

**Methow Water 2066
Interested Party Meeting**

Farm Bureau

October 30, 2019, 10:30 am
Rocking Horse Bakery, Winthrop

MEETING NOTES

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia, Water 2066 Facilitation Team
Participant: Dick Ewing, Water Committee Chair, Farm Bureau

Meeting Questions & Notes:

1. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

A more rural, agrarian (resource-based) economy, integrated with industry, such as forest products, mining and grazing, integrated with local businesses and other industries.

2. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

1. Agriculture
2. Industrial and commercial use
3. Vibrant towns
4. Instream for recreation
5. Instream for fish

Due to ESA, a lot of the water to support fish has already come from the agricultural community.

3. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

The solution is forest management. There is too much evaporative loss due to current, dense canopy cover. Need to open up the canopy. Colorado study found 20% increase in streamflow as a result of proper forest management.

4. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

Yes, from a legal and management perspective.

No, in terms of what the watershed can produce.

5. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

Sufficient access to water for human uses, specifically including municipalities. There needs to be a mechanism to capture and reallocate relinquished water.

6. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

Maintaining agriculture water for agriculture uses. If water is changed from agriculture to another out-of-stream use, it should be divided and distributed in thirds. For example, 1/3 for agriculture, 1/3 for fish, 1/3 for the other out-of-stream use.

7. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

Give people the freedom to choose living in town or out of town. Provide/create attractions for people to live in town. Change the rule to allow for cluster development (more than one single family home), to keep open space. Quality of development is important (how it is done), not specifically where it is done (inside vs. outside of town).

8. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Yes, if there is an attraction for the towns.

9. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

Yes, restore all exempt uses in RCW 90.44.050 to allow for commercial and clustered development.

10. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Yes, should maximize the use of agricultural industry and need to find a way to support both in-town and natural resources based-economies.

11. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Forest products, restoring a level of ranching, mining, and creating a more artisan community—implementing a bigger vision, similar to Ashland, Oregon.

12. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

Yes, would like to see a trail system with nodes and B&Bs that could support our recreational economy.

13. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

Yes. Despite efforts to improve agricultural economy in Methow there will be attrition in agriculture where ag water rights will be freed up for other uses. Once converted to year round use this source of water could provide water for municipalities, A & B class water systems or an industrial use over 5000 gpd.

14. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

Yes, the real issue in my mind is flexibility to use water wisely.

15. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

No. If possible, do a source exchange for water that has already been transferred. For example, water that has been transferred out, have them use the 750 acre-feet of Roosevelt water currently made available through Office of Columbia River and bring the water back to the Methow.

16. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Strongly agree.

17. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

- Floodplain restoration - Strongly agree
- Beaver Dams - Strongly agree
- Constructed beaver dam analogs - Strongly agree
- Off channel reservoirs (no direct impact to rivers or fish) – Strongly agree
- Dams (instream storage) - Strongly agree
- Groundwater recharge from surface water - Strongly agree
- Forest management – Strongly agree

The main way to get storage would be in the uplands (i.e. forest management) and looking at small dams (beaver or otherwise). A dam at Lost River could back water into Pasayten Wilderness, which could augment flows for fish in the Methow River.

18. Which subbasin do you live in?

Thompson Creek

19. Additional thoughts.

Would like to see freedom to use 2 cfs reservations. Two cfs from Early Winters reach or relinquished water could support towns. Need to also look to storage for a holistic fix. There is no one fix and it needs to be a combination.

Idea: Build a narrow gage cog Swiss style railway over Hwy 20 down to Pateros and over to Anacortes. Close Hwy 20 (North Cascades). Put platforms at each of the trailheads. Make it desirable to come for the weekend, but not feel the need to stay or buy second property for a second home. Big advantage to such a railway would-be year-round access to the Methow over the North Cascades.

Methow Water 2066

Interested Parties Meeting

Irrigators

Meeting held December 3, 2019, 10:30 am at Methow Valley Community Center

Participants: Jeff Zwar, senior water right holder

Vic Stokes, Wolf Creek

Greg Nordang, MVID

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia

Meeting Questions & Notes:

20. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

XX

21. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

Jeff	Vic	Greg
1. Vibrant towns	1. Agriculture	1. Agriculture
2. Agriculture	2. Towns	2. Vibrant towns
3. Instream flow for recreation Commercial/Industrial	3. Commercial/Industrial	3.

22. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

See #2.

23. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

There are times that it could be a problem (climate change). Hard to be certain. Hope to solve situation before it happens.

24. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

How to get through a drought situation.

25. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

Jeff hasn't been short on water in decades.

