon Society when Marve Hoover became ill. Jon took over in Marve’s place. Both gentlemen took an academic approach to the Watershed Plan. Both were quiet, behind the scene, ‘get ‘er done’ type of people.

**Review draft Entiat Watershed Annual Report** **(D 1)**

*(Attachment #3: CCD Entiat WS Annual Report)*

**Mike R:** GeoEngineers was hired in October to create a template for the Annual Report. The template will allow room for changes as they come along.

**John M:** What we are focusing on is the general look of the report, not the content at this point. The Planning Unit’s input is important. The theme is to “Inform, Invite, and Inspire” with the hopes that this report will get the other Entiat Valley citizens involved. Phil and Mike have done an excellent job of prioritizing. There were 12 pages to deal with, but that number was bumped up to 16. This reflects a core chunk to showcase this year. Next year a different core chunk will be featured.

**John M (continued):** This report would be received in 11” x 17” format. The audience is the Planning Unit and Entiat Valley citizens. “The Entiat is doing great things, come join us” is the reasoning to invite other residents to get involved. The first page would be a showcase, and subsequent pages would carry topics such as financing, monitoring results, and landowner property currently being worked on. A lot of facts and content would be crammed in a small place.

**Mike R:** A picture of an Entiat resident with a fish caught at the mouth of the Entiat River could be the showcase for this year.

**Mike Kaputa:** Maybe the showcase project could be the top banner.

**Mike R:** We wanted to do that, but we do not currently have a photo that would highlight the Entiat as we would like. So your suggestion is to work on the banner to make it more specific.

**John M:** The colors need to be vibrant and of a high definition. This picture was selected for the header to show the letters. We welcome photos to have as a cover showcase. Maybe we should have a contest to see who can take next years “banner photo”.

**Mike R:** That is a good idea!

**John M:** We want the cover banner to reflect the whole Water Planning Unit. The second page has an aerial photo of the Entiat. Ray Sandidge was the selected landowner for this edition. The article talks about what he has worked on with the planning unit for the watershed, and about who he is and what he does. There are a lot of folks doing a lot of things in the Entiat Valley, making it difficult to choose.

**Mike K:** Are we looking for comments today, or sending it out like this?

**John M:** This is the general look of how it will appear in print.

**Ken Bevis:** Does the different color lettering have a meaning?

**John M:** The colored letters are highlighted for critical things that have happened or been accomplished.

**Dave Holland:** That looks great! I look for titles, headlines, bold print, and highlighted areas.

**John M:** The highlighted areas will give you the gist of the story, without reading through the whole thing, if that is what readers wish to do. Page three is the budget and calendar page. The budget is associated with the project by subject, with who manages the project, and the monitoring programs. We are putting pictures to the meetings of what is being accomplished. It shows which partners are in the play, the dollars spent, and the work done.

**Mike R:** Rick is one of the partners that are not reflected yet. That piece of the pie will get bigger and show more partners as we go along.

**Rich Malinowski:** You will have another pie graph to show this?

**John M:** Partners will be identified on the back cover, so they will be listed. It is difficult to get a budget list from all the partners. The template is set up to include as much content as we are able to get from the partners.

**Rich M:** Are city meetings included in the newsletter?

**Keith Vradenburg:** I will get a list of City of Entiat meetings, community events to Mike Rickel.

**Mike R:** We want to acknowledge community events and meetings in a box. Keith, please send me the list. Rich, please find out the date of the Kids Fishing Day.

**Keith V:** Are Waterfront events to be included?

**Mike R:** We are looking for feedback on the format more than the content. There will be one other opportunity for review. I hope this comes out in February.

**John M:** The next page has content unique to this report. The intent is to have a featured project. One year it would feature a toxicity study, another year it may feature the Knapp-Wham Diversion project. Another year an example might be the screen on the Harrison Side Channel with before and after photos, which agencies involved, the cost, what was done, and a map identifying where it is. Are there any questions about that layout?

**Mike K:** There is a Wenatchee World article that would be nice to be seen identifying that communities outside the Entiat community notice the work going on in the Entiat.

