

October 7, 2009
ENTIAT WATERSHED PLANNING UNIT MEETING MINUTES
Entiat Grange Hall, Entiat, WA

Meeting Attendance: See Attendance List (**Attachment #1**)
See detailed Agenda (**Attachment #4**)
Facilitator / Watershed Coordinator: Mike Rickel
Notes: Heather Java

Welcome / Introductions

Mike R: Does anyone have any comments on the July meeting minutes . . . comments or edits? Hearing nothing, meeting minutes are finalized.

New Business

- UCSRB Award to Entiat landowner steering committee
- Update on Preston Reach controlled burn by Forest Service

Pamela N. and Mike R.: The IMW is gaining momentum. We would like to select a logo. We will develop alternatives to present at Jan meeting. Is this appropriate? How much input would you like? The purpose is to have symbol for IMW that is recognizable to the community. We would like to have a EWPU linked to IMW and water resources. Only logo so far is CCD but EWPU has taken on a life of its own appropriate to develop logo. Feedback or thoughts?

Ray S.: Could be a good tool to gaining public support, a broader awareness of watershed plan. Often support is pictorial to get public attention and gain support the better, easier it is to get funding and cooperation and agency /organizational support.

Phil: This effort was initially attempted 10 years ago by myself and Rick Edwards for the EWPU. The group supported the development of the logo then and we should try again.

Karen W.: Maybe a contest? Talk to Entiat Chamber of Commerce as a way to increase awareness and gain support.

Mike R. : We will continue with this effort and bring to next meeting. Should we continue with the agenda?

New Business 1

Mike R.: UCSRB had a 10 year celebration acknowledging accomplishments of organizations in salmon recovery, habitat, and fisheries. The UCSRB specifically acknowledged two landowner groups; one of which was the Entiat Landowner Steering

Committee. Efforts of landowners and PU are acknowledged for important roles that you play in improving salmon habitat in the upper Columbia River region

Derek V : One of the first people in Chelan County to embrace salmon recovery and lead the way was Ester Stefaniw who was instrumental, as a county commissioner with moving salmon restoration in Chelan County forward and she said, “if you think you are a stakeholder then you are”. She empowered people to be involved. The Landowner Steering Committee is indicative of her call to action.

Mike R.: I accepted the award plaque on behalf of the landowners. Where should this be housed? I will provide to Hal to decide. There are also some baseball hats with the UCSRB logo for you and a pin. Please help yourself to a hat if you would like. Thank you, I am appreciative of your efforts. We may try to get a picture to use in newspaper article.

New Business 2

Update on the Preston Creek “controlled burn”. It escaped into the experimental forest and declared a “wildfire” on Sunday. It is currently 20% contained and it is hoped that it will be contained before October 17th when the modern rifle hunting season opens.

Preston-Fox map resented

Tom G: I am the acting Ranger for Entiat. I will give an overview on what is happening to date. It started to burn last week. 5504 Entiat River Road near Brennegan Creek. An east wind came up unexpectedly, now the fire is 1000 acres. 600 acres were planned to burn in 02-03 plan. About halfway through, the prescribed fire was to reduce dense forests, trying to thin out a bit. It was working. Our main concern is in the experimental forest. There were no plans to burn this section but the fire crossed contingency lines on Saturday. We have 24 hours to control it, then it becomes a wildfire. We made that call. Now the treatment is converted to wild fire. There are 140 folks up there now and sleeping here. We appreciate the community support with places to sleep and food. We have put a couple of loads of retardant so far. We don't want a fire at this stage of year. More crews coming today on incident from all around state and Oregon. It is secure on the west side and we are trying to keep out of burns. Fire affects are in line with what we anticipated with the prescribed fire. 10 acres spots are expected and it wants to burn down to road. Vlad is around town and can provide info, if not contact FS.

Keith V: What info is on the sign now?

Tom G: We can put information piece with contact info.

Keith V: Call the school or City.

Tom: Lakewood trail closed and the approach trail is closed. We are looking at hunting on the opening 17th hope to have it held up but it is too hard to tell at this point.

Bob W.: Glad that upper piece burned

Tom G.: Very active fuels in that area. Hopefully the retardant will keep dry areas out of danger. Fire is over the hill not like that. We will have difficulty keeping it out of the rocky area. Anything else?

