

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

**Meeting Attendance:** See Attendance List (**Attachment #1**)  
See detailed Agenda (**Attachment #2**)  
**Facilitator / Watershed Coordinator:** Mike Rickel  
**Notes:** Heather Java and 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**

**April 2009 EWPU Minutes:** The April 2009 minutes were accepted as written

**July 2009 Agenda:** Mike Rickel stated he will make an effort to compress the agenda in order to end the meeting before lunch if attendees have need for this

**New Business:**

**Bob W.:** When do we update the watershed plan?

**Mike R.:** This year, please speak to the updates needed under the reserve tracking system.

**Bob White:** The city Marina.

**Phil A.:** We could do this now to save time.

**Bob W.:** The city is planning a marina in the watershed boundary. Could the planning unit make adjustments to allow for the marina?

**Mike R.:** How might the marina impact the watershed?

**John M.:** Management of water resources.

**Dave H.:** Shoreline Management fund. More funding.

**Mike R.:** Think actions/activities in Entiat that might be considered mitigation

**John M.:** Under minimum? Bill revision requires that planning unit be asked for consistent with watershed management plans, expansion of Entiat under watershed plan when it requires a revision

**Mike R.:** If consistent with plan. EWPU could develop a letter of support if it proves to be consistent.

**Dave H.:** Make sure consistent language is used. It may not speak for but doesn't go against plan. Not an inconsistency/

**Mike R.:** This way done before "Not inconsistent with letter"

**Dave H.:** Does it impact anything in plan like water quality or quantity?

**Phil A.:** We should request that the city does a review through CCD regarding water quality, quantity, habitat and stream flow. Then we could amend watershed plan and DIP.

**Bob W.:** Last public hearing we applied for permit, 2 years down the road if EWPU is in agreement.

**Mike R.:** Next steps . . . formal letter from city and review marina proposal.

**Ray S.:** Review from two aspects, development. It is recognized that EWPU doesn't find Entiat? You should have preformed this 2<sup>nd</sup> benefit if review if EWPU is aware, then city can use that if things can be stated in such a manner that grants/funding is consistent with watershed plan.

**Mike R.:** Based on meeting with Bob and Susan, we should write up a letter of recommendation.

**Ray S.:** EWPU can't endorse but marina is in compliance in order to line up ducks to get stimulus money for some work. Talk about watershed's contribution . . . stroke former governor. Use a backdoor effort to gain some additional support of Locke. At some point tie back to watershed that we are aware of what city is doing.

**Mike R.:** I will meet with Bob Whitehall later.

### **Water Resources:**

#### **Status of Entiat Basin Assessment of Gaged Flows and Entiat Gages**

*(Attachment 3: Ecology's Gaging Support of Gages within the Entiat Basin)*

**Dave H.:** Review the handout "Ecology's Gaging Support of Gages within the Entiat Basin"

**Tillicum Creek:** Best location to address lower range climate based change

**Roaring Creek:** Highly supported. We will keep for a while but with no long term commitments

**Mad River:** Tentative drop. The problem is with renegotiating contact, statewide.

What happens if issue with adding telemetry . . . No answer. We are hopeful that we can have but it takes awhile to address station at other USGS sites.

**Overview:** We are handing over all but three stations to EWPU if it is interested in maintaining. We need to know by next fall, at least for the ones dropped. Telemetry can be moved to other sites. EWPU to take over operations in this case. Real time monitoring on gages removed.

**Mike R.:** Review that value of those dropped sites to find and maintain funding if necessary. Explain Mad River.

**Dave H.:** Fish use not high enough to propose to maintain. In fact P.U. made them consider keeping but it is an issue of compatibility. Ongoing telemetry maintenance of USGS to pick up cost of someone else, Not a simple answer more then just Entiat in Contract

**Mike R.:** They are of high value to EWPU.

**Dave H.:** We will keep going until decision is make. Don't know how long we can continue. Should discuss maintenance.

**Mike R.** Any question or discussion points? For information not for discussion, we will consider at October meeting.

**Dave H.:** 5000\$ to start, 2,500\$ per year maintenance

### **Water Tracking:**

*(Attachment 4: Building permits and Well logs in the Entiat from September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004 to June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009)*

**Aaron P.:** Bottom line the most important report for tracking, what debits have actually occurred for 8/24 with assistance of Russ Griffith? Sort through, went to DOE and pulled

well logs. Deciphered what well uses tally water use from reserve of 5000 gallons per day debit. No specific amount. 0.6 for domestic use, line nest that actual use estimate of 380 gall or meth? 275 galloons per day and estimate 400 gallons. We are talking internally about what actually is being used.

