

October 1, 2014
ENTIAT WATERSHED PLANNING UNIT MEETING MINUTES
Entiat Grange Hall, Entiat, WA

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

Welcome / Introductions

Meeting began at 9:10 a.m.

Mike Rickel welcomed those in attendance and opened the meeting with a round of introductions. He called for new business items; reviewed and accepted the October 2014 agenda.

- **Approve July 2014 EWPU Meeting Minutes**

Mike asked if there were edits to make to the July Minutes. No comments for edits were made, and the minutes were finalized.

Entiat Landowner Steering Committee Update

- **Summer Chinook Fishery Season**

(Attachment 3: Letter to Jeff Korth, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)

(Attachment 4: Email from Travis Maitland, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)

Mike Rickel: Landowners expressed discouragement from the lack of communication regarding fishing seasons and disappointment with the lack of fishing seasons. Some considered not allowing access to their property for monitoring purposes. Landowners want to be engaged with the fishing issue, so copies of the letter to Jeff Korth and the email from Travis Maitland are available on the back table for review.

Hal Hawley: Could we change the Wednesday date so he can come?

Mike R: He had prior commitments and couldn't attend today. I think he can come to other quarterly meetings. While the Fish and Wildlife folks responded, there has been no response from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

I have not heard news about the fish caught this season. We don't have any information from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Does anyone have a sense of how many fish were caught on the river? Conard, have you heard?

Conard Petersen: I have not seen a lot of cars, and no one asked permission to park on my property.

Hal H: I have not seen much activity on my land.

Craig Chisam: There have been a lot of people fishing, and a steady stream of customers. Some folks were return customers.

Mike Cushman: During the construction we saw a few fishing. One person was panning for gold.

Kate Terrell: We thought the fishing season was successful.

Mike R: We anticipate more and more fishing. We are working with the landowners to allow land access to fishing sites, and getting ready for next year's season.

Conard P: The discouragement was settled when fishing was allowed and folks are probably over the problem.

- **Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP)**

(Attachment 5: Stewardship Checklist from DNR)

Mike Kaputa: A brief overview of what the VSP program is: Ruckelshaus mediated between environmental groups and agricultural groups to reach a common and acceptable ground in regards to protecting critical areas. There was a stay on critical areas for a number of years. There are two VSP pilot programs currently taking place in Washington State. One is in Thurston County and the other is in Chelan County. A stakeholder meeting was held in July. Another meeting is planned for October 29, from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Conference Tech Center. We are working through the information gathered so far and hope to understand what is going on with agricultural lands in critical areas. We want to have more representatives from the Tribes and environmental groups. The Legislature has only provided two years to get the work done. We contracted with them and are six months into the process. We only have 18 months to complete the work.

What are the critical area functions and values? Is there an easy way for a farmer to address those gaps?

We've developed a check list to give an example that is simple and straightforward to use. *(See Attachment 5.)* Our mapping is not comprehensive, and there may be other areas. What do folks need to do in those critical areas? The suggestions of what can be done to improve conditions are on the second page of the handout. We tried to come up with simple questions.

There are other critical areas, but this is a beginning tool to get things started. How do we monitor implementation? What are clear indicators of participation? There is a 10 year monitoring requirement to see how the implementations are going. We have to have the plan finished next summer, but the monitoring is long term.

I encourage you to attend the October meeting. We have an attendee list of those that came to the previous meeting. We are working with environmental groups and stakeholders.

Mickey Fleming: I learned that the basic principle is to avoid any further degradation.

Mike K: That's right. It is protection of critical areas.

Mickey F: So enhancement efforts are mentioned. What is the base line in one of the issues?

Mike K: That is a good question. The fundamental starting point is 2011 critical areas and moving forward. We would see no further degradation. My sense is that there will be a strong enhancement component.

Conard P: For agriculture, is the basis 100 years ago, 10 years ago, how long?

Mickey F: The proposal for habitat farming is an incentive.

Mike K: There is a fair amount of funding for salmon recovery efforts. It is not at the forefront of these discussions. It will be interesting to see what comes of it.

Dave Holland: It sounds like the product is more of a guideline of things to do rather than a specific list of things to do.

Mike K: The question is, do we have enough people in high priority critical areas doing enough to make things better? A specific list is what it will work toward. That will be where the program will succeed.

Dave H: Was there more interest in upland issues or streams?

Mike K: We have done mapping of critical areas. We know where everything is. There is a lot of upland interaction for Mule Deer and elk. There will be a discussion on that.

Mike C: The critical area mapping, will this go across the state?

Mike K: Most of the information we have is pretty current. WDFW updated their pH maps this year. For our efforts, we are doing pretty well.

Mike C: We could reach out to our farmers and let them know about these meetings and get their input too.

