

April 4, 2012  
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 / Susan Dretke  
**Notes:** Nada Wentz

**Welcome / Introductions**

Meeting began at 9:16 a.m.

Mike Rickel welcomed meeting attendees and started the round of introductions.

- **Approve January EWPU Meeting Minutes**

**Mike R:** The April meeting notice was sent out with a link to the January minutes which were posted on the Cascadia web site for review. Does anyone have any comments or edits for the January 2012 meeting minutes?

Hearing none, the January 2012 meeting minutes are finalized.

- **Review and Accept April Agenda**

**Mike R:** The Agenda's Monitoring Update portion will be presented by Susan Dretke and Fish & Wildlife, instead of by Dretke and Whitehall. There are two decision points today, finalizing the Entiat Watershed signs and formalizing the decision to mark logs installed as part of habitat restoration efforts, or not mark logs.

**Mike R:** Due to some folks needing to leave this meeting to attend another meeting, the Agenda items 'Shoreline Master Program' and 'Monitoring Updates' will trade positions. The Entiat Video will be viewed at the end of the meeting rather than the beginning.

- **Call for New Business Items**

**Keith Vradenburg:** Would like to add a discussion on the Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Safe Quality Food (SQF) programs to the Agenda.

**Mike R:** The Agenda will stand as corrected.

**Outreach Efforts**

- **Entiat Focused Video Screening (I)**

**Susan Dretke:** A meeting was held on March 22 to specifically address community concerns regarding wood structures in the river. Thirty Entiat landowners and over a

dozen agencies were in attendance. Presenters came to give information on designs of established structures. The minutes from that meeting will be sent out to the folks that attended. Evaluations from that meeting came back with good feedback. Some folks were skeptical at first, but were appreciative and more comfortable with the idea.

**Mike R:** Everyone who attended that meeting is present at this meeting. The design, monitoring and maintenance concerns were discussed with the landowners, including putting into place a mechanism to fund damaged structures. Legislation to protect landowners risk with emergency response was also discussed. These woody structures will be monitored for the long haul. Agencies can't walk away from the structures.

**Karin Whitehall:** I thought it was well done, professionally done. I wish I had thought to address Mrs. Parker about the differences between the West side of the mountains and the Entiat.

**Phil Archibald:** The meeting showed a lot of forethought. My concern is the whole recreational floating question. We did consider recreational. Entiat is not a major recreational venue. I'm concerned that the recreational venue popped up as a wild card. Anyone down that river knows you need to be properly equipped for the river. I suggest building a file or reference to respond to the recreational boating community and signage to warn for dangerous areas.

**Mike R:** I want to compliment Susan for doing a good job facilitating that meeting!

**Phil A:** That is the point I want to make too!

**Mike Kaputa:** Whatcom County said they would bring some of the recreational people to the areas and talk about those problem. There are future efforts in the Stillwater that we didn't talk about as much. The river safety council has participated in enough forums in King County to know what is needed to help us in the Entiat. We should engage them to give them a way to express their concerns.

**Ron Walters:** I want to emphasize how important it is to get groups to participate. Three incidents happened on the Wenatchee, by natural occurring log jams. Doug England and I are the ones that tend to deal with folks when it happens, and they are very emotional situations. The importance of having the watershed groups is high.

**Steve Kolk:** Listing the Entiat may be a way to accomplish this. The American Whitewater and the Washington Canoe Club are good sources to contact for knowledge of dangerous areas in their brochures.

**Mike K:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) made a public commitment for long term business with the watersheds. We are now working on contracts to keep long term going. It was an important part of the meeting. Having money to do the work is important for people to know.