**John M:** There is a risk of plagiarism with copying their images and story.

**Ken B:** Maybe we should consider finding a skilled photographer with map and list of photo points to go to for seasonal images of the same place.

**Mike R:** There is value in getting a library of good photos established. That is a good suggestion. We will try to make some progress with that library idea.

**Russell Griffith:** Is this document folded in half with staples in the middle?

**John M:** Yes, here is the center page that shows everything. There are ten different bookmark size photos and a small description with general map in the center showing the whole area being worked on. It could be a water resource or water quality showcased in each edition.

**Russell G:** Are you going to make this timeless, so it will be in the report this year and next year, or keep this for historical uses?

**John M:** The idea of having this template is to use it over and over for the next ten years.

**Russell G:** It would be nice to have a record of this for history and not just have it for one year, then thrown out.

**Phil A:** This will be on the conservation Website, and archived for a long time.

**Russell G:** I want to see this keep going.

**Derek Van Marter:** Russ makes a good point. In this first report, is there anything that tells us how this came about and why; something that tells the story of why this work was done?

**Mike R:** We have a small article on the back that explains a little. Maybe not to the extent it should be explained.

**Russell G:** We want to get the word out to the community. Something for the older generation that does not have computer savvy.

**Phil A:** It will be mailed to everyone and the electronic version is saved.

**John M:** Is there any more input on this project center page?

**Ken B:** A featured article on how this planning unit got started and why, would be a good place to start.

**John M:** That was not included on one of the three pages. The Methow uses a format similar to what we are trying to set up. Additional outreach efforts would need another medium. The Methow has a calendar.

**Ken B:** Is it a two year calendar?

**Mike R:** This template will be one medium we are using. Calendars can be another medium to use for another year.

**John M:** Integrative Status Effectiveness is on the next page to go with monitoring. Compliance monitoring, pictures and text on what monitoring is will go here as well. Do you have any questions for this page?

**Rich M:** Is there any acknowledgement or thanks to the landowners included in the newsletter?

**John M:** Yes, on page eleven.

**Rich M:** Is there a list of landowners involved?

**Mike R:** That was a level we didn't intend to get detailed with.

**John M:** There may be a couple more pages of what is going on with the physical monitoring at different creeks, with water temperatures, and sediment in the past and the present.

**Mike R:** One thing I struggle to do is make this report attractive and readable and present the information needed.

**Phil A:** It is difficult to write the articles in lay persons' terms instead of technical terms. I am looking for feedback concerning understandable text.

**Ken B:** A suggestion is to make the scales and the text the same through out the document.

**John M:** On the back page, where the address of the conservation District, contacts, and partners is located; change the text to say Annual Report instead of newsletter.

**Rich M:** When can we anticipate seeing this?

**Mike R:** The final draft should be towards the end of the month. We will send out the final draft for editing and review by you folks.

**Derek V:** The thread will be the landowners' efforts?

**Mike R:** In this edition, an article is written to do that.

**D-1** **Is there any objection to the Conservation District incorporating the edits and updates from today's meeting to finalize the Annual Report, produce and mail out? (NO OBJECTIONS)**

**Derek V:** It would be good to put a tickler in the Chamber of Commerce newsletter about the report coming out.

**Keith V:** I can put a small article in the newsletter to have people watch for this.

**Mike R:** We will move the Chelan County Update item to this time slot, if everyone agrees.

### Update from Chelan County

#### **Shoreline Master Program**

**Mike K:** For the next three days the county and city are meeting to compare the existing plan and the new state requirements. The workshops will then be set up to walk through what is currently on the books and what the alternatives to addressing the new requirements will be. I'm optimistic about the permitting needs. We will be

doing a lot of outreach and workshops this year. I was thinking of using this same platform for the Entiat Valley. I don't know if this will work for the Planning Unit, but it may help. The Shoreline workshops are focused workshops.

