

January 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 9:00 a.m.

Mike Rickel welcomed folks to the meeting and started the round of introductions.

Mike R: The January meeting notice was sent out a couple of weeks ago and with it was a link to the October minutes which were posted on the Cascadia web site for review. Does anyone have any comments or edits for the October 2011 meeting minutes?

Hearing none, the October meeting minutes are finalized.

- **Review and Accept January Agenda**

Mike Rickel and meeting attendants reviewed the October agenda items. He learned late Tuesday night that the draft video of the Entiat is not ready for review today as hoped. A meeting will be coordinated with landowners when it is ready, and committed to review it before the end of February.

Copies of the draft Annual Report will be passed out for review today.

The January Agenda was accepted as amended.

New Business

- **Ruckelshaus Legislation**

Susan Dretke: An email was sent to all the agricultural growers I have emails for, encouraging their attendance at a meeting on Monday, January 9, in the Commissioners Chambers at 11:00 a.m. The meeting will address critical areas in agriculture lands and how the Ruckelshaus Legislation affects it. Come to the informational meeting. It will have significant impact to growers. Please get the word out to folks.

Mike R: Asked if Mike K had any additional input and confirming what Susan offered was accurate.

Mike Kaputa: Yes, thank you! We are allowing a couple of hours for questions and answers. The Commissioner's Chambers is located at the intersection of Douglas and Washington streets.

- **Annual Washington DC Trip**

Derek Van Marter: The Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) will make their annual trip to WA DC in March. Whatever we can add to their assortment of 'leave behinds' will benefit the Planning Unit. 'Leave behinds' are local pictures and quotes from local folks. Please send them to Susan or Mike Rickel.

Mike R: We hope to have copies of the 'Entiat Watershed Story' video for folks in Washington DC so they can see how landowners have taken an active part in the restoration. This is one of the things I'm committed to sending with UCSRB before the end of February.

- **Entiat River Appreciation**

Susan D: We are looking for property owners who are willing to let volunteer cleanup crews access their property during River Appreciation this coming summer. If you know of landowners willing to do this or locations that might need it, please let me know. River Appreciation is the first Saturday in August..

I'd also like to thank you to, since they are here, Casey Leigh and Bill Gilmartin for allowing us to work on their property last year.

- **Updated Shoreline Master Program Draft**

Mike K: We are very close to having the Shoreline draft completed. A couple items of interest are channel migration zones and the rules pertaining to them. A link for the Ruckelshaus Rules is included. It is helpful to see how these work together. I will bring the draft to the April Planning Unit meeting.

Outreach Efforts

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

Mike R: I'm disappointed that the video isn't ready. An evening meeting will take place at the Entiat Fire-hall or Grange for the landowners, agency representatives, and the community to review the video. I hope to stay away from game nights or other conflicting meetings. Howell at the Moon will be present to share in the review and edits. I hope all of you will come to see the video and learn more of the Entiat watershed.

The video is a good outreach tool for the new comers to learn about the Entiat history, and good support for the landowners that are part of the history. The video will be used

locally, regionally and nationally to explain the Entiat Story to natural resource management/planning/implementation and to hopefully provide an example for how others might go about it. In addition, we will use it locally to provide context for new landowners and as a means to engage landowners into the process. We are grateful to our sponsors for their help with funding for this video.

Bill Gilmartin: Can we have a copy or two at the library for the community to view?

Mike R: Yes, we can do that.

- **Draft Annual Report (I)**

(Attachment 3: Draft Annual Report copy)

Susan D: There are a few copies of the Annual Report draft being circulated for review. A couple of notes about the draft copy, the color you see is not true to the final report; and this report is half the size of the report in 2008. It contains a River Appreciation article, fishing, and Bob Whitehall. The last two pages show results from monitoring that has been done.

Thank you to Pamela Nelle for writing that up. This is a rough draft, and open to comments and edits. If we can get it to fit, we would like to get some redd counts featured in the white space on the back of this copy. We haven't received all the information yet. Please review and send me your comments. The goal is to have the final document by the end of January. If there are a lot of comments, we can push that deadline back a little.