**Mike R.:** Plan estimates, no meters installed so defaults to 5000 gal/pr day. Do we want to continue with assumed use? Is 400 good as compared to 5000?

**Dave H.:** Consumptive as compared to non consumptive?

**John M.:** Workgroup is empowered by ?, not funded and supported. I strongly recommend that 5000 gallons per day not be used as quantity. Get after this task.

**Kate T.:** What is public perception of metering?

**John M.:** This planning unit spoke in favor o metering, so yes, Ken Shoester ant DOE could speak to broader acceptance

**Dave H.:** Irrigated Agriculture is metered now, issue is domestic use and that needs to be done locally.

**Kate T.:** Personal standpoint is “the more aware, the more apt to conserve”.

**Dave H.:** Other area meters consumptive dropped after metering?

**Lisa P.:** Data is coming out of Chelan County, we should ask for volunteers.

**Bob W.:** City runs 5-8000 gallon use per household. City has meters to give out for no cost.

**Mike R.:** Tremendous. Consider lack of funding. Refine consumptive use to get more accurate measurements.

**Dave H.:** Indoor vs. Outdoor use.

**Bob W.:** Subtract summer from winter. Also consider year round or summer residence.

**Mike R.:** Couple vs. Family.

**Bob W.:** See if we get any volunteers.

**John M.:** Use same monitoring system as on pg 439 of watershed plan? Outdoor vs. indoor, on a per acreage basis. Permanent grass duty, component, or established? Probability of 35 gallons and 2.71 people per unit. So, number of units x 35 gallons x 2.71 = estimate. 5000 gallons comes from RCW 90.14 for well use of people that came back from war and want to settle. It is the statutory maximum.

**Lisa P.:** ?

**Aaron P.:** Cross section of use of exempt wells

**Dave H.:** Replacement Wells

**Aaron P.:** Pull together wells outside of WRIA, up and down the Columbia. Only Entiat doesn't include replacements.

**Lisa P.:** Number of new water rights permits establishes reserve to know where Entiat is in reserve

**Mike R.:** Obligated to refine water use, not use.

**Mike K.:** Debited against reserve. Citing since April 2004.

**Mike R.:** When was the adoption of the rule?

**John M.:** It became effective in August 2004.

**Lisa P.:** Mike Kaputo, would you speak of Chumstick volunteers?

**Mike K.:** Different, but across the basin it is similar to Entiat but more complicated. Wenatchee, 380 gallons usage background info but invested. If this is actual and develops debit/credit. We aspired to work together with Association and software with community development?

**Mike R.:** Next Steps? I offer to coordinate a steering group to coordinate refined usage number through metering.

### **5 Year Report:**

**Dave H.:** When is 5 year report due . . . 5 years from date of citing. 25/50/75% use reserve every 5 years.

**John M.:** 2010, 2015, 2020

**Mike R.:** Due 2010, between this summer and 2010.

**Phil A.:** Coming soon, think about that annual report, if we have a significant chunk in new report of water use (what we know we don't know).

**Lisa P.:** Great idea . . . metering.

**Phil A.:** In 2009 report?

**Karin W.:** Can we match the last report?

**Lisa P.:** Get everything we need in next month. What narrative is there to translate?

**Karin W.:** Aim high.

**Mike K.:** Volunteer or required? What are to follow, building permit stage or established wells at county. We should discuss how to ask/engage folks about what count want to be consistent between Wenatchee and Entiat.

**John M.:** Recommended out of the plan Section 9, page 926?, bullet 2. Planning unit is to work with willing users cross section. If it is a willing citizen based concept at time of new user ask, maybe a flyer with watershed plan subject to rule. Seeking folks to willingly install a meter. Mike you are right about being consistent. Not all new users permit know to ask DOE to do this.