**Mike R:** My sense would be to ask the Landowner Steering Committee to review these Shoreline Plans.

**Mike K:** This is the process so far; the county and city are to adopt this plan by the end of June 2010.

### **Watershed Planning Amendment Request**

**Mike K:** Phase 4 is in the fourth year. The existing legislature goes for five years. We are entering the fifth year. Discussion is focused on what to do about that. Do we need to suggest change for legislature to extend it for five years? What is legislature's stand for the future? How do we address the legislature on this? A challenge with the state budget is folks are not as receptive to extending the funding. There are many immediate issues to tend to. We are working with Senator Parlette on this and with the Department of Ecology (DOE) – Dave Holland. The cause is not imminent right now, but needs to be addressed soon. Mike Rickel, Dave Holland and I will talk about what is the best way to go about addressing this over the next few months.

**Mike R:** My concern is to not jeopardize the efforts of the Planning Unit. I am concerned that we will not get enough traction for this.

**Mike K:** This may not be the best year to push a significant issue with the legislature.

**John M:** What is the time line the Entiat is on? Look at the timeliness set up and make a decision to push or not accordingly. The end of eligibility for the Entiat is the priority push button.

**Mike K:** The time line we are looking at is when is the best time to propose this? I'm not sure what DOE will do or decide.

**Dave H:** February 2010 would be the fifth year. Funding for Phase 4 base funding would run out in June of 2010. Continue to request other funding to keep it going. Other options to fund need to be researched.

**Mike K:** Clearly Senator Parlette doesn't want to propose anything until everyone (partners, CCD, NRCS, DOE) is on board. We are trying to figure out if we need to get someone to sponsor it now or not. The Entiat is not critical this year, but next year it will be critical.

**Russell G:** It is a political thing to ask the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) for funding. I suggest that if we want legislative changes with Republican representatives in a Democratic House, first we need to research who the key people are in legislature that could sponsor us right now.

**Mike R:** I would agree. Finding that support, the key people interested in the Watershed Units.

**Russell G:** Convince the right people to stay in and help. Find the legislature people who will sponsor the Entiat. If it doesn't pass this year, try next year too.

**Mike R:** Is it reasonable to bring this up at the April meeting?

**Mike K:** We are working with Senator Parlette. She is trying to see who else on the Democratic side would be on line with this support. We will know in April.

**Russell G:** Maybe some of the other Watersheds may know who will give support or who we can contact.

**Phil A:** Write a letter to legislators to feel out who would support and help EWPU.

**John M:** Dave, can you restate the DOE's position?

**Dave H:** I can not speak for DOE higher ups, but my understanding is they are not opposed to this but they are not going to support anything new at this session especially. Bill Zachman would be the guy to talk to for where DOE stands right now.

**Russell G:** The question is will DOE support the plan or buck it? If they will buck it, there is no reason to ask.

**Mike K:** There is no straight forward way to deal with each Watershed group. Criteria of what DOE will support and how much support for each project would be good.

**Tom G:** Something we have not addressed is EHSB 2514. When this was passed it was a Democratic office that signed and supported it. Maybe we should find the supporters of that and get their support again.

**John M:** Most of these supporters are gone now. It would be better to go to current people.

**Mike K:** Where is the support for this? I would like to have criteria of where and how people will support this. What would the performance standard be? Because we don't have criteria, we don't know how much the budget should be before we ask for funding. The Planning Unit may need to write a letter of support. Expect to see something come out in an email telling us.

**Mike R:** My understanding is the EWPU would write a letter of support.

**Russell G:** Someone needs to write a bill. As a group we need to collectively go and write a bill to present. I suggest that Foster Creek meet with a couple people from the EWPU to get the ball rolling. Select a few people to write it and bring to the larger group.

**Mike R:** That may be the direction we take. Look for information on this item of a bill, before the April meeting.

### **Coordination with Yakama Nation**

**(D 2)**

*(Attachment #4: Letter of Support from Yakama Nation)*

**Mike R:** We are thankful for the letter of support written by the Yakama Nation, helping EWPU get closer to implementation. Thank you for the involvement you have had! The direction the Yakama Nation has taken is to work with the Habitat Subcommittee. Now I'll open this up to John or Brandon Rogers and Lee Carlson on how the Planning Unit can best support.

