

Methow Watershed Council
Meeting Minutes
February 18, 2009
Riverbank Building

Council Members present were:, Chairman Katharine Bill, Greg Knott, Marty Williams, Ray Campbell, Tim Johnson, MVID, Nate Wehmeyer, Okanogan County, Tom Gehring, Council Member Town of Twisp, and Coordinator Lee Hatcher.

Council Members Absent: Vicky Welch and Secretary Jackie Moriarty.

Guests present: Rusty Post, DOE and Bill Sullivan and Tim Flynn (via phone) Aspect Consulting.

Chairman Bill called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

Fiscal report from Clerk/Treasurer Colleen Storms
Twin Lakes Aquifer Coalition support letter
February meeting/conduct
Coordinator's Review
Town of Twisp letter to DOE regarding 2 cfs transfer

MOTION:

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

VOLUNTEER TIME

Coordinator Hatcher touched briefly on the new sign-in sheet, explaining that the hours that Council Members volunteer at meetings will help the MWC leverage money when applying for grants. Hatcher explained that credit will be given as follows: two hours for regular meetings; travel time; committee meetings outside the regular meetings; phone calls; and research. Hatcher urged Council Members to record their hours and turn an accounting in at each monthly meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 15, 2009

MOTION:

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of January 15, 2009 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

TIMELINE REVIEW

Chairman Bill discussed the MWC timeline stating the group stayed on track for February. Chairman Bill went over March tasks. Council Member Wehmeyer asked if a boundary map had been adopted, Chairman Bill confirmed that the Council had agreed to use the Golder boundary map. Council Member Wehmeyer shared that he just wanted to make sure before he gathered more information.

COORDINATOR'S REPORT

Coordinator Hatcher discussed Clerk/Treasurer Storms quarterly report. Hatcher reported a total of \$73,000 left on all of the grants that has to be used by June 30, 2009. Rusty Post explained that there will need to be a grant amendment in order to tap into the other portion of funding for the Phase 4 Project. Post shared that the MWC is certain of receiving the remaining funds because this is considered to be a base grant and those funds have not been reduced as much as others.

Hatcher announced that Bill Zachmann of DOE had contacted him sharing that the MWC's priority 1 project (Instream Rule Revision Grant Phase II) was rated as the #1 priority project in the central region. Post shared that this grant is subject to budget cuts and that he and the other central region leads had gathered and prioritized as a group; Rusty was able to negotiate the MWC grant into the lead position. Post warned the Council that they may not receive 100% of the funding on the proposal. Post stated that the Council may need to pare down to the lowest amount possible that still allows them to get the work done. Chairman Bill inquired as to when that work would need to take place. Post advised that the work should be done as soon as possible and definitely before the March meeting. Council thanked Post for his help in the central region prioritization process.

Hatcher reported that he had started research regarding outside funding sources for MWC. Hatcher is preparing a spreadsheet containing funding source due dates, amounts available and MWC eligibility. Hatcher shared that he had attended a Methow Restoration Council meeting and asked the Council to consider if his presents is needed at future meetings since the MWC is already represented. Hatcher shared that he is working with Clerk/Treasurer Colleen Storms and Secretary Moriarty on defining duties, communication and organization issues.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Bill Sullivan, Aspect Consulting was present and Tim Flynn joined via phone to update the Council on the progress and direction of the draft outline of the Detailed Implementation Plan.

Section 1. – Introduction

Section 2. - Update Since Watershed Plan Approval - Table 12 issues – Chairman Bill volunteered to send more information regarding previous discussions to Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Post suggested mentioning County tracking info, local planning efforts such as shoreline management, comprehensive and flood planning and critical area studies.

Section 3. – Framework for Implementation - Three major objectives were discussed modify instream flow rule, increase storage and/or recharge and the development mechanism to facilitate transfer of water. Discussed an invitation being sent to group A and B and municipal water rights holders for their input. Mr. Sullivan shared that he has a form letter that MWC can use to invite input. Mr. Sullivan advised bringing these groups in early in the process.

Section 4. – Prioritization – The prioritization list established by Council at the January meeting will be discussed and background information gathered on those priorities.