**Jim Small:** The meeting and the audience was very well managed. That is how we should do it from now on.

- **Monitoring Report (I)**

**Susan D:** A very thorough, detailed, high leveled report is posted on the Fish and Wildlife web site. The report is in the process being revised into a version that is more reader friendly. This is the ISEMP monitoring including habitat surveys, mark and recapture information, side channel study with mark and recapture, and Redd surveys. It will include all the information collected in detailed monitoring for the last two years. It is very scientifically oriented. I'm working with Pamela Nelle to create the reader friendly version to be sent to folks who had granted access to the river from their land. We had hoped to have a copy for you today, but we are not quite ready. Are there any questions about this report?

**Mike R:** We can get a link to provide that report.

**Tom Tebb, DOE:** It is about 135 pages.

- **Watershed Signage (D)**

**Susan D:** We had talked at our last meeting of installing watershed signage. The consensus at that meeting is that it definitely should include the EWPU graphic. The sign company was contacted and the signs are 18" x 24," at \$19.62 each sign. Is that an acceptable graphic?

**Mike K:** Would these be placed at the roads? It would be good to check the sign code. That size seems small.

**Susan D:** Susan demonstrated the size.

**Phil A:** If these signs are prototypes, make three of four of them.

**Susan D:** The next size up is about \$25 a sign.

**Phil A:** I was hoping to have "Welcome to the Watershed" on the signs too.

**Susan D:** That would be easy enough to add that. Are there any other comments on the signs?

**Jon Small:** Maybe 'welcome' should be on the first sign.

**Nancy Warner:** Depending on the speed limit, letters would be on signs 24" x 36" lettering with DOT restrictions.

**Susan D:** The second idea would be to put a little sturdier kiosk where the existing one is now. The panels allow changeable signs. Possibly another idea is to have a single similar KIOSK to convey detailed information on what is going on in the watershed.

**Karin W:** The historical society would like to see it moved.

**Phil A:** The Entiat historical society put a lot of time into it. Check with them to see where they are at.

**Susan D:** We would build a new one, similar to the existing one.

**Phil A:** WSCC built this one. The one at Cooper's is a compromise placing.

**Karin W:** The pictures are replaceable and someone has a paper version to refresh the pictures.

**Phil A:** Check with the Hatchery to see about designs for the kiosk.

**Mike R:** The intent is to provide more detailed information.

**Mickey Fleming:** Interpretive signs on fish habitat, glaciations and other things would be nice.

**Mike R:** Are there any objections for the proposed signs?

**Phil A:** Just propose the 24" x 36" size with the logo on it. Forget the "welcome" part.

**Dave Burdick:** Use a fairly large sign, put it on the highway for better visibility, and have that sign say "Entering the Watershed," like the Cascadia signs.

**Phil A:** New folks in the area were not aware of what was going on in the river, about the work, or the groups working in the watershed.

**Mike R:** So the sign should have the words "Entiat River Watershed" printed on it?

**Phil A:** The wording is better.

**Nancy W:** Placement of the sign is where you first start up the river, by the forest sign? The 'welcome' sign could be carved in the wood frame above the sign, using the Forest Service design. Words on the sign depend on the audience we are trying to reach.

**Mike R:** We are trying to reach multiple groups. The video is to engage the local community. Do we include the 'welcome' or not?

**Phil A:** How much more time and effort do we want to put into this? The wooden kiosk is worth considering.

**Susan D:** The wooden kiosk could be incorporated. This sign in particular is to remind folks – brand awareness – by the side of the road. There is no deadline, and it is better to do it right the first time.

**Phil A:** Mount the sign to a multi-purpose sign that could be accommodated in the kiosk.

**Steve K:** Whatever you get from the sign shop is a stamped metal sign.

**Susan D:** Do you want the 2' x 3'?

*Is there any objection to finalizing the proposed Entiat Watershed signs?*

**Decision: Yes, motion passes. Finalize the proposed 'Entiat Watershed Sign.'**

### Landowner Steering Committee

- **Access to Private Land, GAP and SQF combined (I)**

**Mike R:** Keith asked to add “GAP & SQF” to the agenda. The discussion ties in with concerns of the landowners.

**Jon S:** We have two programs – Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Safe Quality Food (SQF). Orchardists have to log everything that occurs in their orchards with the workers, the trees, the pesticides used. We have to keep a log of visitors on the property. Anyone coming onto the property for monitoring a couple of times a year needs to come and check in with the owner to fulfill the log requirement. The program requires that the fruit be untouched, and that nothing is left in the orchard. There has been a breakdown in communications, people – agencies must communicate with the landowner before accessing the property. If there is no communication, cooperation will not continue.