**Lee Carlson:** Lee introduced Brandon Rogers. Brandon works on the ground with the landowners.

**Brandon R:** The letter of support and bringing money along. If money is the struggle, we will work with groups to help find the money. You have done a good job up here with the plans. We have been fighting the money battle for a long time. A number of tribes have gotten together (the Yakama and the Colville) to bring up a known quantity number that will give us the ability to get this program on the ground. The annual business of going after the SRFB dollars every year encourages us to put together good projects that beat out the others in asking for money. What we want to do is work with the local groups to look out 2, 3, 4, and 5 years ahead with the plans. We have a known amount coming in every year. Having the promise of dollars, we find a reach – work on it / fix it, then move on to the next reach. In our memo to the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB), we identified nine areas we want to work on. The Entiat is one of the areas. Project ties are to the areas that have real biological influence. If you can work in the reaches we are working in, we will bring more money – more folks to work. We encourage the ramp up of the projects. This year, we want to get folks to look 2 and 3 years down the road. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), Steve Kolk and Jennifer, takes time to hire consultants to report to all three groups with the reach assessments, to speed up the process. If we could get the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to give us our first check – we'd be happy.

**Mike R:** So the proposal from the Planning Unit would get support from the Yakama Nation to finish the assessments?

**Lee C:** We still have annual budgeting projects. Start looking for the reach.

**Mike R:** As we continue to get the small projects picked off, your proposal of bigger projects/reaches to step up the process. I think the Planning Unit can support that.

**Lee C:** The Keystone, the Entiat River Effectiveness with John Monahan about some new projects. Those are what have been committed to so far.

**Brandon R:** The forest roads are another item.

**Rick Edwards:** Do you think you will be investing on monitoring and evaluation?

**Lee C:** I'm not sure where we are with the specific monitoring actions. I'm not sure if BPA is completely on board with that. We have not pushed too hard with that yet. It is on the list of "To Do's".

**Mike R:** Relative to the specific proposal, we want to look at reach projects.

**Ken B:** Will there be a process before things can be approved?

**Lee C:** In a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with BPA, money for 46 items is being discussed. Some things are lumped together to have maximum flexibility with projects. Some projects will be felt strongly about and funding would cover the whole project. Some projects will have partial funding, which will help with other funding agencies.

**D-2** **Is there any objection to the Planning Unit providing a letter of support to proposals being developed on behalf of the Yakama Nation that are coordinated with the Entiat Habitat Subcommittee (EHSC)?**  
**(NO OBJECTIONS)**

**Lee C:** The letter is not needed right now. We want to develop the plans and make them work. At this point, I have the money and want to influence the group to some degree. Our goal is to get the salmon back up here.

**John M:** The Lower Entiat, and around the Bridge to Bridge area, are the priority areas.

**Lee C:** The Stillwater area is the reach we want to focus on this year. Support on the Lower Entiat was an area that is important to EWPU.

**John M:** We wanted to have clarity on what the area is.

**Mike R:** Rather than write a letter of support, just show the support in the minutes.

**Ray Sandidge:** To hear the plans of the Yakama Nation opens up more light at the end of the tunnel.

## **Habitat**

*(Attachment 5: a. Water Quality Draft; b. Master Plan of Work; c. Water Quantity Draft)*

### **Draft Plan of Work / 3 Year Work Plan**

**Mike R:** What we have been requested to do is make a three year work plan to help. I don't have anything to share at this time. We will be working with the Habitat Subcommittee and have something to bring to the April meeting.

**Derek V:** Last year the plan was updated. The emphasis is on the implementation schedule with more detail to use for the next three years.

**Mike R:** The work plan is more specific; what is the work, what is the money needed, who is doing the work. Are there other questions on that item?