Tom G.: It is against the road here and by road system. It is steering that way. The lab has a weather station up there. Crews came in late concerned about rollers across road. We want to keep it above the high road.

Vlad: The community has not expressed much concerned. We would like to keep it low key.

Keith V.: We just want info available.

Vlad: If community concern becomes apparent, then we will change tactics. Concerned landowners near fire can get info, just want to avoid panic. I am available at Ranger District for any questions. We will get a number up.

Tom G.: If it hangs on we will change the posting on the board.

Review of initial purpose of Coordinated Resource Management Plan

Mike R.: Ray called just yesterday and asked that we discuss the initial purpose that brought the group together. I recognize the importance of considering landowner concerns. Ray feels that lately we are too focused on water resources and habitat and wanted to bring this item to the group for discussion.

Ray S.: To help understand where we came from and where we are today, we should look to past efforts that started an Entiat Chamber of Commerce meeting. We had quite a few different ownerships; federal, private, and county in the watershed. We saw different stakeholders that each had their own agenda and were not well coordinated in resource management efforts. Those along the river, primarily private landowners, were recipients of good and poor resource management decisions.

For instance, the Crumb Canyon fire. a property owner had hauled off mill ends for years because he hoped to sell them. There was a major thunderstorm event and washed out a gully large enough for homes to fall into. All of the mill ends, not all but most, ended up in the river deposited anywhere there was slow moving water. There were major debris piles silting in and changing the course of the river. Following that fire we again had a major recovery effort undertaken to rehabilitate the hill sides. Rock was put in dry washes along that area. Salvage logging at top of canyons. That project was not well supervised or controlled and contract salvage loggers skidded logs vertically up slope and created straight shot waterways. Then a major rain event that resulted in 100 year flows washed down the hill sides and undid all of the work done. A major gully washed through Hinton's orchard. It took out 3 acres and dumped the bin pile in the river

temporarily blocking river flow for 3 or 4 min and broke through. What would that amount of debris do to current project? We became aware after the Dinkelman fire and mule deer feeding programs began. We took feed up to deer and bird feeding stations.

With that background, the Entiat Chamber of Commerce people were interested in developing a Coordinated Resource Management Plan, which included landowners, wild lands, and natural resources workers. The Chamber invited anyone we thought were stakeholders. It took a year to get things sorted out in the structure. Two facilitators for WSU came to identify organizational structure. Over a time, the broad CRM model evolved into fish and water being primary focus and the watershed plan intensified this.

Forest management, fire, orchards, roads, and wildlife species have fallen through the cracks. Maybe we might look at this again in January. Is there enough interest to integrate these concerns? We will have fires and associated stresses and cougar encounters. Two weeks ago the Burdick's there were 2 cougars around their house. Across the road from my place at Bruce Wick's house there was another 2 cougars. Bob saw a cougar at Jon Small's house. A lot of us have small kids around. Cougars came when we had our 6, 8 and 12 year old grandchildren staying with us. It has us concerned. I called the game department and was told to contact the agent handling cougars. I was not happy with the response. The man sounded as if he was just out of college and came across as though we shouldn't be concerned and said, "We don't do protection" Since then there have been two incidents of horses being attacked.

Things like this has the public are concerned. We need to include this to gain public support. We need to look at broadening what we track so we don't lose that segment of public support. Karin and Bob Whitehall were part of the original effort. That was quite a few years ago and my memory is not good. Am I remembering things Karin?

Karin W.: We talked about CRM developed by SCS. It looked at all stakeholder interests and found out that the effort should include the entire watershed. . We want things approached scientifically and got into fish and water because of funding. When we were first talking, the salmon were not listed as endangered or threatened as they are now. We didn't want them listed. Our original idea was to include the entire watershed and how to best manage all species.

Bob W: When I started, I spoke with Ray. When you call agency you can't get satisfactory answer, agencies should know this. We would like to keep relationships good. We should be able to follow up and get satisfactory answers. Average landowner have even harder problem getting help from agencies.

Ray S: There are changes in structure, like in Fish and Wildlife. Different individuals at agencies have left, people that were involved with this group are no longer staffed as they were. My concern is that, several people brought concerns about cougars to me. My call was trying to get feedback to give to locals. The person did not acknowledge this. He acted like I was a nut. Not effective communication.