### **Entiat River Water Exchange/Banking Update**

*(Attachment 5: Recommendation to EWPU Development of an Entiat Water Bank Program June 22, 2009)*

**Mike R.:** Discussion point. Evaluate citizens interest in water bank formed steering committee to initiate effort, thought it was a good idea, formed a survey to 'gage interest' and found out there is tremendous interest for local control not totally land over to ecology, handout is a feedback from survey.

**Mike K.:** Love to have Jo on this; I am interested to see how this develops.

**Mike R.:** Thoughts or next steps? What tools are needed?

**Mike K.:** in general, best interest without constraints of water bank. If it leads to water bank then great, if not. ..

**Lisa P.:** Meeting in May, spoke to fact that need to know what a water bank means. Last meeting notes submitted permit to bring money up to the Entiat and have people sit down and figure out the legal implications.

**Phil A.:** Find working water bank and invite to come here and inform public in a non threatening way.

**Mike K.:** Maybe we should not approach it from a pure watering bank perspective; it is limiting, look at leasing.

**Mike R.:** Satisfy needs of local Entiat users that fit into

**Lisa P.:** What are goals of folk's visions, values. What did folks think about this 3 or 4 years ago? Look at this when considering nest steps. My goal is to pick that paper back

up. Legal and working with DOE for exceptions to rule. Biggest hurdles are upstream transfers.

**Mike R.:** Any objection to propose and forward recommendation to DOE and moving forward?

**Dave H.:** We need clarification from DOE. Framework and aspects and purposes need to be determined. What are outcomes, what tools are there?

**Mike R.:** Comments?

**Dave H.:** I will be glad to work with the EWPU on this.

**John M.:** Even through well log. Proposed previously but needs follow through.

**Aaron P.:** People filed with planning department and DOE not both.

**Mike R.:** Flyer identified to Planning Department and DOE

**Lisa P.:** New and existing applicants.

**John M.:** Priority list of monitoring represented cross section, pumping records to gain loss elevation etc

**John S.:** Metering wastewater to develop actual use (consumptive)

**Dave H.:** Consumptive accounts for this when doing evapotranspiration measuring consumptive loss are numbers out there that should be rolled in.

**Mike R.:** I will offer to create a work group, fined report at October meeting. Thanks Aaron.

Lisa Pelly and Aaron Penvose made their apologies because they needed to leave

**Lisa P.:** Methow loved the Entiat Annual Report

**Phil A.:** We should think broadly about distribution, a lot of people like seeing it.

**Mike R.:** The first thousand went to Entiat Mailboxes and we ordered 100 more

## **Habitat**

### **Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update**

*(Attachment 6: Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board. EWPU Update July 2009)*

**James W.:** Derek sends his apologies, there was an urgent meeting. First I will speak to project funding coordination. It encompasses what we intend to do in the basin in the next couple of years. Lines up with other basins, graph shows spikes in implementation. Ideally spikes occur in different years in different basins. But that depends on the IMW. There were 18 pre-proposals submitted for approval. We completed the tours last week. 1.95 million in SRFB.

**Kate T.:** Two were Tributary Funds.

**James W.:** Ok, 16. Previous years we went back to DC, this year for education we invited people to tour the Upper Columbia. Congress makes decisions with out seeing Columbia Basin. The tours are on August 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>. The 26<sup>th</sup> in Entiat and the 27<sup>th</sup> in Methow. Implementation schedule are cumbersome spreadsheets. The board has been working with software companies. The Software used by Chelan/Douglas boards are working on an online basis for implementation, to create a “living” or real-time schedule which allows analysis of what we have done, are doing, and what we intend to do. This will allow us to start addressing limiting factors.

**Mike R.:** The Annual Watershed Action Team is afraid to make data updates.

**John W.:** Take snap shots of 'living schedule' and send to NOAA. That should get a lot easier.

### **Project Status Summary**

*(Attachment 7: Entiat Project Update Summer 2009)*

**Mike R.:** Landowners to participate in an Agricultural tour. Contacting folks to participate. Something like Rich would present/prepare. A snapshot at a high level and engage if additional info requested. Any comments or questions? That was certainly too easy, there is a lot going on. If IMW moves forward we can move on to ISEMP.