### **Draft Map of Existing Public Access Locations on Lower Entiat River**

*(Attachment #6: a. Lower Entiat Public Access Draft Brochure 1/14/0; b. Comment Sheet)*

**Mike R:** We decided to maintain the public access points in existence. A final draft for review will be brought to the meeting in April. The desired outcome is to make this as timeless as possible until there is a fishing season. Then we will have something that is available to the public when fishing is allowed. I would like your input.

**Ken B:** Will you be the point of contact for this?

**Mike R:** Yes. A week from today is the limit for comments. Please get them to me soon. Mike Kaputa, when do we need to get this to Amy, before your contract?

**Mike K:** My understanding is we can copy this. If you want different material to print on, or laminate it, let me know what you need.

**Mike R:** I will let you know.

**Ken B:** Let the officials and the law enforcement know about this so everyone is on the same page.

**Phil A:** Who is the primary enforcement officer?

**Ken B:** I don't know. They switched their territory.

**Phil A:** I think it is Grant.

**Russell G:** It would be good to add, 'obey the fishing license' text.

**Mike R:** We need to be stronger about the private landowner issues.

**Rich M:** We need to address parking and access issues.

**Mike R:** I'll look to you to help with that, Rich.

**John M:** Once you work out the parking here, access here, and photograph those areas and insert the photos in the brochure so it is clear to the public.

**Ray S:** Don't underestimate the problem with parking.

**Ken B:** Ownership of the river bottom needs to be addressed too. The Methow river bottom is not private ownership.

**Mike R:** From the bridge access points, it is a means to reach the river. Those details need to be made clearer. If there is no support from the landowners, they will not be included in the brochure.

**Ray S:** Parking is a big issue.

**Conard Petersen:** It is a good idea, but it will take some planning.

**Mike R:** I will work on the next draft with the County.

### **Ongoing Habitat Projects Update**

*(Attachment #7: Project Update – Rich M.)*

**Rich M:** Concrete was poured yesterday at the Knapp-Wham Fish Screen project. A couple of landowners are struggling to sign their agreements. We may have to go and re-draw the design. One well will need to be used at the Keystone, but we hope to change is over next year.

**Ray S:** If I have a concern, who do I call if Jim Small isn't the contact person anymore?

**Rich M:** I'll get that information to you. There will be less water needed, and Mike Small is probably the contact.

**Mike R:** In the interest of time, you all have the handout. If there are any questions, please contact Rich.

**Russell G:** The ice flow we had this year, was a relatively minor flow. We need to address what to plan ahead for.

**Don Olin:** A lot of trees planted last fall were lost.

**ISEMP –**

**Effectiveness monitoring**

**John M:** Pamela is not here. ISEMP supports the Entiat monitoring. Funding is still in place and moving forward. Reports are ongoing.

**IMW (draft experimental design and development process)**

**John M:** What works better rock or wood? More specific questions needing specific experimental designs that address concerns by the funding agencies are needed. We have a draft lined out.

**Ray S:** How do we make sure that we coordinate monitoring and evaluation efforts to go along with the plan? The exchange of information will be critical.

**John M:** My answer is there are multiple questions from partners, work through the Habitat Subcommittee about who does what – when – and how, is written out as a means of documentation. There has been a lot of effort in the monitoring piece. We are seeing revisions of documents to lay out the experimental design. I think the people are together on it. Through those we can get the coordination of monitoring that we need.

**Mike R:** It takes several years of data collection to get this coordinated.

**12:15 p.m. BREAK FOR LUNCH - back at 1:00 p.m.**

Meeting resumed at 1:05 p.m.

**Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update**

*(Attachment #8: a. UCSRB Update; b. Salmon Recovery Plan book\*)*

**Derek V:** At the January meeting, the Board had a public hearing and approved the implementation schedules. We received good comments from the Okanogan Farm Bureau, which I replied to. In December, the Board approved their own projects. The list of 7 projects totaled \$7 million dollars. Some match money, some BPA money. The Planning Unit members will remember from October the proposed budget for the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB). Now the governor has come out with the new budget. The dollars for salmon recovery has dropped. Pack SRFB dollars are on an annual budget. The Pack SRFB is double that of the state and for this year remains the same. We don't know about 2010. I wanted to bring to the planning Unit the Salmon Recovery Plan report from the Governor's office. This may be found online at [www.governor.wa.gov/gсро](http://www.governor.wa.gov/gсро). As we gear up, we need the corresponding dollars to make it a reality.