Mike R: We will send out a link for this document later today. We need feedback within the next two weeks, by January 18. This is also an outreach tool for the landowners.

The challenge with the fish counts is to provide good data. Data on short term monitoring could give a good outlook when long term monitoring may show a different story. We want to share the information gained in a way that does not give false expectations.

Susan D: There will be a detailed monitoring report sent to landowners who have allowed access to river on their property, with a thank you card for their help. We anticipate using some of that information in the monitoring section of the Annual Report.

Pamela Nelle: A placeholder is what we are working out right now with Catherine on a Forest Service project. I will have a more detailed review including information on tagging of juvenile fish. This is a very drafty draft. Information will be sent to everyone.

Susan D: Should we expand on redd counts and trends? Is this a decision point? We have been urged to use caution in giving out information in small bites. We want to

make everyone aware there is a more detailed report coming for landowners that request it.

Pamela N: There is monitoring specific to fish, and there is other background monitoring that goes on too. Do you have a space to interpret the data in half a sheet of paper?

Susan D: That is the challenge. How much is enough and what doesn't show accurate pictures with this format?

Pamela N: Is there a reason for sticking with eight pages?

Susan D: Yes, there is a reason.

Phil Archibald: Some comments on monitoring. I don't think the question is: give information that is understandable by lay and local people. Landowners want to know, at this point of time where we are with fish count; what are we looking at and how do we interpret the information. The same information is wanted for the steelhead. I understand not wanting to let landowners interpret information for themselves. This is where we were then, where we are now and what is the goal

Susan D: Please understand I'm not trying to hold back information. My understanding is the way the information is collected changed in 2006. These three questions are very important and valid because the redds for steelhead method of data collection in 2006 changed. I'm not sure about the format.

Phil A: I can't speak for methodology. Since this reporting is from 2000. If you have data, look for ways to use it and use it well. Build a graph that shows the changes down the years.

Mike R: Phil identifies some of the reasons that it is a challenge to report the changes.

Derek VM: I agree to use data, along Phil's line of thought. The graph can show the changes and differences in data collection and numbers.

Susan D: I did not mean to imply we are holding information back. I'm having trouble with space in this report.

Phil A: I would suggest, instead of showing all monitoring, pick one species. Maybe Chinook since that has the longest data record.

Susan D: Thank you! That helps a lot. I'm struggling with what information is most critical to get out. I wanted to get the habitat and fish response captured in there. That was the concentrated effort in 2010-2011.

Karin W: Maybe have an online version showing the data for other species.

Don Olin: The two don't equate. We want to show the habitat improvements bringing in more fish. We've put this many weirs in and it's made a difference in the fish count. It needs to be productive in nature.

Pamela N: The reporting of numbers is important. The challenge is showing the fish counts are results of the work done. It seems it is easy to collect the data and give a report. But scientists are conscientious about their work, and want to make sure they can support the data results.

Bob Whitehall: All that stuff is coming into play.

Mike R: January 18 is the deadline for comments. We will send out a link to the report and request that edits/suggestions be provided no later than January 18th. Once we get all the input we will provide a new link with the updated report. We want to finalize this report no later than the middle of February.

- **Watershed Signage (D)**

Mike R: We have been encouraged by the Planning Unit to have more signs telling about what work is going on in the valley, and who to contact. We have a few examples of signs for your review.

Susan Dretke: Signs are one of the things we talked about at an earlier meeting, signs that say "Entering the Entiat Watershed." We went to websites to get ideas of signs used in other watersheds. We photo-shopped some sign examples to get a better idea of what they could look like. These are very blocky examples.

Another option is a road sign at the bottom of the Entiat River Road, manufactured of metal and mounted on a post. Some signs are more involved, detailed information about the watershed. A local artist said she would charge about 200 for a design. We could contract with the Correctional Institute to create the actual sign.

Examples from the Correctional Institute are the Cascadia Conservation District signs at the north end of Odabashian Bridge.