**Jim S:** The sheer volume of people is a lot to deal with. My orchard is like my backyard, when you wander through my orchard and I don't know who you are, I have to find you and find out what you are doing there. It is a complex process. We want monitoring but access to the river is a problem. Get prior permission. When we have to deal with ten to fifteen people on a busy day, it becomes a big problem. If we know someone is coming, we don't have to find them and check them out.

**Ray Sandidge:** There are some severe penalties on the landowners if people don't get prior permission. If the yard was treated with pesticide and people come in there, even the meter reader, and they get sick – the landowner could lose his home. It is even more severe with orchardists. The Department of Labor inspectors don't have to announce they are coming, but the landowner is still liable for what happens to the inspectors. The Pit tag folks left two large battery boxes that they drug through the property. A little later I looked for the folks and they didn't know the sign applied to them. This could cause someone their business and livelihood. The GAP is not well known around here. It has major impact on the fruit folks. Agencies need to check with the landowners for pesticide applications before accessing property. There needs to be some way to let

agency people know what the story is. Maybe changes in staff over a period of time should make it necessary to have a general policy manual for all agencies that says what you have to do before accessing landowner property. New staff members need to be made aware of this.

**Mike R:** Certainly this is on Cascadia to follow up on.

**Ray S:** There is not a process yet, that we know of, but this is the group to get the word out to the agencies.

**Mike R:** I like the briefing to let agencies know your requirements. We thought we had key contacts. Are there other orchards that have responsible supervisors other than the landlords?

**Conard Petersen:** Survey crews and monitoring folks need to know this too.

**Mike K:** Mike Rickel, are you going to organize something to get the word out? It is important to understand the program and the implications of accessing. Make sure “private property” is understood by all agencies.

**Mike R:** Maybe Jon could advise us of the consequences. We need to make sure the landowners are contacted 48 hours before property is accessed.

**Ray S:** The fish mark and recapture group is a six to nine man group working at night. I had to deny that access on a liability basis recommendation from my insurance agent. The group would have to go over a bridge across the bypass channel of Hanan Detwiler Ditch. If someone fell off that bridge, I'd be liable. We need to address the whole farmers' provisions for access. We need to have some consultation on that.

**Mike R:** We should create an agreement to show responsibility of the person accessing.

**Ray S:** Get a copy out to the landowners.

**Mike R:** That would be a good and reasonable approach. A ‘hold harmless’ agreement is not worth much sometimes.

**Bob Whitehall:** Have an agency contact person check in with the landowners annually.

**Mike R:** The agreement should be an annual re-entry agreement that is flexible enough to meet those requirements. Agencies need to understand this and have it written in their agreement.

**Steve K:** Is this monitoring going on below the high water mark?

**Susan D:** No.

**Steve K:** If we walk upstream and downstream, we could access public places.

**Susan D:** The Habitat Survey shoots topography and uses the public access to float the river. The recapture folks access private property frequently. This dialogue is good for me. The efforts will be stepped up to let agencies know this information. Not every agency works through Cascadia, so we don't always know. If someone is on your property, please call me. I will work with Department of Ecology (DOE) to see what their monitoring efforts will be and when. They don't have an agreement through Cascadia. I hope to run a much tighter ship.

**Jim S:** We are doing these things at these times. You will be notified, if not notified call Susan.

**Karin W:** Entiat is not navigable, so the bottom of the river is landowner property too.

**Susan D:** I will find out the work crew schedules and call the landowners to let them know. Coordination will be much tighter this year.