Funding coordination, now started with the Yakama Nation MOA, know how much and how to spend it, to work with the watershed action partners. What are we going to do, how are we going to do it, and where are the dollars coming from? The intent is to find out where people want to go. I'm hoping the UCSRB can help with the money.

**Mike R:** As projects become more complicated, is it the idea to pool funds between sub basins?

**Derek V:** I don't think that will work. Where are the greatest biological needs? That might drive a portion of the funds, but not all of the funds altogether. It is far more difficult to ebb and flow the funds. It is better to keep it going.

**Rich M:** We work with the Yakama Nation. What about the Colville Nation?

**Derek V:** Yakama Nation, yes. The Colville signs their MOA with BPA. It will be applied to the Okanogan County. That is all I have. Are there any other questions?

**Mike R:** That three year work plan will be brought to the EWPU meeting in April. We'll have a meeting in February to work that out.

**Derek V:** There is some preliminary work to be done before the February meeting. The Regional Technical Team (RTT) will have a report in February. In March and April we will have an updated implementation schedule with all the past and current projects lined out and prioritized.

**Mike R:** Are there any other questions or comments for Derek?

## Water Resources

### Water Quality Update

*(Attachment #9: Entiat Water Quality Trends - PowerPoint Presentation)*

**Rick Woodsmith:** Rick explained the graphs and pictures he is presenting from his PowerPoint. He also gave explanations of different pH measuring devices used in the Entiat, and the companies that make them.

**Paul Pickett:** When the pH levels get down to 40, the hydrolabs have trouble doing their job.

**Rick W:** Showed pictures of the ice flow in January 2009.

**Paul P:** Do ice flows like that cause bed scouring?

**Rick W:** Yes. Are there any other questions?

### Entiat River Water Exchange / Banking Update

**(D 3)**

*(Attachment #10: Landowners Guide to WA Water Rights book\*)*

**Lisa Pelly:** I would like to bring the landowners and the Planning Unit members together to discuss what Water Exchange and Banking would be. We welcome anyone who wants to participate. One of the first things to do is work on a piece to go to the public at large in Entiat. Critical issues are: who runs it; how much water to use; and the structure of the bank. I would like to get a survey out to the public and get their input. If everyone approves, then we can get it out to the public in Entiat. Water banking has not happened in the Entiat and is not likely to happen. Our organization has some specific issues regarding the language in the document.

**Mike R:** Is there an interest from the Planning Unit to do that? What Lisa is talking about is to explore the possibilities.

**Ray S:** The present law works contrary to the conservation ways. This is not an uncommon thing. That is why I asked her to address the group.

**Lisa P:** In Oregon, you can't relinquish a part of your water right. In Washington, you can. A bill was dropped yesterday that would make Washington State close to Oregon State in water rights.

**Mike R:** I'm hoping to have a meeting with the Subcommittee on the evening of January 26<sup>th</sup> to evaluate this. People who are interested, please contact me.

**Lisa P:** I want to thank you for Cascadia Conservation District's support and help.

**Mike R:** Are there any other questions or discussions? If not, we will go to the Decision Point.

### **D-3 Is there any objection to the Conservation district and Washington Rivers Conservancy updating the draft water banking / exchange survey and mailing to water right holders for feedback?**

**(NO OBJECTIONS)**

### Habitat Farming Enterprise Program Update

*( Conference Call with Bobby McCormick)*

*(Attachment #11: Entiat River HFEP - PowerPoint presentation)*

**Nancy Warner:** We will be having a Welcoming Meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup>, here in Entiat.

*(Nancy went through the slide show while Bobby gave the presentation.)*

**Nancy W:** The Status Report is available at the website: [www.ecosystemmarketplace.com](http://www.ecosystemmarketplace.com). Nancy opened the floor for comments and questions.