Derek VM: The logo on the top of the Agenda sheet would be an obvious logo for the signs?

Susan D: Yes. That is a definite idea too.

Mike R: Any sign will have the EWPU logo on it. There is more than one format to work with. One a simple road sign, and another more detailed sign with contact information.

Chris Clemons: How is this different than the one that is at the mouth of the river now?

Susan D: This just makes folks aware they are entering the Entiat Watershed. Planting an idea, making them aware they are entering the watershed. The informational sign would go at the kiosk for stopping and reading.

Mike R: The detailed signs would be at places like City Hall, library, at project sites and the grocery store. They would be updated more frequently and have wider distribution.

Phil A: The reason for the signs came from the meeting last summer. The need for information, a drive by awareness, something is going on here. They are multilevel informational signs. I like the more pictorial ones, with the partnership logos on the signs. Use the four symbols on the signage.

Decision point: *The Planning Unit decided to move forward with sign designs.*

Susan D:

1. Do we want to proceed with getting signs installed?
2. Picking the sign styles?

Jon Small: Use the Planning Unit logo.

Mike R: The Planning Unit logo won't change.

Karin W: I would like it to say Entiat WRIA.

Mike K: I think you will want a subcommittee to choose the signage.

Mike R: I think we are hearing support for signage. Rather than a committee, it is the District's responsibility to bring plans to those who are concerned, take comments, turn it around and have signs up after the snow melts this spring.

Bob W: Have a sign by the kiosk.

Susan D: Yes. We want to proceed with signage and we want the EWPU logo to have prominent places on the signs.

Catherine Willard: We have a graphic designer at the Forest Service office that could help.

Bill G: If you have multiple designs, get a price break, and have multiple signs five miles apart up the river.

Pamela N: You could replace the word entering with 'welcome.'

Jason Lundgren: We work with the Wenatchee Valley Community College to get our signage. It took them a while to get them made, but it was fairly inexpensive.

Susan D: Thank you! Any comments, suggestions, or ideas, please let me know.

Habitat

- **Lower Entiat Reach Assessment (I)**

(Attachment 4: Power Point Presentation - Draft BOR River Assessment)

Mike R: Rob Richardson is with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) in Boise is here for this portion of the agenda. He will present the lower Entiat Reach assessment and information from that assessment.

Steve Kolk: Should we give the background for this? 2014 is the Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) concerted effort to do habitat projects at the mouth of the Entiat.

Rob Richardson: I am from the BOR office in Boise. A lot has been done in the Entiat all across the board. The assessment reports what is going on in the river and the physical work that has been done. In addition, the assessment looks at what kind of physical actions can be done to make improvements? *(Rob started the presentation, with discussion, graphs of how the river has changed and where it has changed down through the years.)*

The tributary assessment takes the Entiat River from the mouth to 26 miles up the river.

When glaciers were in the valley, they pushed the sediment down the valley. This image shows the 8000 year terrace, working down to the active flood plain we have now. These images are created from LIDAR pictures taken in 2006. It reflects the 100 year flood inundation, ancient channel scars and terraces left behind.

Mike K: Does that flood line match the regular floodplain?

Rob R: Yes. The red dashed line shows the same. The red line is a simplified line.

There are different floodplains and valley bottoms. It can get confusing as to which floodplain we are talking about. The active floodplain is a two year floodplain shown in the blue areas. Yellow represents the floodplain from the last glacier period which is not activated very often, if at all. The river has very coarse armor, bigger rocks. Sediment that comes into the channel comes from upstream and upper tributaries. When it comes down, it pushes the river off to the side. Tributary values don't have as much impact as the areas that are steeper.

Coarse armoring immobilizes scour that could result in damaging bridges. This image shows the 100 year flood plain. The Dinkelman weir was built in 2001. The bed material didn't move until 2006. Some of it did move then, but for five years it didn't change.