What I would like to see is that we do not lose track about the preservation and conservation of total natural resources of the entire valley. It might take us out of our comfort zone and make some of us work harder, but the benefits to be gained will enhance our watershed efforts. Our success has been because of public support and confidence. We don't know what organizations are doing, what non-governmental organizations are doing to preserve natural resources. I think it will enhance our efforts to consider including that and including people.

Mike R: What should the CCD do? How can we report to landowners? We need to get agreement on appropriate things to track and key players. This will loop back to 11:15 agenda item.

Derek V: You are right; funding has not been there for efforts besides fish and water. Years ago you had relationships. To that end is, what we should bring these people to this group and present and tie to CRM?

Ray S.: Working relationships build confidence. While we might not always agree, atleast we will be working together. Part is getting to know and understand each other when we talk. We get a better understanding. Some of the people we have had in past success is in relationships and confidence not necessarily formal letters.

Mike R.: This group has the ability to reestablish relationships. We will review the CRM ideas on how to track the items identified as important to the group. We will run it by the steering committee to identify agencies and plan to track this.

Don O.: We need upper valley support. The lower valley is involved.

Mike R.: We need landowners to help with this.

Ray S.: This is a way to get new blood into landowner representation, to pass the baton.

Mike R.: Good Point. Thank you. We will be working on this and have follow-up later.

Water Resources

Dave H.: You are aware of DOE cutbacks that have resulted in support of only three gages: Tillicum, Roaring Creek, and Entiat River at North Fork. While we were made aware of the importance of the DOE Mad River at Camp 9 gage, DOE will no longer be supporting it. DOE is aware of the importance of it. It will be left in place through winter but not maintained. We are looking for someone to maintain and train them before snow fall. DOE does not have funds. It will continue to transmit until the battery fails. If the funding can be found the DOE will work with you to upgrade the USGS Mad River site for example if someone has 5k to get telemetry established. There is a 1350\$ annual cost for telemetry with additional cost for O and M. If EWPU can come up with

money, we will continue. 1350\$ is a good number.

Mike R.: Mad River ranked at highest priority. We want to upgrade. It is recommended from HSC is to find funds to support this.

Dave H.: Another option is to upgrade existing for 8k. But an upgrade on USGS is more cost effective.

Phil A.: We have been involved for years and want to keep it in tack as much as possible. We should justify reasons for flow, temperature, and flood early warning etc. We would lose the real-time temperature monitoring, air and water, and flow. Electronically retrieving the data record keeps the burden off of me to keep track. This is punching a hole I cannot fill. Temperature is important gauge info and gives me the ability to work smart. It seems backward to take out technology. All organizations are stretched for money. Mad River flow is critical to understanding Mad River. The problem is ongoing. The CD does what it can to backfill.

Ray S.: If we think outside of box, alternate sources of funding like NGOs and communities are interested in doing something. I hate to see us lose that. Agency funding is tight but there are other organizations like Trout Unlimited. We have the ability to pursue them.

Phil A.: Can the CD look for funding?

Mike R.: The CD works hard to make good on recommendations. The next decision point is, can CD move to find funding? Are there other locations that we would look to fund?

Derek V.: FCRPs Biop EPA project funding from Obama put emphasis on R and D. We should find short term funding then look to BPA to fund for next ten years. My guess is less then 100k for the Upper Columbia.

Karin W.: USGS or DOE?

Derek V.: It is up to your recommendations.

Phil A.: It is identified as Mad River Camp 9. Telemetry is compromise but best substitute for losing camp 9.

Ray S.: Is it feasible for the CD to do a 1 page info sheet that explains the gauges that we need to maintain, the cost , and the money we need to update telemetry. That would help all of us.

Mike R.: We have that minus the costs.

Dave H.: If you want to pursue upgrading, there are two other than the three gauges mentioned that they want to decommission before winter. Are there other gauges that organizations would like to maintain? Are they on a timeline?

Phil A.: We are experiencing an event right now, a 1000 acre fire. If we have a record in place, we can't look ahead, if you are going to pull plug, do it.

Ray S.: If maintenance can be done by a non-technical person, and actions are identified on fact sheet, we can find locals to go out and maintain.

Rick W.: Can I assist with the O and M on the other Ecology gauges?

Dave H.: Telemetry is ongoing. There is cost to changing batteries yes, but real costs are not maintenance. Other concern is fact checking, DOE is concerned with quality control. These are the issues.