Mike K: We look to agencies to get the word out.

Mike R: What is the funding for some of these programs linking the efforts to protect and improve salmon habitat? It will be difficult to link salmon recovery funds with critical area improvement.

Kate T: We have done a lot of riparian work, but if there is no direct point, the funds would dry up.

Mike R: That would be our challenge, to link the fund.

Kate T: One of the things that came up is that it will only be for 10 years. That will be an image or issue to get past.

Mike R: What was the anticipated timeline for the 10 year monitoring? County ordinances?

Mike K: Yes, provision in the law for 10 years of monitoring based on individual service plans...The contract is between the service provider and the grower. But after the 10 years, there are no ordinances. It is non-regulatory.

Mike R: With the agricultural leases issue, there is a huge investment to get the riparian area going. What happens after the 10 years?

Kate T: We had 10 years into a project and the landowner pulled the riparian.

Mike K: If we can't figure out how to do this in a voluntary way the County will be compelled to do it in a regulatory way. We hope to exceed the lowest standard. Environmental groups push that there are consequences for failure to do the work. It will be incumbent on our group to have a response to possible failures. We have to have a clear certainty that protections will continue. We have great hopes that this will work. There is not much going on in this arena. I don't know how it will turn out.

- **Damage Survey Report for Mills Canyon Fire**

Mike K: Mike Kane, NRCS and the Forest Service came and evaluated the Dinkelman and Mills Canyon areas to put together a report. In the end, recommendations were made for projects that could be funded with NRCS assistance. The County Commissioners were interested in providing matching funds from the newly created flood control funds. We are currently working with NRCS to contract and with the Commissioners for funding. The County would pay forward and get it back. Mike Kane said NRCS had some recommendations. Some of the projects implemented in the late '90's were working pretty well.

Mike R: I heard from NRCS staff that they didn't feel it would do much good to clean out the catch basins constructed in the 90's.

Mike K: The trees and riparian vegetation would act as a natural way to slow flood waters down. The new damage survey recommendations are: trash rack on Dinkelman Road, three earthen berms on the Swanson property, and four earthen berms at the bottom of the Skaman property. NRCS felt the value of all the projects would be about \$50,000 to \$60,000.

Conard P: What is the plan on the Swanson property?

Mike K: To put in a berm to direct flows into the ditch.

Conard P: There is an irrigation ditch. I've lived there most of my life and know how that Canyon reacts to fires and floods. There are differences in what happened in the '88 fire to this year's fire. In '88 we had 150 years of stuff to urn. This year it was only 20 years of growth. I was amazed at the regrowth that managed to regenerate. It is nothing like the damage done in '88. There are some areas that didn't burn out at all. The Swakane Canyon burned on the top, but didn't burn out. In July, the vegetation was so green that it didn't burn. Some people in the Mills Canyon have done preliminary work on their land to protect themselves from flooding. Rather than assuming the very worst, a lot of riparian areas have dried out. There are not a lot of blackened areas. There are still green trees at the base of Mill Canyon. I think it will not be a catastrophe as it was in the past.

Pamela Nelle: How soon will they start working on this project?

Mike K: This fall. The '88 fire was a huge event. The dozens of structures built at that time will help a lot. It is pretty minor work needed for this year's fire. We are contracting now, and start the work this fall for the next month or two.

Mike R: A trash rack on Mill Creek? Is most of the water in Mill Creek a return water from the Knapp-Wham (KW)?

Conard P: Yes, absolutely. 100% of the water is irrigation.

Mike R: Is water gathered with the trash rack?

Conard P: The water that came down there rarely got to the Entiat River. After the irrigation district put in the ditch, the water did get to the Entiat River. The dam was put there to funnel extra water into the river.

Mike R: I'm alarmed that if water is directed back in the return channel there will be more flooding. Perhaps there is an alternative to the trash rack.

Conard P: Folks took the dam out even after advice not to. The water out of the canyon is full of silt. The ditch water is clear.

Mike K: If there is other information that is needing to be considered, please let us know.

Conard P: The work done after the '88 flood helped immensely!

Kate T: Can I get a copy of that report, prioritization of burned areas before and after the fires?

Mike K: Yes, it should be on the BAER report.

Kate T: We are to work on the Mills, Chiwaukum and Carlton complex prioritization. This would be good information.

Mike R: Are you anticipating those projects to be built this fall?

Mike K: Yes, we have work on watershed protection plans for the last three years. We hope to do it this fall but contracting sometimes does not happen that quickly.

Kate T: We are concerned about the current fires.

Mike K: Thank you to the Entiat landowners that helped with the projects.