**Ray S:** Don't feel bad about leaks in your ship. Landowners have a blizzard of paper work and regulation changes to try and stay on top of.

**Mike R:** I will work on this agreement.

**Jon S:** What if the document is outlined and given to agencies, rather than another meeting?

**Mike R:** That is okay. Let's do that and run it by the landowners, then share it with the agencies. Before the end of the month, look for a draft agreement. Does anyone have more items for the Landowner Steering Committee?

We'll go ahead with the Water Rights portion of the Agenda before the viewing the video, for the convenience of folks that need to leave by 11:00.

### **Water Resources**

- **Water Right Applications and Ecology's Position (I)**

*(Attachment 3: Water Right Tracking List)*

*(Attachment 4: Contact Information for Water Right Transfers)*

**Mike R:** As folks may be aware, as of December 28, 2004, there was a hold on new water rights from the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) in the Yakima Basin.

**Tom Tebb, DOE:** The Yakima Basin is federalized and managed by BOR. It is a complex set of canals, rivers, and reservoirs. The river is highlighted as the next opportunity for salmon recovery. Local and State officials are discussing development of additional water supplies. As part of the DOE impact, the Black Rock storage filed a

withdrawal with DOE. Withdrawal was also enacted when Grand Coulee Dam was built. We have been keeping track of different applications; applications of release going through BOR, a running list of all releases and how withdrawal will impact it. New applications after 2004 are subject to that withdrawal process. We are not processing applications. People have more of a demand to move water from point A to point B. We had a permit writer in Taylor Horne, but have not been able to fill his vacancy since he left. At last count there were thirty old applications prior to 2004 and nine new ones. A vacancy is being held due to possible reductions of force. That's not to say you can't get your applications processed. I brought flyers with information on other ways to process applications. The current number of applications is small in some ways. Some applications in the Basin are 20 years old. DOE is trying to figure out where the limited resources need to fill the highest priority. All you need to file an application is \$50 and a stamp, which is easy. I can't control the inventory. It is difficult to explain and difficult to manage. Are there any questions?

**Ron Walters:** What about reserves?

**Tom T:** If the reserve is withdrawn in significant quantities, you need to contact BOR.

**Phil A:** Could you explain withdraw?

**Tom T:** We want to make sure we withhold withdraw water to fulfill the needs of the project.

**Jim S:** Is Black Rock done?

**Tom T:** It has evolved. It was a big reservoir, a fish passage, a water conservation using the existing dam heights, and many other activities need to be done before going to the Columbia. While we try to move forward with the consensus group, it will also cost a lot of money.

**Jim S:** It will probably take 20 years.

**Tom T:** Let's postpone that discussion to do the other things and see how far we get into the Columbia.

**Ron W:** How does that work in with the Columbia?

**Tom T:** One third goes back into the river. The biggest chunk of water is Lake Roosevelt. We are working out Lake Roosevelt's foot in a half draw down. It costs money, where water didn't cost money before. BOR operations and maintenance operations had to pass on costs to the landowners. The Lake Sullivan Forest Service will cost share with DOE to make water available to surrounding areas. We are not funneling water from high to low. The current water code allows water to move, most typically, downstream.

**Ron W:** There is an expiration date. It is fairly close?

**Tom T:** December 2011. They requested an extension to 2014. I don't know how many extensions they will approve.

**Ron W:** Is there anything to keep this group involved?

**Tom T:** There is public information. I will let you know about the Public Notice. We will build in a level like the 1938 withdrawal. I don't know how much water is involved.

**Ron W:** We can request knowing how much?

**Mike K:** We are proceeding in the Wenatchee with small cities and how to access the reserve. We are teaming with other partners. Mike Rickel will be involved with those discussions. We would like to accommodate those reserves.

**Tom T:** Come check with BOR first. It is not a 'no.'

**Mike K:** What is the mechanism to do that, lead entity? One wrinkle is who asks for the reserve? Could a group of folks request part of the reserve? What does that mean for us?