Section 5. – DIP Development – Mr. Sullivan shared the importance of Section 5.3 - Coordination with Other Planning Entities in WRIA 48 – Council provided a few agencies to Mr. Sullivan, including Okanogan County Planning Department, Bureau of Reclamation, Methow Restoration Council and Forest Service.

Section 6. – Strategies and Actions to Implement – Mr. Sullivan suggested that in this section the Council will need to select the top implementation actions, summarize each of the implementation actions, develop a detailed plan for just those actions and determine funding sources for each action.

Council Member Williams discussed water use estimate for exempt wells. Mr. Sullivan shared the history of how the water use estimate of 600 gallons per day was determined. A compromise between the Planning Unit and DOE based on the Town of Twisp water usage was agreed upon to use as a starting figure.

Section 7. - Implementation Schedule – Identify sequence of actions.

Section 8. – Funding

Section 9. – Implementation Strategies – This is the section that all other requirements that may not have been addressed in other sections of the DIP can be placed

Section 10. - References

Council feels that the prioritization is in order. Mr. Post mentioned recommendations listed in the plan and that they may need to be prioritized. Council did not find those recommendations to be a high priority for discussion at this time.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Council which priorities they felt to be most important for the development of a detailed plan. Mr. Sullivan suggested taking the top 3 -5 items from the prioritization list. Council decided to refine definitions for 1–A through 1–C (Council felt all other 1-C are subsidiary to developing water storage). Council Member Knott suggested that Council take time to clearly identify the benefit and/or goals they are

trying to achieve with these actions. Chairman Bill suggested taking on meeting to flush out all of the details for each of the top three priorities; Bill asked for Aspects help.

1st Grouping

- Modify WAC 173-548 1-A
- Preserve Agricultural Lands and Uses/ Buyer Seller Water Agreements 1-B
- Develop Water Storage 1-C
 - Artificial Groundwater Recharge 1-C
 - Protect Artificial Recharge and Existing Unlined Irrigation Canals 1-C
 - Enhance Artificial Recharge Using Unused Unlined Irrigation Canals 1-C
 - Environmental Benefits of Unlined Irrigation Canals 1-C
 - Groundwater Recharge from Unlined Irrigation Canals for ASR Projects 1-C
 - Habitat 1-C

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WATER USE STUDY

Mr. Sullivan shared that the purpose of the study plan is to outline a method to develop a sensible average daily demand for exempt well lots that will support an effort to modify the instream flow rule. This study will apply to indoor /outdoor use for the developing an average tailored to WRIA 48 using data from Group A and B systems. Mr. Sullivan explained that data already gathered shows that indoor water use is steady throughout the year and shows throughout the state to be an average of approximately 200 gpd. Mr. Sullivan feels that with the data back up for this study it is a defensible indoor use figure.

Mr. Sullivan discussed three methods that can be used to determine outdoor use. Method 1 – The Analogous System in which they would find similar systems and design models formed from such contributing factors as average annual precipitation, lot size and occupancy. A group of public water systems that provide a good representation of water use and conditions across WRIA 48 would be chosen for the study. Chairman Bill questioned whether we would have different averages depending on season or location or just one average. Mr. Sullivan stated just one average for location and season.

Method 2– Information from 120 WRIA’s across the State of Washington and some information from other states is gathered and used to determine a usage. Mr. Sullivan reported that the Department of Health (DOH) currently uses this system for their estimation of water use. Council Member Knott pointed out that the precipitation amounts are significantly different in Carlton versus Mazama, and asked how Aspect planned to come to one aggregate number for the entire Methow Valley. Sullivan shared that it could be based on population, the higher density of population would weigh heavier on the gpd figure and that that figure may be higher or lower in other areas in the Methow Valley, but would average out. Council Member Campbell discussed factoring in recharge. Mr. Sullivan clarified that at this time they are just trying to determine a defensible gpd figure and that recharge could be discussed at a later date.