Habitat

- **2014 Project Implementation Update**

Chris Clemons: Yakama Nation projects completed this summer were on the Milne property up to the Whitehall property. Mini boulder clusters were constructed, small wood structures, and bank treatment along the Scoville property. Wildlands was our contractor and they finished up about a week ago. Other than fire restrictions, there were no major issues during construction.

Mike K: The Chelan County Department of Natural Resources project was the Harrison project near the Petersen's property. Two levies were removed, a side channel with sediment deprivation was cleared, a large wood structure was placed at the inlet to direct more flows to the side channels. We worked with Dr. Harrison to remove about 40 fruit trees. The bank was laid back and to prepare for riparian planting. He was reimbursed for the productive trees that he lost. We now have about 1,000 feet of shoreline that will be planted in mid-October.

Mike R: Were there structures put in the river?

Mike K: That was my understanding.

Conard P: There were four structures. I was surprised that the heavy equipment did such a good job.

Mike K: Hurst Construction was the contractor. They did a good job. It was all one contract. If you see something or something happens, let us know.

Mike R: Instead of a tour, ask the sponsors to have pictures of projects to present at the January meeting.

Mike K: I advocate having a tour, as some of these are large projects. We want to hear what went well and what didn't go well, and what the concerns are.

Mike R: There are tours in the plans and will invite the Planning Unit to attend.

Conard P: There are not many places where you can see what is getting accomplished from the road.

Mickey F: The more we can get a couple of Board members to come look at the projects, the better.

Mike K: What is your sense of the wood structure at the inlet? How did folks respond to that structure? How does it look? Are there past concerns still concerns?

Conard P: My personal opinion, they look artificial – not natural looking, not esthetically pleasing. Maybe they will look better next spring. My concern was the use of fir and pine, which are the worst choices to have above the water.

Hal H: Do they rot?

Conard P: Yes, they rot.

Mike K: We are putting in projects, this isn't the end of something. It is the start of the monitoring. Let's see what the community feels now and again next spring.

Conard P: Where the ground is wet and dry over and over, that will make the difference. Yellow pine is bad. You can watch that rot right in front of you.

Mike R: Pitch is good kindling on those. I don't think we used any pine in the structures.

Mike K: There are a few on the Foreman property and at Keystone. Olin Excavation developed a 350 foot long channel by the Asher's property, fed by ground water.

Conard P: There were a few cedar.

Mike K: Tree choices of the landowners were taken into consideration.

Mike R: Mike Cushman has pictures of the two District projects constructed this summer. One was at the Entiat National Fish Hatchery, and the other is the Keystone to Kiosk project.

Mike C: Boulder clusters, bank habitat and one or two log structures using boulders as ballast were constructed in the District projects this summer.

Mike R: I will send invitations to the Planning Unit to attend the projects tour. There are a couple of prescheduled tours. The Board will have a tour on October 16.

Chris C: The 15 and 16 are both tour days.

Mike R: We are trying to match up the best tour for the appropriate agencies involved.

Steve K: Has Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) asked for a tour?

Mike R: No, they have not.

Chris C: The 16th does not seem like a good time to have an agency tour.

Mike K: Is it overkill to have a community meeting as well? Extend invitations to the public for the tours?

Jason Sims: I'm glad you brought that up.

Steve K: There is only so much participation in public meetings, so we want to offer private participation as well.

Pamela N: A lot of people don't want to go out and look. But it would be nice to see the old 2010 projects now and the new projects that have been put in. It would be nice to see the projects that have been put in the river.

Steve K: We have high flow and some low flow films that we could put together.

Pamela N: Can we post it on the website?

Mike R: We can give links for folks to watch the tours without having to go out to them.

Pamela N: If folks don't know something, they listen to whatever other folks tell them. If they can see it for themselves, it would be first-hand knowledge and they would be better informed.

Mike C: The films need to be short and sweet to keep people involved.

Kate T: Our films are short.

- **2016/2017 Project Developments**

Jason S: I'll be the project manager for the next round of projects. This is a quick presentation of the proposed middle Entiat Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) implementation. We've had a couple rounds of successful projects. Stormy and Gray reaches are scheduled for the next round.

We'd like to have landowners attend the designing meetings, as well as some representatives from the Planning Unit Meetings. At the next public meeting, we'll wrap up the 2014 projects and roll out the 2016-17 projects. The goal is to capture the risks early and then address the concerns.

Steve K: It is a formalized way to acknowledge risk identification and management before the project starts construction. Dealing with things up front is less costly than dealing with them as they come up.

Mike K: some risks are technical and some are emotional. It is important to involve the community.

Jason S: We want to engage everyone in the community early on.

Mike K: do it in a way that is not a formal public meeting. The goal is to get folks together. A round table forum is less formal and more conversational to engage the community.

Jason S: The round table, open house style is a good way to get one on one discussion going. We are not dead set on any one way.