**Mike R:** My hope is to facilitate the process before reserve is in place. After the rule is decided how to access these water rights? Is that something we want to collectively approach?

**Tom T:** You would have to process the application from 91 – 98 before you get to the reserves. The status of filing, first in line, first in right gets first service, then go back and see if anything is left.

**Mike R:** With the instream flow, the ability has been hampered by the budget. We are working to track with wells and diversions.

**Tom T:** You have always been a shining star as a watershed group. You have tried to match the resources, and staff time. We'd like to have that commitment in the future, but we can't guarantee it.

**Mike R:** We will find some approach to address that. We will work collectively to loosen the applications that have been on the files for a number of years.

**Dave Burdick:** House reimbursement for changes.

**Mike K:** You say there are 30?

**Tom T:** I can't say for sure. Here is a list of the 30 pending prior to 2004. There are pending change orders highlighted in yellow by Taylor Horne.

**Karin W:** BOR is not considering exempt wells as part of the process?

**Tom T:** Yes. I hope this information is useful.

**Mike R:** Having those lists is helpful. We can verify it with the landowners.

**Tom T:** If you want to come to the Yakima office, come on down and we can pull up the information.

- **Water Metering Request Letter (I)**

**Mike R:** I'm hoping to have Dave Burdick help with the water metering discussion. For background, there has been some question on the amount of domestic water used for outdoor water use. In order to determine this, we are considering sending out a letter requesting that a few key landowners allow their domestic wells (that also provide water to their lawn and garden of ½ or less) to be metered. We have a good handle on who has those, and who has surface diversions. We are looking for willing landowners who would be interested in using meters. Is the assumed use of water accurate, is it accurate or close? I'm hoping Dave can help us identify information once we get it. What do we do with that information?

**Dave B:** If we are not using as much as the maximum levels, we won't lose anything. If we use more than the maximum then we have to rectify it through permits. Get a handle on the quantities that are being consumed. The state has some interest in it, but can't do anything about it. It depends on who is putting those things in.

**Mike R:** It wouldn't be public information.

**Tom T:** You gave yourself a very generous amount of water. It is interesting how you did it. The question I understand is what if we gave it too much?

**Mike K:** Modify that a little. Is the reserve too large?

**Tom T:** No.

**Mike R:** On an individual basis, it is quite large. We may have unduly limited the number of wells because of the assumed usage.

**Tom T:** We are looking at 95 gallons per day, 9,552 for outdoor use. We need the information to be substantially proofed.

**Phil A:** A suggestion to prospective landowner water users – state this is a trial run for data usage.

**Tom T:** If we find the amount of water is more or less, that information is up to the landowner. We won't just start regulating.

**Nancy W:** If there is something about conservation of water, maybe sweeten it with incentive.

**Mike R:** This is great feedback! We would need to work with willing landowners. Input for the letter is needed. The data gathering information and what is done with it will be a group decision. Hopefully we can calibrate the actual use to help the watershed.

**Tom T:** If you put the table in the rule, then you are stuck. Now that whole framework is what you have to use.

**Karin W:** How difficult is it to change a rule?

**Tom T:** It is very difficult! There are no resources.

**Mike K:** That is good information to bring back to the group and discuss what to do. My sense is that we are several years from getting to this.

**Dave B:** Do you have an estimated total bill?

**Phil A:** Is there an estimated total use?

**Tom T:** It is in 107 parcels.

**Mike R:** The demand (building) has slowed down since 2008.

**Tom T:** You could double that if you restricted the use by what you have. The incentive could be subdivision.

**Mike R:** We want to find out if there is interest from the group, to gather that data and make that decision. Someone will give a report on the status of the reserve account at the next EWPU meeting. I will send out an updated letter. The objective is only to collect data and no regulatory action will be done (and the information will not be sent to anyone) as a result of this information.