When putting in a project, you want to do some specific analysis at that site. You want to think about scour-age. If you are on a straight section of the river, like Dinkelman, it takes a lot to change. Scour that was pushed out has filled back in. Threshold needs to be determined and worked out above and below the (different word here).

Historic reports indicate six to seven large pools per mile may have existed along the lower Entiat. I question the validity of the number of large pools. Generally three to four pools per mile makes more sense.

Jim Small: I've not heard about channelization. A lot of the pools that were here when I came were behind huge boulders.

Rob R: The boulders maintained the pools.

Jim S: June of 1972 was the largest flood since the 1948 flood. The next one was in 2006. The pink lines show how little the channel has moved. Riparian efforts help to keep it in place.

Rob R: There are very few active areas of erosion, shown by fine sand. Established banks have large boulders and cobbles. The dam was partially destroyed in the late 1930's; more was damaged in the '48 flood. By 1962 the channel is locked in because of bank protection. Riprap is in place to protect the road. The red lines, as far as they are set back, are random. I will clarify that in the report too.

Casey Leigh: Is the yellow line showing how far it would have migrated?

Rob R: It never migrated more than 3 feet per year. Most places were immeasurable. Migration generally happened during the larger floods.

Are the islands forming because of log jams or because of what the river is doing? It was determined that it is because of what the river is doing. Log jams are formed at the head of the islands. Are side channels perennial or seasonal? The log jams protect side channels.

It is impossible to determine how much Large Woody Debris (LWD) was in the channel before development. No one monitored them before. On all locations where there are bends or islands, LWD is collecting. How many log jams have been in the river? We figured there could have been as many as ten. Currently, there are 16 log jams in the study area, five of them constructed.

From all of this, we can't restore what we had 300 years ago. We don't know what was there. What are the key elements we need to know? What is most beneficial to the fish and ok with the landowners?

Jim S: How do you determine the 100 feet wide riparian buffer? On the lower river with agriculture activities going on, desired conditions would eliminate a lot of agriculture.

Rob R: I based this on the two year active flood plain. The flood plain is close to the water table. Some areas are greater and some are less. I came up with that number by the number of trees. It is hard to report on a seven mile reach, and hard to report average conditions.

How do we take average conditions and provide a tool to project what is appropriate? Habitat protection, where are areas of flood plain that have been disconnected? How do we get the biggest bang for the buck? There are several areas where levees could be good choices for projects.

Channel migration is encouraging the river to move towards a natural position. The red lines show where channel migration may occur if there is no bank protection.

Phil A: At that location, what is the likelihood of backwater into the pond?

Rob R: A great likelihood to do so. The concern is sediment filling. We need to have enough flow going through to flush it out. It would help to do some specific modeling to the study.

(Instream Structure – slide presentation) Individual LWD placements are appropriate along most banks. Boulder clusters are appropriate near bedrock and / or valley walls.

The take home points: The majority of the channel size came over thousands of years. It is heavily armored. We will get more benefit from connecting two year floodplains than we will connecting 100 year flood plains. Channel migration is slow. LWD accumulates at the head of islands. Human modifications have only a minor impact. The greatest human impact was the removal of instream structures.

Mike K: What are your next steps?

Rob R: I received some review, and am waiting for written reviews. The report will be turned around and become final in early February. A second report will be coming out a month or two after this report.

Steve K: We could get copies to folks.

Mike R: We could have the draft report posted to our website later today. This identified the geomorphic physical constraints in the river. Where are the opportunities to narrow down possible projects? We will be taking this physical information and, working with the Regional Technical Team and landowners, work to identify the projects opportunities and community support for these opportunities.

Bob W: In the lower river, in the backwater area, is that area evaluated as part of the assessment?

Rob R: The more specific assessment would give us a better answer.

Mike R: The District is interested in working with the city on a project closer to the kiosk. Maybe make modifications on existing structures. Landowners have requested modifications.

Rob R: If you have feedback from the landowners, please let me know.

Steve K: The next Planning Unit meeting would be a good time for Rob to present the existing projects report, and update what has happened with the reach assessment information. The next meeting is in April. We will have a pretty good idea at that time how and when to move forward.