**Ken B:** If this is implemented, would it be implemented with IRIS or with others?

**Ray S:** This got started as a side bar discussion from growers who were impacted. Is there a way to help keep the farmer on the farm without pushing him off of his farm? There may be a way to keep streamside property in agriculture and also be a benefit to the habitat.

**Nancy W:** We did a feasibility study about three years ago. We get the final report in February.

**Ray S:** Those of you with copies, look at paragraph 5. Ray forwarded a copy to Russell Griffith, who wants to turn it over to the State tax man to get their take on it.

**Nancy W:** Do you want to say any more about that?

**Bobby M:** No. I would like to add that we cover a lot of material in the draft. I urge you to go in there and make sure it reads the way you want it to.

**Nancy W:** I think it would be good if they contact you personally.

**Bobby M:** Does anyone have ideas or criticisms?

**Don Olin:** Is this in a PDF file?

**Nancy W:** Yes. Unless anyone else has comments, I'll see you on the 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Mike R:** Thank you for your presentation. That will be a complete presentation of the idea. I will send out a meeting notice to the Planning Unit.

**Nancy W:** I will send the meeting draft to you.

**Mike R:** I will get it added as an attachment to the meeting minutes for today. And I'll get the room reserved for that meeting.

### **Status of Modeling of Entiat Basin Assessment of Gaged Flows** *(Conference call)*

*(Attachment #12: Entiat WR Modeling Draft - PowerPoint presentation)*

**Paul Pickett:** We are looking at how to model and stage flows at the stations. This report has gone through internal review. The report is not quite ready. What you see will be pretty close to what will be in the report. The graphs may change a little, but it is close.

*(PowerPoint Presentation)*

**Paul P:** There are two USDA flow gages that give timed data.

**Ray S:** Would there be a benefit of having a real time station?

**Phil A:** They are real time at the Keystone.

*(Conference call with Bill Zachman from Department of Ecology)*

**Bill Zachman:** My apologies for not being present at the meeting. The senior managers asked us to have a better way to monitor with gages. The question asked is how to get several watersheds to show a higher priority with gages. Gages help us to make stream flow rules. Other questions we are discussing are, what kind of gage infrastructure is there, and what do we need to keep maintained.

**Mike R:** What I understand you to say is that you will make recommendations as to how to proceed?

**Ray S:** What would be the impact of having the USGS gage that does not have real time ability, be converted to real time?

**Bill Z:** I defer to Paul or Dave.

**Paul P:** We can improve them a little.

**Rick E:** How would you decide whether to maintain a gage?

**Paul P:** There are different levels on the decisions.

**Dave H:** DOE recognizes that there are other uses for these gages than just flow. They provide other important information needed. If I understand you right Rick, you are asking about the gaging strategy work group on how to distribute and maintain gages around the state.

**Bill Z:** Our best deployment of our state resources. We can go into a basin and establish where ten gages go, to get the information we need to know. When that work was done, some of the gages would come out and go to a different station to help there. The highest need gets the first crack at it.

**Paul P:** Based on your needs, where do the regressions show that the gage is needed?

**Phil A:** The water quantity subcommittee made a table that shows the uses and priorities for each gage which I hope you have seen, but I have not seen it in Paul's presentation.

**Dave H:** I have not seen it.

**Paul P:** I did not put everything on this presentation for time frame reasons. Roaring Creek is a high priority for stream flow, so maybe keep it.

**Phil A:** The planning unit has learned to use the entire tool box to address technical issues, and use the best tool to do the job. In this case, real time telemetered gages that measure flow and temperature are much better tools than predictive models.

**Ray S:** If that one gage is converted / changed to make it a real time gage, would it help our case? Would we benefit from the overall benefit?

**Rick W:** It wouldn't lessen the impact of losing a gage later.

**Phil A:** Flow is big time information we need to know in order to predict the timing of spawning of ESA-listed species and perform spawning surveys accordingly.