### **Monitoring Update**

**Mark Nelson:** I am a fish biologist with US Fish and Wildlife Service. This will be a little introduction to radio telemetry. (*Mark passed around transmitters and turned on the receiver.*) The transmitter signals every five seconds and the batteries will track the life of the fish for three years. Receivers pick up the signal.

**Mike K:** How do you get that in the fish?

**Mark N:** They are surgically inserted. The tag, the receiver and the antennae are needed. The equipment tracks the movement of the fish. You can see the receivers along the banks of the river. If you want to know what happens to the fish, go to [www.fws.gov/midcolumbiariverfro/reports.html](http://www.fws.gov/midcolumbiariverfro/reports.html) website for information. We wear our uniforms so you will know who we are.

**Tom Degrosellier:** *(power point video of PIT tagging procedures.)* PIT means Passive Integrated Transponder. These are much smaller than the transmitters, and the batteries last up to 75 years. They are smaller than a dime, can be inserted into smaller fish, and have very little impact on the animals. The transceiver gives power and stores data. The antenna connects with the transceiver. The focused is on fish are spring Chinook and steelhead. PIT tags help with Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) information giving information on habitats and how well the habitats are working for the fish. They also help keep an eye on stray fish from other areas coming into the Entiat. We are dependent on the landowners for this work.

**Bob W:** When monitoring, do you show much of a loss?

**Tom D:** We tag a lot of fish in the summer and then recapture them in the winter to learn what sites and percentages of survival through the winter. A good number we don't see again.

**Jon S:** How long do you see this continuing?

**Tom D:** That is a big question for researchers. How long to get an accurate answer. Some cases it is a very long time. The Chiwawa is a great example. That data set is 18 – 20 years old. New methods and designs become available. It depends on what specific question you want to answer.

**Nancy W:** Do you have middle school and high school shadows as you do this work?

**Tom D:** We try to have one or two do that if there is an interest.

### **Shoreline Master Program Update (I)**

**Mike K:** We are working on integrating all the different chapters for the master plan. Look for the draft to be available in the next couple of months. When it is available we will re-engage the advisor groups.

**Hal Hawley:** How many years are you away from the county line, where orchard borders are going to be?

**Mike K:** The Shoreline does not address the pesticide buffers. I don't see any changes in buffer lines. It is a grandfathered land use. That is not subject to setback. We do have an eye on that case.

**Jim S:** Five hundred feet is halfway up the hillside.

**Mike R:** That is a couple months away, ready at the next July meeting.

**Mike K:** I'd be happy to give another update in July.

**Mike R:** Are there any other questions for Mike Kaputa?

**Marking Large Wood Installed for Habitat (D)**

*Is there any objection to formalizing the decision made today regarding the marking (or not) of logs installed as part of habitat restoration efforts?*

**Decision: Mark the logs.**

**Mike R:** The County is prepared to mark the wood they use at Dillwater. Cascadia Conservation Board is interested to know what the EWPU wants to do. The District feels due to design, the loose wood will not be a big issue. But we are somewhat responsible for any wood that breaks loose. One Board member has worked in the Forest Service and stated that it is hard to mark logs.

**Jim S:** You will have to prove your log didn't take out a bridge. Marked logs or branded logs.

**Conard P:** Get out the branding irons and a way to brand the log.

**Mike R:** Our staff is willing to do it.

**Conard P:** Inserting a brass or steel rod in the log, will make it hard to tell whose tree it is. It looks to me to be far-fetched, that it isn't worth the trouble.

**Jon S:** Part of it is trying to address the liability, even if it isn't effective.

**Karin W:** How is the county going to mark the logs?

**Mike K:** We have a couple of ideas of different ways to try. Conard's idea is a good idea.

**Karin W:** PIT tag them. What is the cost of a PIT tag?

**Tom D:** About \$3.00.

**Mike K:** It is cheap to mark the tree.

**Karin W:** Do you still have those brands Conard?

**Conard P:** Yes!

**Karin W:** There you go!

**Jim S:** It is a Planning Unit liability.

**Bob W:** The folks that are worried will calm down after a year or so.

**Jon S:** We will have off channel debris too.

**Steve K:** We are not taking a position of marking or not marking. But do a good job marking them. Instances happen when a mark comes off, or didn't see the log, and it may achieve the opposite of what you intend it to do, depending on how it is handled.