Large Woody Debris Forum and Next Steps (I)

Mike K: We had the large wood workshop, put together by the County and a large wood planning team. We had a good range of speakers addressing how wood is important to rivers. They all did a nice job of explaining, with great examples of how projects have been done and the different techniques they used. The general goal was to get together to develop a common understanding of wood projects. It was well attended, and a lot of good discussion after the presentations. We are going to reconvene the planning group who put that workshop together and talk about next steps on January 24, in the Leavenworth Chelan PUD, at 1:00 p.m. We will be talking about how to develop best management practices, management, and monitoring. I will talk a little about this at the Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) meeting tomorrow.

Mike R: Mike K, you made mention of a large wood moratorium in Lake Chelan. We hope the needs are seen by the commissioners. We have a lot riding on this information.

Mike K: Lake Chelan is a lot different than the Wenatchee or Entiat watersheds. Lake Chelan adopted a moratorium for any wood projects for use of wood in city limits. There are types of mitigation for use of wood. Entiat and Wenatchee use wood for habitat. We hope to solve the Lake Chelan problems through the issues in Entiat and Wenatchee.

Susan D: One of the things we want to talk about the handout is at the doorway, is written in an article by American Whitewaters. Please feel free to take one. I spoke with the author and he is more than excited to have his article shared. He is writing a second paper with more technical aspects. It takes some of the issues we've heard before and addresses them from a paddler's perspective.

Mike R: It tells of the role LWD plays in the river, gives background information and awareness to help make better decisions of whether you want to support it. If you support, be willing to share it with the commissioners. If we don't share it, the commissioners may be hearing only from a small number of landowners that are not in support of it. I'm not sure that is how the Entiat landowners feel. Wood is an important part of, but not the only way, to restore fish habitat in the Entiat.

Jim S: The only problem I have heard that landowners have with Large Wood projects is the liability.

Mike K: We had an attorney speak about liability at the workshop. There is a link from builder to liability. The questions are how much safety, liability, long term monitoring and funding for such.

Mike R: Those are the critical issues for landowners. Remove the risk from the things that we build. We recognize that is critical for continued projects that involve Large Wood

Jim S: I think most of the landowners understand, because the liability is a concern. There won't be any traction for LWD from the landowners until that is answered.

Mike K: What is our action plan? Moratoriums are temporary, but how temporary? We will likely have some community meetings. How we respond is important.

Jim S: I feel we are going nowhere until this is resolved. A moratorium will destroy the EWPU. So, we need to meet this issue before that happens. We need to address the issues soon. Lay out the steps of the process and timelines. We have good projects coming, but we need issues resolved first. If we lose the support of the people in the valley, there isn't much point of the EWPU existing. We can't force the issue. We will be stopped politically. It needs to be a priority.

Mike R: I agree!

Casey L: Has anyone talked to the commissioners about the liability to them for contracts that have been signed? The commissioners could be responsible for damage to Cascadia and others. It needs to be pointed out to them.

Mike K: What is the long term strategy? We know wood is important, but how do we do it?

Casey L: Could we buy some more time so projects for this summer won't be stopped, and slow down the moratorium movement?

Susan D: That is the main goal at the meeting on January 24, to address the issues quickly. This group has been meeting and the urgency is a priority. It is a struggle to get this done in a timely manner.

Derek VM: I appreciate the comments. It is not just an Entiat issue, but goes across the state. Oregon has a law about this. The legislative path is very long road. We do have districts behind us. This is a short session where there is a 2 billion dollar budget gap. We will continue to move forward. Don't know if we will have results by the time we need help to move forward.

Jim S: Drafting a bill gets you a long way down the road, but not all the way there

Mike R: The other issue is safety. Answering the questions of the public is crucial.

Mike K: We might consider sending around the White Paper.

Mike R: Do you have a link for the White Paper posted on your website?

Susan D: I have a pdf version.