Phil A.: The USGS answer is no, because all data can be called into court and challenged. DOE is not as strict but it is still important to back up field data with certification.

Dave H.: There are two decisions here. Do we want to pursue funding?

Phil A.: Yes, please.

Karin W.: What about keep in DOE?

Phil A.: The problem is high flows. If camp 9 goes, we need temperature data not necessarily flow gauge.

Mike R.: So the answer to 1 is, yes pursue funding.

Dave H.: 2, can we decommission other gauges?

Karin W.: What is problem with leaving the gauges in over winter?

Phil A.: In light of Preston Creek value, other gauges might be important.

Derek V.: It seems important to ask Rick, but DOE will pull out gauges?

Dave H.: Yes, in short order.

Pam N.: Is there a cheaper way to find temperature data so there are no data gaps?

Phil A.: Yes, but kind of unreliable. We can hide them and are becoming better but cannot be in year round.

Mike R.: We will pursue funding for Mad River and Temperature gauges.

Kurt H.: If we change operators, will that change proprietary nature of the data?

Kurt H.: Someone must assume management and quality of data.

Dave H.: The data will pass on with equipment.

Kurt H.: So we can have a historic data record. If so it would be a big work load for us to take on as, well as volunteers.

Habitat

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Update

Derek V.: I will go over a few points. Congratulations on the Ester Stefaniw Award!

As you are aware we took the implementation schedule and mapped it out according to funding available in the Upper Columbia. We have 16-17 Million available through a variety of sources (5 or 6) all contributing in various ways. We are trying to align with biological need. 1st is a series of graphs EWPU supported IMW spike in 2011, 2014, 2017 and 2020. We are trying to refine this and we can talk again in January.

The current round of SRFB and Trib funds had 1.95 Million for implementation for 15 projects. 12 might be funded if they past technical review. I will give testimony next Monday. Thanks to Hal Hawley for reviewing projects.

UCSRB hosted tour August 26-27 and talked about several projects. We received excellent feed back from Becky Heath. The USFS Regional Forester came to see what we were doing. We will meet next week in the Methow.

Mike R.: I apologize for not printing the handout and neglecting to bring it.

Derek V.: Contact me with questions.

Update on ISEMP

Pam N.: We finished 30 sites as part of the 2009 habitat and fish effectiveness monitoring season on the mainstem Entiat and Mad River. There were 25 randomly located snorkeling sites completed as part of the status and trend monitoring. We also got time with personal to research the best fish capture techniques to use as part of the IMW. Switching from a snorkel-based sample design to mark-recapture. We are looking at pit tagging during 2 periods of capture; 1 in July at around 400 cfs and 2 in time to be decided to get estimates of growth and survival.

We worked at 3 sites this summer using snorkeling, e-herding, for a mark recapture model with pit tags. Need to recapture at least 30 fish on day two. During trials on subsequent days we had 29 and 25. We think we can get the rates up. Next year still part of protocol development but a larger effort will be in place. There will be no snorkeling this winter.

Project Update

Mike R.: The Below the Keystone Bridge project site is very active even with the late sign placement. Construction brought a lot of questions regarding funding components and tied to EWPU. It was funded by Chelan County PUD and Salmon Recovery Funding Board. There was instream habitat work, upgrades to irrigation, riparian restoration and enhancement, and upgrade to the fish screen to provide Keystone Ranch with irrigation water as part of the decommissioning of the HD ditch. This is the last season the HD ditch will be needed but it won't be shut down until the new system has been proven to work. We will complete effort this fall, by snow fall.

The KW Project consisted of upgrading the diversion to accommodate water diversion by constructing a permanent irrigation rock wing dam habitat feature. This project was done with input from Jon Small and Conard Peterson to improve irrigation. These are the 2 main projects currently; we are working with 4 landowners in lower valley, planning several other projects.

Ray S.: I have a question on the HD headworks. Did the engineering consider the high water levels during spring run off at site? It appeared that there was a danger of overtopping and run off.

Mike R.: The screen?

Ray S.: The gate going into the screen and the bypass. Water was almost to the top. Was the original height of concrete works with re engineering of water diversions coming? Did that affect the flow of the gauge? If those are topped, we must block off water going into the 2 pipes going into the system.

Mike R.: I am reluctant to say if it was one thing or another. I must talk to the engineers.