### **ISEMP**

**Mike R.:** We will move to IMW with John M.

**Mike K.:** Can we have a discussion about the acquisition and impact on the valley, to do with roles and citizen comment review. We need to discuss prior to citizen discussion. Where are the files on acquisition?

**Mike R.:** Items 13 and 16. There is 1 conservation easement.

**Jon S.:** We need info on acquisition.

**Mickey F.:** The parcel at road mile 19. Hal asked for an info packet. It is 65 acres on both sides of the river. Hal and Mary Troy are the owners and there is a well and trailer on the parcel. They wanted to build, but selling due to medical reasons. There is a large meander portion of the river, large pieces of woody debris and is rated high priority in the tributary assessment. Propose is to purchase land trust to hold title. What about negative affects on school tax income. Director proposed not to seek lower taxes.

**Jon S.:** Previously the CDLT said this and then asked for reduction.

**Mickey F.:** I looked this up and there was a 50% reduction.

**Mike K.:** County open space can get 100%.

**Mickey F.:** Bob said we would not go for full.

**Mike R.:** This is available to anyone?

**Mike K.:** Taxes are low I this county. Concern for no progress in several years, concerned with private ownership possibilities.

**Mickey F.:** One side is cliff and one side is river. It is a better animal habitat.

**Mike K.:** General concern not competitive with habitat interests. Looking at general property interests. Never been able to move public property to private ownership. Is there Forest Service property that was given in the depression that may not be in line with Forest Service mission?

**Mickey F.:** Lack of personnel?

**Mike K.:** Lack of initiative.

**Jon S.:** Why purchase instead of easement?

**Mickey F.:** Because they want to sell, we are pursuing an easement on Tyee Ranch in cooperation with #9 Stillwater Design in the floodplain.

**Mike K.:** What percent is critical? Is there some way to spend less and find something more critical? Anyway to spend less? Why spend 10 million when 1 acre is 1 million and high priority.

**Mickey F.:** It is reflected in the appraisal. Rock is not contributing obviously, well at one corner, but from appraisal physical development limited, will pursuer possibility of splitting parcel in two halves, maybe split at road. Land trust is a private entity, non

profit corporation with a membership association funding program (tributary assessment/SRFB) supported by membership.

**John M.:** Sell to generate income in areas that don't need restoration.

**Mike K.:** Horselake. Contemplate the future and policy in place for gifted or acquired land, have the ability from policy view to decommission or higher priority.

**Kate T.:** Precedence has been set.

**Mike K.:** Look at Nature Conservancy; it is done all over the country.

**Kate T.:** Talk to Chris Johnson.

**Mike K.:** 200 feet of setback, if that area protected what's the point of acquisition in the last 5 years. There are 7 or 8 cases where folks received variances question of private stewardship of property.

**Mickey F.:** Saw on tour a lot of restoration projects. We saw parcels having negative affects from development. CDLT finds lands with high habitat priorities in order to prevent development damage, wells, construction, etc. When we fund opportunities to protect those in a stewardship basis like Tyee, the higher amount of restoration work on a conservation easement to protect restoration work. Appreciate input from community members.

**Mike R.:** I did hear that CDLT will continue to pay taxes, sell part in the case of the acquisition. Tyee tremendously beneficial to CCD and we are committed to providing background and support. Karin, anything?

**Karin W.:** Entiat School District has the lowest funding in the state. Anything that reduces taxes takes away from the students. Last time the CDLT said that they would pay taxes and then got a reduction.

**Mickey F.:** I looked at the file; it was a 50% reduction. It was not that much money.

**Jon S.:** We can't rely on Bob's word, because you cannot put much weight on them.

**Mickey F.:** I will bring that up to the board.

**Mike R.:** I ask that whatever is brought to the board, be brought here too.

**Mike K.:** ?

**Karin W.:** S.D. lost almost 1/3 to 1/2 of private acreage to public, USFS, BLM, City of Seattle etc. Major changes in characteristics of the valley. Major decision might have to combine with CDLT, we will have a conversation with them.