(Attachment 5: Skellenger Bender White Paper website link)

Mike K: all the materials from the workshop are posted on our website. All presentations are posted as well.

(Attachment 6: Chelan County Natural Resources website link)

Mike R: Thank you, Doug, for coming to hear some of the discussions.

Doug England: The commissioners discussed the large wood issue but it was specific to Lake Chelan.

Mike R: This discussion gives you a flavor of what we hope to do.

Why Large Wood is Important (I)

(Attachment 7: Paddler Chuck Story)

Phil A: I live up the valley by Stormy Creek, and continue to be involved as a technical advisor.

Wood in the river is important to fish, and is resistant to river flow. The larger the wood the better the results are. The big trees are 200 – 300 years old. There are no more trees in this area that are that old. They were logged down, blown down, and burned down. The size matters. The sign at the side channel by Entiat city limits is gone, but the side channel is still there. We've looked at it and wanted to get water to stay in it the whole year around. While discussing ways to accomplish that, we concluded we didn't know what to do. The log jam built ice events that triggered the side channel to now be filled year around. That is a recent example that is beneficial to the fish. It doesn't interfere with roads or land.

You start fishing where there is wood. Fish hide in wood to rest. Fish want to grow, and slow deep water habitats are where fishermen go. Spring Chinook love the slow deep water habitats! It has cover and protection from predators.

The four “C’s” are: cold, clean, connected and complex. Right now I’ll talk about complex – fast water and flood plain habitat are important to fish. If you put a single log in the river, you start something. But if you put a big live red cedar tree in the water, the roots and branches create eddies. Complex velocities are only created well with wood, roots and branches of trees. As fish are exposed to each other, they get into more fights. They don’t like to see each other. If you have cover in the form of sticks, logs, and roots, you increase their growth, food and protection. What happens when a big cottonwood falls in the river? It starts to decay. What makes them slippery? Parasites, algae, fungi, and they are the base of fish food sources. Fall leaf litter gives aquatic life food. This activity on logs increases growth rate and provides food for aquatic life, which provides food for fish.

Mike R: What is the big picture for the outcome we hope to get?

Phil A: I think it is time for an addendum on the Watershed Plan. If you haven’t been to the Chiwawa River, view the river. It has a high wood loading, and is a good visual of what is going on there now. Then look at the fish numbers there. Empirical science is to observe and interpret what is happening.

Chris C: The Chiwawa is a good site. You can Google the Chiwawa River.

Mike R: We asked Phil to make this presentation because we know the large wood issue is not going away. We hope to continue to do projects to help with fish habitat.

Water Resources

- **Entiat Water Exchange Update and Next Steps (I)**

Mike R: Transfers or water notices are to be provided by DOE to the EWPU and Conservation District for comment for consideration by DOE before they can take place.

Doug England: That is in opposition to what you want to achieve. By the time you get through DOE, it is too late. Don’t you want to do something before it gets that far?

Mike R: We have a landowner who wishes to lease his water to another landowner on the Knapp-Wham (KW). The Entiat Water Exchange is a venue to proactively connect sellers with buyers and keep the water in the valley. We don’t want it widely known so that outsiders can come in and offer more money than the valley can offer.

Mike K: Landowners can’t sell the right to water because it belongs to the land.

Conard Petersen: I don’t think very many of the KW water users want to sell water out of the area. They will not support any plan that jeopardizes their shares to outsiders or out of the KW area.

Jim S: I don’t know that you can control that.

Mike R: That is the group we thought we could utilize to test the Water Exchange, but most all of the irrigable acres are already in production so there is not a great amount of need at least not in the KW service area.

Steve K: Doesn't Trout Unlimited have a pot of money for keeping water in the stream through leases?

Jason Hatch: We had a meeting decision that the water is used, and to keep it in the valley.

Jon S: We talked about Trout Unlimited purchasing the water, but that caused other problems, and was not supported by the committee

Doug E: That is part of the concern of the meeting.

Jason Hatch: Those terms could be a lease, to keep it instream. We couldn't pull it off in 30 days, but it could be done in the valley – with planning.