Phil A.: The wing dam was designed to be overtopped. I think they assumed that during high flow, the gates would be closed which will prevent too much water from going down to the screen.

Ray S.: When closed, the water overtops or goes over. It is a major problem with debris in low flows. The ditch came during high flow with improvements in the diversion. We will have more water in diversion. Was this considered during engineering improvements?

Derek V.: It was a BOR design.

Phil A.: I don't know if it was adequate.

Ray S.: The gate closed and water went around and eroded soil. We should expect the same thing on the upper river side if water goes around the concrete structure. Erosion and debris in high flow.

Mike R.: We will follow up. The CD is still a partner. We will work with you to make sure with the owner and manager is happy. We will come up with a solution.

Bob W.: Thanks for the sign. We were missing the boat for not getting publicity. Everybody thought it was a pipe line. Maybe put up ads for future work at the kiosk. A lot of people stop and look at that.

Todd R.: A logo will also help.

Mike R.: Thanks for that info. We will continue in this effort.

Karin W.: Maybe consider making contractor be responsible for this, like DOT.

Fisheries Update

Bob W.: The Chinook season is open on the river. A lot of work went into getting it open, a lot of work with WDFW. We looked at regulations and presented to NOAA. We ended up with a steelhead season this year, lots of fishing same as Chinook season. It set boundaries that work best, really appreciate Dennis Beach's work. I know of 10 fish caught in back water and some caught by James. There is a fish checker out everyday; hopefully this will help in future knowing just how many fish were/are caught.

There were cutthroat planted in the upper Entiat River above the falls. There will eventually be fishing changes in the Upper Valley. There was a big planting effort Labor Day 6k above North Fork.

Hal H.: I saw a picture of a 17 inch cutthroat.

Bob W.: Catch and release will get other fish out, there are plenty to eat. We need education in campgrounds. There is a 15 fish limit on brook trout, a combination of 5 on rainbow, and cutthroat will be eliminated. The size is 2-3 inches and we hope for 50% survival rate brought up to Cottonwood.

Mike R.: I wrote a letter on behalf of the Landowner Steering Committee. So that we can get signatures and send on to Phil Anderson in appreciation of WDFW efforts to establish a steelhead fishery in the Entiat.

Bob W.: There is pressure from other side to not do this. We are trying to inform them that landowners want this.

Phil A.: Are we considering incidental take?

Bob W.: Most of fish in mouth are waiting for fall runoff.

Bob W.: It is up to the number of fish.

Mike R.: This helps justify support and credibility in the community for the EWPU.

Bob W.: They are working on catch and release from campgrounds. Up to now there has been little enforcement. If it opens then things would be better then now.

Phil A.: If that fishery can be self policing. Yakima is now open year around.

Bob W.: Educational info in campgrounds is important.

Phil A.: There is lots of illegal fishing. Let's accommodate the fishery as is, with restrictions.

Bob W.: The enforcement people are back up to numbers.

Derek V.: This is great involvement with co-managers. Thanks for all of the support.

Bob W.: It is a tough fishery. Only a couple of holes have steelhead. A lot more spots and there are quite a few people out there trying. I don't see a lot of other fish being caught. There were more Chinook caught this year due to better fishing conditions. The other thing is that starting next year, salmon and steelhead licenses will include a \$7 charge in the Upper Columbia but the new \$7 charge will cover regulation enforcement person for the upper Columbia. There is no money here for enforcement and fish checkers this year. Linda Evens Parlette is just for selected fisheries. Otherwise, the budget would never allow them to open. Set up forever. Once in there, it will be in there forever.

Mike R.: The biggest challenge is opening and regulation. Will there be another?

Bob W.: The permit 1st issued stated that it had a 15 day NOAA timeframe, because if we wait till fish are here, they will be at hatchery by the time the permit opens. If the numbers are there, it will open in spring.

Phil A.: 4th year post hatchery close. If enough fish stray with pit tag, we can count on closing next year and reopening for special hatchery.

Bob W.: Pit tag set up is good for telling where fish are.

Jim S.: Thank you Bob and other people assisting in the opening of the fisheries. It is incredible to see our resources being used. It has made a lot of difference.

Phil A.: Is the public behaving on your land?

Jim S.: No problems.

Ray S.: People are talking about fishing in the Entiat. It gets a lot of discussion.