**Mike R:** I thought we would have responsibility for each log that comes down.

**Jim S:** I don't know how it will unfold.

**Conard P:** It is easy to see the difference between a sawn log yesterday and one sawn 30 years ago. It will be difficult to tell what the source of damage would be. Most of the bridges survived the high river in the 1948 flood.

**Mike R:** It is perception of the issue as well as reality. Are we creating a bigger issue when we don't need to? I'm looking to the Planning Unit to give some direction.

**Hal H:** If someone does tag and someone else doesn't tag, the tagless will get blamed. It is a waste of time. Fires from upper Entiat will see a lot of timber come down river in the next 10 to 20 years.

**Mike R:** Is it a recommendation of the Planning Unit that we pursue marking? The action is very broad for the action of the District projects. I'm not hearing a strong sentiment one way or the other. One alternative, mark the logs most likely to get loose.

**Steve K:** If you are talking about a perception, you should mark them all.

**Dave B:** Couldn't you do an inventory and inventory again after an event?

**Jim S:** The Planning Unit has been kicked in the teeth lately and the last 20 years of work is not good enough or well thought out enough. I'd rather err on the side of the Planning Unit.

**Bob W:** It seems to me you could do this when monitoring, spray painting a certain color on the end of each log at monitoring time. That way it is fresh each year.

**Karin W:** I'm most interested in whose property will be damaged or whose bridge is taken out. I don't care where the trees go after that.

**Mike R:** I was looking for direction from the Planning Unit, which way to go. The cost of marking them won't be very much, if it is bringing confidence to the group. Is there any objection to Cascadia District marking the logs we install?

**Keith V:** I believe that would be good.

**Bob W:** If the logs don't come loose, discontinue the program of marking them.

**Chris Clemons:** We are monitoring with GPS. We could monitor the logs that way too.

**Mike R:** The decision is to mark the logs.

### **Entiat Video**

*(Entiat Video was viewed by the Planning Unit.)*

**Jim S:** I'm disappointed that it wasn't more about the Planning Unit. Some of the footage is in black and white. Some footage isn't even the Entiat.

**Mike K:** That came up during the Columbia video. It appeared the Methow drove the creation for that video. There is still a part of the video that is missing.

**Jim S:** Why would they expect to be paid for something they didn't do? I couldn't grow culls and expect premium price. The filmers have an attitude.

**Mike K:** Maybe we could talk about this at the Landowner Steering Committee? The historical perspective to get that message across is overlooked.

**Mike R:** We shared the story and told them the story. They didn't show what we shared with them.

**Jim S:** I can't imagine making some of the file footage cutesy.

**Mike R:** Some of the footage is from the '60's when Rocky Reach was built.

**Jim S:** That has nothing to do with the Entiat.

**Adam Neff:** Not knowing the history, I wouldn't have known what was missing.

**Mike R:** For the purpose of engaging other landowners we are hoping this works.

**Conard P:** What were they told we wanted?

**Mike R:** How the community came together to manage water, provide an example to the state and beyond.

**Nancy W:** We could have a discussion guide, map growth of the Planning Unit throughout the film. What made it successful here, that could help.

**Mike R:** Thank you!

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

**Mike R:** The next meeting will be here at the Grange Hall on July 11, 2012, at 9:00 am. Meeting evaluation forms are in the back. I encourage you to take an evaluation form to fill out and return.

Thank you for your attendance!

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

**List of Attachments**

**Attachment**

**Contents**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Attendance List                               |
| 2 | April 2011 Agenda                             |
| 3 | Water Right Tracking List                     |
| 4 | Contact Information for Water Right Transfers |