Mike K: Hold it in trust for some future use.

Jon S: We haven't had a meeting for a while.

Derek VM: Isn't that the intent of the trust water? Use it or lose is a Washington State law. It is about negotiating appropriate terms to keep it in the area.

Mike R: It would be best if we can protect the water rights, and allow Entiat users to access that water, not lose it. I lean heavily on Trout Unlimited for that information. I will work with the steering committee to schedule another meeting, likely on or near February 1, to plan for next steps to keep momentum on this issue. I am not sure how much further we can take it though.

- **Outdoor Water use Strategy (I)**

Mike R: The purpose of the Outdoor Water use Strategy is to identify water users that are not on the irrigation water, and to determine what the outdoor water use is versus the household use as we believe that might be the area where we could be more accurate with actual vs. assumed use. This information could determine if more growth would be available with the existing reserve for homes. Meters would be used to determine the difference between outdoor and household usage. I will bring the letter to be sent to landowners requesting that they help us determine outdoor use and information to the April meeting. Bob Whitehall has meters to use for volunteers that want to help determine the actual water usage. The target areas are service areas outside irrigation districts. The approach is to get fair representation of about 15 users for different outdoor needs.

Jim S: The domestic wells, you are allowed to irrigate ½ acre. The problem is that the DOE thinks that number is accurate, but it might not be. An assumed usage?

Karin W: What is that usage?

Mike R: 5,000 gallons a day.

Susan D: The DOE average use for a family is 4,800 gallons a day with an allowance to irrigate up to ½ acre. It is based on that assumption, an overall assumption. Subtract 4,800 from the reserve, meter the outdoor usage for a more accurate number.

Doug E: Where that usage has been set, what is the danger of DOE changing the reserve?

Mike K: There is a reserve in the Entiat and in the Wenatchee. The Entiat maximum allowable is 5,000 gallons a day per household. I hope to have the actual debit against the domestic reserve between September 2004 and December 2011 by the April meeting. Knowing how much the actual outdoor usage is, will be a benefit. My suspicion is that 300 gallons per household is closer to the actual number, rather than 5000. Likelihood is the reserves were created from the Planning Unit.

Doug E: The state has money for reserves. If the state is short of water and says you don't need as much water as you think you do, could they change the reserves?

Mike K: They would have to go in and change the rules.

Susan D: That possibility exists, but is not likely to happen. It is not something the state would entertain lightly.

Jim S: What Doug is saying, is the worst case scenario.

Karin W: In Kittitas County, if you want to have a well, you have to pay blood money to get it.

Derek VM: Demonstrating our known usage versus assumed usage is good information.

Bob W: There are a lot of folks that have summer homes and don't use that much water. That is a tough one.

Mike R: That assumed use is for year around usage.

Don O: There are some folks that have a ½ acre share, but use 5 acre share of water.

Mike K: We'd feel better if we had DOE confirming that. With the transition and an interim DOE person, I'm not sure who we are working with. It would be good to have DOE confirm their commitment.

Karin W: Should we write a letter to DOE to be here at the April meeting for this discussion?

Don O: We are just about to get hit with meters, because of DOE.

Jim S: DOE changes their commitments all the time.

Meeting Close-out, Evaluation and Adjourn

Mike R: The next meeting will be here at the Grange Hall on April 4, 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, and have a happy new year everyone!

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

List of Attachments

<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Contents</u>
1	Attendance List
2	October 2011 Agenda
3	Website link for Draft Annual Report www.cascadiacd.org/ewpu-agendas-minutes-Jan-4-2012_206-23a.html
4	Power Point Presentation - Draft BOR River Assessment
5	Website link for Skellenger Bender White Paper www.cascadiacd.org/ewpu-agendas-minutes-Jan-4-2012_206-23a.html
6	Website link for Chelan County Natural Resources www.co.chelan.wa.us/nr
7	Website link for Paddler Chuck Story www.cascadiacd.org (click on “Large Woody Debris” article.)