Karin W.: I saw Scott Mitchell and he asked if old bridge was closed to fishing. I am going to call Paula Cox to take out the sign.

Mike R.: Thank you. That point was identified in the access map.

All things Entiat Position

Mike R.: BEF people are here to officially introduce Heather Java. She was hired in June to replace Rich/Tom. She is hitting the ground running. The EHSC recognized the need to increase capacity of CCD to help with the IMW in Entiat. The CCD is hoping to do 80 projects in the Entiat. We went through the interview process and found a couple of people that might be good, but their references did not check out. In that process, we realized we already had on staff. We made offer to Heather because between hire date the landowners and project partners gave positive feedback. It has been hard to maintain the CCD as a main point of contact since Sarah Walker left. One of the primary partners is BEF. Sarah worked to form the partnership.

Todd and Robert met with us yesterday to reevaluate our grant contract. We talked about, how to track our progress, and then reevaluate and readjust our approach. The BEF allows us to evaluate and adjust the agreement with them based on the EWPU goals. We want you to be able to meet Heather; she will be very active with the EHSC and IMW

Todd R.: Thanks for indulging me today. It reassures me why we want to work with you. You have passion for progress and a holistic approach and we learn from your project implementation. I remember meeting back at the firehouse with landowners wanting to understand and relay information back to stakeholders. Sarah was able to be full time in the Entiat and Mike only part time. We are interested to see how you push through to your long-term vision and approach. If you are not familiar with BEF, our goal is to add value as we can. BEF identified that there might not be enough staff support to continue the EWPU.

Mike R.: I want to re-link and review the CRM and coordinate with BEF. Before my time, key elements were identified by the PU, like spawning numbers and various elements many were biological and also social. How was monitoring achieved? Biology is coordinated by ISEMP and various agencies and data is going to UCSRB. Now, we are creating a process on how we are reporting on social issues that will provide

information that goes into annual report. If they were identified as important in 1997 are they still relevant and important bring back to PU in January?

Are there other issues that need to be included? It is important to be holistic. Ray, I see that as a critical reconnection with CRM. I am thankful to BEF and am interested in making links between implementation and perception. Alteration to river; what does failure and success look like? How to we adjust and reevaluate pools? Do we build to monitor and maintain structures?

Derek V.: This level of engagement warrants having a full time position. The local infrastructure can't happen without it. We saw a need to pony up and invest in the EWPU in order to continue to build relationship and support the IMW.

Mike R.: We would like to send out a letter of introduction for Heather and highlight changes to the IMW.

Ray S.: I think we should use the Chamber of Commerce letter to introduce her.

Mike R.: Also fisheries.

Ray S.: A letter doesn't always get to everyone. The Entiat Leader is handed out to family and friends outside of the area.

Mike.: I noticed that there were also a lot of inserts, maybe that is a way.

Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update

Erin F.: Our first public review draft of the SMP (*June 9, 2009 version*) was distributed in mid June to the advisory committee and interested parties. The draft SMP is also available on our website at:

http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/nr/nr_shoreline_master_program.html . The draft is waiting for comments from DOE, and the Cities of Cashmere, Chelan, Entiat, Leavenworth and Wenatchee. We have received comments from our advisory committee. Last October (2008) we did a presentation to the EWPU on the shoreline rules and regulations which apply to the area 200 feet landward of the ordinary high-water mark. Our current SMP was written in 1975 and updated in 1979. The County and participating jurisdictions are required to update by DOE through legislation that was passed in 2003 and we are getting close to the end of the update process. We are hopeful that it should be adopted by DOE in June 2010. Although, we may have to move back our timeline in order to meet all requirements of the WAC & RCW's related to the SMP. We are working with DOE and the consultants to develop options for the public access requirements in the SMA. The WAC states that for any subdivision of 4 or more lots the property owner is required to provide public access to the shoreline. Things that may work well for Seattle may not work so well here and the SMP is a program that is developed by and for the citizens. We are trying to make it accessible to everyone.

Derek V.: Do you have any idea of changes between the two?

Erin F.: The inclusion of additional shorelines (federal lands). Back in the 1970's the USGS mapping did not include any shorelines located within lands owned by the federal government, which made them exempt from the regulations of the SMP. When the legislature passed the 2003 SMP guidelines it required all jurisdictions to include federal lands in their updates. The SMP will apply to private activities on federal lands (e.g. in-holding leases and boat launches) but it will not apply to any federal activities.