**Mike R.:** Ready to move on?

### **ISEMP Presentation by John Monahan**

*(Attachment 8: Entiat Watershed Habitat Enhancement and Effectiveness Evaluation PowerPoint)*

**James W.:** Hoping to setup where there is not intense competition, we know everybody is on a cycle.

**Pamela N.:** Look at the regional level, board to get all to happen with out competition.

**Mike K.:** This doesn't drive what I have in with monitoring e.g. Railroad. Interested to know if Entiat would drive work in Nason Creek, will it change the priority of assessment.

**Pamela N.:** If you can prove with monitoring results that . . . then . . . is irrelevant.

**John M.:** Then results won't drive future restoration projects?

**Kate T.:** How do proposed projects affect IMW?

**John M.:** It is our plan. ISEMP holds that position that they are dictating, you should do this, trying to be feasible, here or there, one plan or another. The subcommittee has

increased from 5 to 30, coordination happen EHSC would need to schedule through Mike Rickel's leadership with proponents. CDLT, CCRP and Yakima Nation coordination groups of project proponents and habitat subcommittee.

**Kate T.:** Not really answered. If current plans run into snags and end up in 2011 not 2010, how does it affect those projects?

**John M.:** On behalf of EHSC, Entiat weather 2010 or 2011 is still 3 years of quiet, a period with plenty of room to reschedule or slide projects with out harming experiment. But that doesn't mean it is ok in the future. It requires careful scheduling otherwise results get confounded and we cannot present to ISEMP or SFRB.

**KT.:** There are a lot of projects proposed.

**John M.:** Current designs came from need to accommodate projects in the lower river and start in the upper river.

**Pamela N.:** Recognize that people have project plans but beyond that get into schedule conflicts and weakens ability to monitor results.

**Mike K.:** It seems like a lot at one time.

**Pamela N.:** 3-5 years.

**John M.:** The challenge with 3-5 years was funding coordination. Try to do 60-80 projects at a time how could there be any funding for anyone else. If you are trying to do 60 projects, that is 12 projects a year I a 5 year time frame. That is a lot for one entity to do. How could it be possible to get enough funding, construction, feasibility and permitting is much less likely.

**Mike K.:** What tradeoffs form monitoring?

**Pamela N.:** I don't think anything regarding temporal and spatial. If implementation in 2011, everything in particular type of reach then switches to different geomorphic reach in next phase. Then can get answers for specific actions in specific place.

**John M.:** Monitoring is expensive. Look at stream flow, getting strong impetus for construction and monitoring done then get out.

Mike K.: Talking about results.

**Pamela N.:** Monitoring results, preconstruction monitoring, habitat preferences, survival and productivity. ISEMP develops "mark and capture" capture log then next day cap. Look USFW and YN (What date?), more benefits and more information with this approach.

**Jon S.:** Have permitting agencies bought off on this?

**John M.:** Good question. Setup to permitting agencies who haven't bought off working at specific action, place and time. Tend to look at implimentability.

**Pamela N.:** Boards have been working on this last week. Jordan talked to about permitting by reach or batch permit.

**Kate T.:** Precedence has been set by USFS, reduces our work load substantially.

**John M.:** Fair to say we won't know until we submit permit? And then permit and funding agencies propose at the reach scale.

**Mike R and Kate T.:** Yes

**John M.:** This makes it easier.

**Jon S.:** What about CCD and its ability to complete these projects?

**Mike R.:** We can't do it all; we recognize this and are teaming with other agencies. This brings up the next agenda item, "All Things Entiat".

**Mike R.:** I propose a decision point. Any objection to the IMW approach in the Entiat Watershed? None. Then the decision will pass.

### **All Things Entiat**

*(Attachment 9: All Things Entiat Draft Position Description)*

**Mike R.:** The CCD is looking to fill this position. Here is a list of tasks identified to support the IMW, ISEMP and other needs of the district and landowner outreach.

**Mike K.:** Funders?

**Mike R.:** BOR, YN, NOAA (Chris Gorden is the primary inspector for the IMW) and the Bonneville Association.

**Mike K.:** I am concerned that we don't have support at the district level. Not sure how much discussion is needed because we need the support.