Chris C: We should have a good cross section folks at the table when it is discussed.

Jason S: Your feedback is crucial.

Mickey F: The White River project, Jason Lundgren did a lot of outreach by directly contacting the landowners. A direct approach rather than just ads and announcements works well. There was an effort put forth to bring them along and engage their interest.

Jason S: That is a great idea! Talk with the sponsors and make sure they are talking to the appropriate people. Does the next one or two months seem to be a feasible meeting time?

Kate T: Letting them have a voice from the beginning is a good plan. Having discussions now will help in the long run. Keep it casual.

Jason S: We don't want to cause more trouble.

Mike R: Do we combine that meeting and update on the 2016-17 projects?

Mike K: We have those visuals of past projects and then say it's not over, and here are the next proposed projects.

Jason S: We had positive feedback with the open house format, and having different stations. While talking, write down the questions. The amount of people at any one station at a time worked well.

Mike C: We didn't have anyone there that was negative.

Mike K: Project team meetings is where to strategize key landowner issues before the open house. Give the landowners opportunity to let unknown problems come to the surface.

Steve K: We need to engage upstream folks, but also include the downstream landowners. Work your way downstream.

Mike C: What is your sense of outreach efforts with previous approaches?

Conard P: It is a good goal to shoot for. When you start a project, there is lots of interest. But it wanes over time. It is a real challenge to get public enthusiasm. It is worth a try. There are potential problems if you can't get the right kind of landowners interested. The environmentalists will take over. Fruit growers have to deal with the food quality protection folks. If restrictions get more stringent, it will affect the recovery process and access to property. We need to keep it in mind. The grower liability is huge!

Mike R: A targeted outreach instead of appointing representatives. Maybe we should have the public meeting toward the middle of November.

Jason S: We should start potentially planning the public outreach.

Summer Monitoring Results

Pamela N: It was a challenging season. Access and sampling did happen. The road closures, turbidity, and fires pushed back the timeline. By the end of this week we will have finished all the sites. We will keep working with the forest Service to access a 3 year site to sample at that time.

Kate T: We are concerned that with a heavy rain, the side hill will go.

Pamela N: It was delayed, but it will be complete.

Tom Desgroseillier: We know we will take a hit in the summer chinook data. This will be an off year. We are looking at the grander picture with the IMW and the relationship of habitat and fish in terms of monitoring and success. We are working toward and incorporating the 2014 projects into similar monitoring in the future. We will also look at

data at the Keystone side channel and Hatchery channel before and after construction. We are still collecting data and will be able to give hard numbers soon.

Mike R: Is January too soon?

Tom D: If there are specific items of interest, yes we could do that.

Mike K: With the IMW monitoring big picture, when would we see some credible results the habitat is having on the fish? I was wondering if we are doing enough to see a difference. What does the future look like? Should we do more or less?

Pamela N: It is three years of data. We are gearing up to put together a report. We hope to answer that. We hope to look at confidence levels. Are we doing enough? That goes back to Tom and biology. It is still too early for the fish to respond.

Tom D: To detect a change on average level of monitoring, there needs to be a 25% change to detect a change in population. With the work done in 2012, I don't know if that is enough to see a change. We are looking at what level of precision monitoring do we have. We have tools to do that and now need to have an assessment and a check in.

Mike K: 25% was really more to 40 to 50% change to detect that it is an extraordinary change.

Pamela N: What we will learn from the Entiat, may not be able to put a 50% change on the watershed. We do monitor the habitat heavily. We could come with a report in January, but it would be a summary type report. But, we are still trying to translate what that comes out to in fish time.

Mike R: Thank you both! Are there any questions?

Dave H: This is interesting conversation. I'd like to check my understanding.

Tom D: We are talking about a study design. We may see a productivity increase.

Dave H: The legislature asks if we are getting the biggest bang for the buck. When would we get an answer to those kind of questions?

Pamela N: We should start to see some of that data and help with those answers. We will not see the populations go through the roof. We need to make sure we design our tests to give us the information we need.

Tom D: We are going out to 2018.

Dave H: I'd like to really get a good handle on it.

Pamela N: 2020.

Mike K: What's the tolerance to spend more?

Meeting Close-out, Evaluation and Adjournment

Mike R: The next Planning Unit meeting will be on January 7, 2015, 9:00 a.m., at the Entiat Grange Hall. Please fill out an evaluation of the meeting before you leave. They are found at the back table.

Thank you for coming! See you on January 7, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

List of Attachments

<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Contents</u>
1	Attendance List
2	October 2014 Agenda
3	Correspondence to WDFW, Jeff Korth
4	Email from WDFW, Travis Maitland
5	DNR Stewardship Checklist