Derek V.: Are the basic exemptions still in place?

Erin F.: Yes, the SMP encourages water related uses on shoreline. I brought copies of the draft SMP. It will probably change a lot in the next version according to comments we have received and with Ecology's comments. The biggest concern is public access. Some people think that there is plenty of public access while others feel that there isn't enough public access. One reason is that when you subdivide four or more lots, you are required by law to provide public access to the shorelines. Many property owners have concerns about the liability associated with providing public access. We will develop public access plans for whole community and we are working with Jones and Stokes and Project Ground Work to develop the plan (*they worked on the "More than a Trail" project in East Wenatchee*). Some of the Cities have public access plans but most of the plans don't talk about the future needs and address the issue of "how do we get to more". One thing we are missing on our advisory committee is representation from the Entiat valley. We would like to have anyone that is interested in the SMP update participate on our advisory committee.

Don O.: It is 80 percent done?

Erin F.: Yes. We still have a few revisions and legwork to do before it will be adoptable by the jurisdictions and DOE. The draft SMP is a little hard to read because of the requirements of the WAC's & RCW's related to shorelines. I don't understand the SMP myself but am learning more about it thanks to Ecology explaining it. The document is 385 pages and is growing. My recommendation is to use the table of contents to find the topics you are interested in as you review the document.

Don O.: We have been trying to make a county wide plan.

Erin F.: Correct. There is a universal chapter (Chapters 1-8) and then jurisdiction specific chapters for the County (Chapter 9) and each city (Chapters 10-14). My recommendation is to make just a county chapter and then separate ones for each jurisdiction, eliminating the universal. It may make it easier for people to use.

Mike R.: 4 or more?

Erin F.: When subdividing private property into lots, the requirements for providing public access. We are planning on trying to move forward, working with ecology to request more funds. There is a potential that we might not get done until June 2011.

A lot of Cities already have their own public access plans. We really only have Lake Chelan and county wide, but without the public access part figured out, we can't move forward.

Mike R.: Hearing that, the draft is delayed until DOE comments, public comments, and revision take place. We will adjust the timeline. Please make sure CCD is on the distribution list and I will forward.

Erin F.: Thank you, we realize there are funding limitations to this project but will keep the EWPU updated as we move forward.

Possible Realignment of State Natural Resource Agencies

Ron S.: This effort was led by budget provisions from different organizations repeating the same work. How do we become more cost effective? Should the outcome be fewer natural resource organizations or should we reorganize. The governor wants ideas. She wants to hear comments from all over the state I will walk through concepts.

Ron Schultz presented varying scenarios of changes to organizational structure of natural resources in Washington State.

Ron S.: Any changes would have to go through legislature. Changes in organizational structure are high cost and confusing. I don't think organizational changes will happen because of money. Most will be internal. We need to see state agencies coordinating better with us in a better-structured cabinet. We want local boards to come with conflicts, then we could help sort through problems to make changes at local level.

Dave H.: State caucus agencies met to identify concerns gone by the wayside. They are precedent example of where coordination can happen.

Ron S.: At a local scale, how do we bring that back and focus and target. Legislature wants to know that money benefits and needs for process and implementation. They want to target a problem and get a solution.

Derek V.: If EWPU makes a comment, I don't want things to be short sided.

Mike R.: What are EWPU's recommendations? Make sure agencies are informed of what we are trying to do?

Ron S.: It would be good to hear what has worked and not worked in past.

Mike R.: Our board has heard of this effort and had concerns. They want us to develop a response. I will develop a proposed response and circulate. This letter will reflect the CCD and EWPU request to have the organizational structure remain status quo in order to allow grassroots organizations and smaller agencies to retain their budget and structure. Is there any issue with this?

Don O.: There are only 20 days to comment.

Mike R.: I will have draft by next Monday with hopes to have out the door by next week. Any thing else?

Doug E.: Put in letter the social and economic impacts of fishing

Mike R.: I will go back and make edits and make more space for landowners.

Doug E.: Lets get landowners from the 1st 7 miles and have present members distribute to get as many signatures as possible.

Phil A.: Are there any local business that can substantiate increased business?

Doug E.: Yes, maybe Shell. I will email my recommendations tomorrow.