**Dave H:** There are two pieces that we have opportunity to use. One is the more technical tool that Paul is advocating, and the second is having input for the Planning Unit to offer recommendations to the DOE to support the salmon recovery hydrological research. That recommendation would need to come out of the next Planning Unit meeting, once you find out where the ground water strategy group is going. If we still need those gages – how can we support them?

**Mike R:** Thank you, Bill, for participating by phone.

**Bill Z:** The Wenatchee and Entiat groups are some of the best.

## **Executive Summary of Storage Assessment Report and Next Steps**

*(Attachment #13: Draft Step B Storage Assessment)*

**Mike R:** The Executive Summary of Storage Assessment Report has been seen to be too costly to pursue. “Comparing the target costs to the estimated actual construction costs indicates that the costs far outweigh the ability to fund the projects using grant funding. For all three sites, the estimated costs are at least an order of magnitude higher than the current market value for storage water. It is not likely that these Entiat storage projects (large surface impoundments) would receive consideration for funding at this time without significant matching funding from outside sources. It is possible that the future dollar value for stored water could increase to the point storage reservoirs do not appear economically feasible.

Site-specific conclusions and recommendations follow:

A reservoir on Lake Creek would be infeasible primarily because of permitting difficulties associated with flooding the existing wetland complex in the upper Lake Creek Basin.

A reservoir on Preston Creek may be feasible from geotechnical and permitting perspectives, but not recommended given the size of the impoundment relative to the basin water yield, and potential land ownership issues in the bottom of the basin may complicate the permitting process.

A reservoir on Myrtle Lake is feasible from geotechnical and permitting perspectives and, despite the relatively low water yield, the project is more feasible than Preston Creek and Lake Creek because the size of the impoundment is smaller. However, a 60-foot tall impoundment is still necessary to store between 400 and 1,410 acre-feet per year. During a normal year there is approximately 810 acre-feet available for storage and this translates to about 13 cfs over a 30-day release schedule. This amount would improve August or September flows in the Entiat River by 5 to 12%. A rough construction cost estimate of \$60 million dollars translates to approximately \$74,000 per acre-foot of storage.

A reservoir on Pyramid Creek is feasible from geotechnical and permitting perspectives and, relative to all the other sites, the basin water yields are high. A 320-foot tall impoundment is necessary to store between 3,690 and 8,700 acre-feet per year. During a normal year, there is 6,310 acre-feet available for storage and this translates to 47 cfs over a 60-day release schedule. This amount would improve August and September flows in the Entiat River by 22 to 48%. A rough construction cost of \$320 million dollars translates to \$51,000 per acre-foot of storage.

All of the sites have unit costs that are much higher than the \$5,000 per acre foot figure that currently approximates the value of storage water funded by grants from Ecology.

Of the two most feasible sites, Pyramid Creek has the highest total cost (\$320 M) but the lowest unit cost (\$51,000 per AF). Further consideration of this site may be warranted if a source for matching funds could be identified and a compelling purpose and needs statement could be developed for permitting.

A final storage option that has not been investigated is groundwater storage. A “whitepaper” describing concepts and potential storage volumes is being developed and will be completed by the middle of February 2009.”

### **Meeting Close-out And Evaluation**

**Mike:** The next meeting is Wednesday, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 at 9:00 am, in the Entiat Grange Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**\*\*\* End 01/14/09 Meeting \*\*\***

**NEXT EWPU MEETING: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 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	Attendance List
2	Proposed Agenda for 01/14/09 EWPU meeting
3	CCD Entiat WS Annual Report
4	Letter of Support from Yakama Nation
5	a.) Water Quality Draft b.) Master Plan of Work c.) Water Quantity Draft
6	a.) Lower Entiat Public Access Brochure Draft b.) Comment Sheet
7	Project Update – Rich Malinowski
8	a.) Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update b.) Salmon Recovery Plan (book) *
9	Entiat Water Quality Trends (PowerPoint)
10	Landowners Guide to WA Water Rights (book) *
11	Entiat River HFEP (PowerPoint)
12	Entiat WR Modeling Draft
13	Draft Step B Storage Assessment

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