Method 3 – Metering – Determine time period, location or implement from now forward mandatory metering for new construction. The benefits of metering would be to provide defensible data. The cons of a mandatory metering program would be the expense and amount of time it would take to gather data. Considerations of the metering method

would be: defining costs, relationships with other agencies, funding, liability issues, installation plan, equipment types, design flow of meter, maintenance plan, data collection and management; and an extensive public outreach and education plan.

Council Member Knott discussed the three methods. Knott pointed out that the metering plan would be the most defensible, but agreed with the considerations discussed. Knott went over his concerns regarding the methods: relying on public water system data; lot size; precipitation, the variability of the entire watershed; being challenged if representative data could not be gathered; and determining full-time population. Council Member Campbell warned that in the past the public has been reluctant to participate in metering

Mr. Sullivan discussed lag time in regards to exempt wells that are located away from the river and the impact they have on instream flow. Sullivan discussed the need to account for people with irrigation rights or ditch members that do not use their wells for irrigation. Mr. Flynn pointed out the reality of trying to prove a lag time effect on the river may be too hard and may invite scrutiny in regards to rule making.

VOLUNTEER TIME

Nothing was discussed at this time.

WATER TRANSFER MECHANISM

Mr. Flynn discussed a pending House Bill extending water banking and trust. Flynn shared that the language in this bill may affect the structuring of water trust mechanisms.

TWIN LAKES AQUIFER COALITION – LETTER OF SUPPORT

The Council discussed the letter of support for the Twin Lakes Aquifer Coalition project, including Council Member Knott's edits. Council Member Knott explained his edits were basically for clarity. Knott asked the Council to consider that MWC does not consider habitat and asked how will this project change the water situation at Twin Lakes? Knott supports the coalition regarding their research but feels that in order to write a letter in total support more data should be collected.

Council Member Campbell wants to wait until the next meeting to read the revisions Council Member Knott provided and to have time to make changes if necessary.

SUSTAINABLE ORGANIZATION TO MANAGE WATER IN THE METHOW VALLEY

Council Member Knott shared his thoughts regarding the long-term survival of the MWC and for the need to have a plan for funding and sustaining the group into the future.

MOTION:

Council Member Knott moved to authorize Coordinator Hatcher to develop a proposed infrastructure and budget for a long-term sustainable organization necessary to implement the Methow Watershed Plan. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

MEETING CONDUCT AND ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER

Council Member Knott suggested if the Council wishes to continue to hold their meetings according to Roberts Rules of Order that in the future, motions need to be written prior to the meeting. Knott feels have prepared motions is a very important tool to keep meetings on track.

Council Member Gehring felt the January meeting was conducted well until the last topic was discussed. Gehring explained his concern regarding the way that Vice-Chairman Fort conducted himself at that point in the meeting and the way that this behavior could be construed by outside guests. Council Member Williams felt that there was misbehavior from both parties and that the issue should have been tabled to another time. Knott suggested that the Council start with the motion and then allow for discussion on the topic.

COORDINATOR HATCHER – THREE MONTH REVIEW

Chairman Bill shared that she had conducted Coordinator Hatcher's three month review. Bill thanked everyone for their input and shared that the meeting with Hatcher went well. Hatcher thanked the Council for their support.

SUPPORT LETTER FOR THE TOWN OF TWISP REGARDING THE TRANSFER OF WATER

Chairman Bill discussed the issue of writing a support letter to the DOE in favor of a water transfer from the Early Winters Reach (2cfs). Hatcher volunteered to work with Vice-Chair Fort to develop a letter and present it at the next meeting. Mr. Post pointed out that a letter of support may be premature if the Town of Twisp has not submitted an application for water transfer prior to the support letter. Bill felt this letter would give the MWC a voice and show the DOE what direction the MWC is heading with water planning.

MOTION:

Council Member Knott moved to approve Coordinator Hatcher working with Vice-Chair Fort to draft a letter to support for the transfer of water from the 2cfs to the Town of Twisp in consultation with Rusty Post to be reviewed by the entire MWC at the next meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 pm. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Katharine Bill, Chairman

ATTEST:

Jackie Moriarty, CMC
Secretary

**Note: These minutes were prepared from an audio recording. I was not always able to determine who was speaking or who made the motions.