**Mike R.:** Have staff to support but need a focused effort.

**Mike K.:** Need a contact person at the district and funding is there, it is a no brainer.

**Mike R.:** The CCD board said it must be supported by the EWPU with existing staff permitting.

**Conrad P.:** Typical hiring?

**Mike R.:** We want them to have some basis of knowledge of Entiat.

**Jon S.:** I would want some Entiat landowners on the hiring board.

**Mike R.:** That is reasonable.

**Mike K.:** This should be a diverse hiring board.

**Mike R.:** Thoughts?

**Conrad P.:** I am concerned that it will take years to bring them up to speed; we should hire someone that already knows a little bit about the Entiat.

**Mike R.:** Should we proceed? If there is no objection that the decision passes.

There was some discussion and decision to proceed with the Agenda Items in order to wrap up the meeting in the next half hour

### **Review Final Draft Entiat River Public Access Brochure**

*(Attachment 10: Entiat River Public Access Brochure)*

**Mike R.:** This is the final draft of the Entiat Public Access Pts. There was a fair degree of input and assistance from Mike Kaputa, his help was appreciated and we are now seeking feedback from the EWPU.

**Mike K.:** I didn't see any problems. I want to make sure that private land owners are aware of this publication due to increased traffic and previous problems and issues at Sleepy Hollow.

**Mike R.:** We will make an effort to contact landowners.

**Mike K.:** Any previous issues?

**Mike R.:** Not that I know of, litter and parking are always issues.

**Jon S.:** Issues with the firehouse and county bridge are things we can address.

**Karin W.:** Is there anyway to see through the numbers?

**James W.:** Use Punch-out. It outlines the letter instead of covering it up.

**Karin W.:** Then we could see the features such as turnout to bridge and other features.

**Mike R.:** I heard punch-out and vetting surrounding land owners.

**Karin W.:** Also respect private property. Make sure it is clear to ask land owners. Many are not aware of hazards like spraying etc.

**Mike R.:** Any objection to the finalized version with changes accepted? No.

### **Shoreline Master Program Update**

**Mike K.:** Updating the Shoreline Master Plan takes lots of details, generally the additional set of regulations on the books written in the 1970's. There is a motion to adopt a new vegetation? This is interesting from the standpoint of shared governance between county and state. State will review compared to WA State Administration Code. We have the draft Shoreline Master Program. First comments are due August 1<sup>st</sup>. There are lots of policy and regulations, with some discussion on public access. It takes some time to walk through. It is a requirement for public access across private property. Suggest that there is an interest from EWPU on doing workshop on parts, current regulations and changes on ground from county perspective. It will take a couple of hours; it is too late to do at the next EWPU meeting. Maybe we could combine meeting workshops with EWPU and landowner steering committee meetings. We will hold as many meetings as needed. It is difficult to gauge what the final product will look like. An interest in the next 3-4 weeks?

**Hal H.:** I am interested.

**Phil A.:** Is it organized generally by region?

**Mike K.:** It is organized by county. Four or five issues that concern Entiat Residents. I can point you toward these issues. The land owner steering committee is on an as needed basis.

**Mike R.:** Yes, I would like to try to combine issues- Should we look to the landowners meeting in the last week of July?

**Jon S.:** The week before?

**Hal H.:** The 3<sup>rd</sup> week.

**Mike K.:** The 21<sup>st</sup> at 3pm at the? hall

### **Meeting Close-out, Evaluation and Adjourn**

**Mike R.:** Prior to that, Mike Kaputa to forward highlighted info. I can bring other items like water banking etc.

**Mike K.:** Give everyone a document and a flag with the appropriate section. The only option is hard copy. Bring to the library so people can pick up ahead of time.

**Mike R.:** Any feedback on the half day meetings? No, then bring snack and forgo lunch.

Thank You

## List of Attachments

### Attachment

### Contents

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| 1 pp 1-2  | Attendance List   |
| 2         | Proposed October Agenda                                   |
| 3         | Ecology's Gaging Support of Gages within the Entiat Basin |
| 4         | Building Permits & Well Logs in the Entiat 9/04 – 6/09    |
| 5         | Entiat Water Bank Program Development Recommendation      |
| 6         | Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update               |
| 7 pp 1-2  | Entiat Project Update                                     |
| 8 pp 1-3  | Entiat Watershed Habitat Enhancement & Effectiveness PP   |
| 9 pp 1-2  | All Things Entiat Draft Position Description              |
| 10 pp 1-2 | Entiat River Public Access Brochure                       |