Okay! We're all okay.

26. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

XX

27. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

XX

28. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to

share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

Yes.

29. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Yes.

30. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Forest products – more intense management of the forest.

Any good industry could be beneficial.

31. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

Yes. Would like to see small scale businesses more than subdivisions, as long as they aren't polluting.

32. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

No. Hate to see browning of agriculture.

33. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

No. The Methow's soil types are not conducive to dryland farming. Concerned with browning of the Valley and creating marginal farming.

34. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

Strongly no.

35. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Strongly agree.

36. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

Floodplain restoration – Agree

Beaver dams – Jeff, Depends; Vic and Greg, Disagree

Constructed beaver dam analogs – Agree

Off channel reservoirs – Strongly agree

Dams (instream storage) – Strongly disagree;

Vic - Could do riffle to slow down water to go into ground

Ground water recharge from surface water – Jeff, Strongly agree; Vic and Greg, Agree

Forest management – Strongly agree

37. Which sub-basin do you live in?

XX

38. Additional thoughts.

Methow Water 2066
Interested Parties Meeting

Methow Conservancy

Meeting held December 3, 2019, 3:00 pm at Methow Conservancy in Winthrop

Participants: Jason Paulsen, Executive Director
Jeanne White, Staff

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia, Water 2066 Co-Facilitator

Meeting Questions & Notes:

1. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

Same, but with an eye toward a traditional way of irrigating and maintaining character.

2. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

1. Instream flow for fish
2. Agriculture
3. Vibrant towns

Industrial use is last.

3. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

Fish first.

4. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

Yes, not enough for fish and agriculture, because of climate-related changes.

5. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

(See above)

Concerned that under the current rule, there isn't the ability for group rural residential development. Clustered development is preferred to sprawl.

Also concerned that there isn't enough water for the development in the towns.

6. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

The organization doesn't have any un-met water-related need. There is a need to ensure there is enough water for fish needs.

7. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

In the towns.

8. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Yes, in towns.

9. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

Yes.

10. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Yes. Light manufacturing, a little more diverse, natural resource based or value added. Something other than tourism.

11. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Would like to see more diversity, but needs to enhance opportunities for locals, including trades and industry consistent with local character. Continued expansion

of broadband is essential, but do worry about what that could look like. Value added timber products, new opportunities for new agriculturalists to reach bigger markets.

Depends on economies and space.

12. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

Yes, if consistent with County Code and done appropriately. Value added. Not a big fan of nightly rentals. Expressed concerned regarding affordable housing.

13. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

Wants to maintain ag land first, then provide water to fish through efficiencies, crop type, incentives, etc., while keeping irrigated ag land irrigated.

14. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

N/A

15. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

No.

16. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Strongly agree.

17. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

Floodplain restoration – Strongly agree
Beaver dams – Agree
Constructed beaver dam analogs – Agree

Off channel reservoirs – Agree (Worth looking at expansion potential)
Dams (instream storage) – Strongly disagree
Ground water recharge from surface water – Need more information
Forest management – Need more information

18. Which sub-basin do you live in?

Methow Valley

19. Additional thoughts?

Is there too much water for residential? We understand that the towns need water (2 cfs from Early Winters). How do you set-up a rule change process that doesn't lead toward 20 years of litigation?

Recommendations:

- There needs to be a legislative framework for a rule change process that incentivize everyone to come together. If the process falls apart, things don't move forward.
- Need to lead with science. Need to agree on how much water fish need.
- Need to agree on how much houses need and have used.
- The Methow Watershed Council needs to operate with tribes at the table.
- There needs to be a legislative education strategy, including education and outreach with elected officials serving in the 12th Legislative District within the first year of being elected.

Would like to see a locally-based water bank set-up and/or a prohibition on out-of-basin transfers.

Methow Water 2066
Interested Parties Meeting

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation

Meeting held November 7, 2019

Participants: Chris Johnson, MSRF Executive Director

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia, Water 2066 Co-Facilitator

Meeting Questions & Notes:

20. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

Vibrant. Would like to see the Methow continued to be diversified enough so that it's not only viewed as a tourist destination. Diverse and economically viable.

21. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

All are #1. Instream flow for recreation and industrial use are on the bottom.

22. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

The current prioritization of exempt wells should be changed to make it available for community water systems, including rural residential. Should be evaluated based on need. Next, incentivize efficient use of irrigation water to provide water right holders without any new water.

23. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

Yes. If we don't become more efficient.

24. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

Current: 1) The Methow Basin rule creates over reliance on exempt wells; 2) Washington State water code, "use it or lose it", encourages waste.
Future: 1) Climate change; 2) Continued growth if current concerns aren't addressed.

25. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

From a fisheries perspective, the reward for agricultural waste limits progress we could make in recovering salmonids. Late season flows, when irrigators need it most.

26. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

Growth management planning will be necessary. Concentrating business, commercial, non-ag to cities and towns to reduce impact higher in the stream or tributary system will be essential.

27. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Multi-family, high density, low income homes should be incentivized to be in incorporated areas. Expanded rural residential needs to be planned for to maintain the rural lifestyle/vision.

28. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

Yes, should be preferred. Single family approvals only where a community water system is not practical.

29. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Yes.

Before water is spread from basin to basin, there needs to be a sufficient study that shows it would benefit instream flow, not impact instream flow.

30. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Hard to predict. Diverse, beyond service industry. We don't need a Walmart economy in the Valley.

31. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

Yes.

This is actually a comprehensive planning and zoning issue. Why fix the water rule if zoning doesn't allow it? Those uses can be permitted, but they will be interruptible. Water is interruptible for anything other than single family residences. Zoning currently restricts commercial/industrial uses outside of towns, unless it is value added to other allowable uses.

32. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

Yes, but the devil is in the details. Overwintering needs of salmonids in winter, if withdrawn between Oct. 1 – April, but could be resolved with storage. Needs to be drop for drop, water for water.

33. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

N/A

34. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

Yes, but would have to change state law. Would be a taking of personal property rights without compensation. Personal property owner and community both need to be compensated if water leaves the basin.

Supports a local water bank. The Methow Watershed Council would purchase water, protect in the Trust Water Rights Program, and then reallocate to other uses in the basin. A percent should stay instream. Should have ability to change based on stream levels. Water stays in Trust; more of a leasing program.

35. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Agree.

36. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

- Floodplain restoration – Need more information
- Beaver dams – Can't count on it as a mitigation tool.
- Constructed beaver dam analogs – Can't count on it as a mitigation tool. Natural state. Take out riprap, etc.)
- Off channel reservoirs – Agree. Pearygin Lake could be further explored. Look at existing lakes, puddles and ponds. Do a source switch to reservoir in late summer, capture peak spring runoff.
- Dams (instream storage) – Strongly disagree
- Ground water recharge from surface water – Agree. Needs to be explored. Every place is unique.
- Forest management – Strongly agree. Forest management is overdue.

37. Which sub-basin do you live in?

Upper Methow River reach

38. Additional thoughts?

Methow Basin Rule should be opened with full knowledge that we'll fight for two decades.

Currently, we're wasteful. For example, if you take 20 acres and break it up into four, five-acre lots it would require four wells, each with their own allowance. And there is no way to track exempt wells. Community systems require monitoring.

We need more science. How do we justify and weigh impacts of expanded growth?

Supports developing a rational allocation of water that supports instream and concentrate growth where it can be accommodated by the river.

Methow Water 2066

Interested Parties Meeting

Okanogan Wilderness League (OWL)

Meeting held December 3, 2019, 1:00 pm at Glover Street Market

Participants: Lee Bernheise, OWL President

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia, Water 2066 Co-Facilitator

Meeting Questions & Notes:

39. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

Wants the resources to be sustainable; will be hard with climate change.

40. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

4. Instream flow for fish
5. Instream flow for recreation
6. Agriculture

41. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

Fish. Noted, there are more than the three ESA species. There are a lot of other fish that are threatened. Our fish can also benefit.

42. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

Yes.

43. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

Over use and over allocation. Need to know how much is left.

44. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

July, August, September. Need to know how much we have and how much we can do through efficiencies. Next, to take relinquished water off the books. All could be accomplished through an adjudication.

(See attached adjudication petition to Maia Bellon, Department of Ecology Director from Lee Bernheise, OWL, dated April 17, 2018.)

45. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

Development isn't necessarily inevitable. We can stop future development. If we are going to have development, it should be in the towns, which is more efficient.

46. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Yes, in towns.

47. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

Other. Only if we could prove our water supply is not over allocated in the valley.

48. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

No. We have enough opportunities.

49. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Fish recovery.

50. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

No. Not until we do an adjudication.

51. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

Yes, for consumptive use only.

52. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

N/A

53. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

Yes, until they change the law.

54. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Other: A lot of storage options have been explored. There is so much surface and groundwater continuity, you would need a lined system.

55. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

- Floodplain restoration – Strongly agree

- Beaver dams – Agree (Transport beavers to areas that can thrive)
- Constructed beaver dam analogs – Neither agree, nor disagree (Not natural, get back to natural state. Take out riprap, etc.)
- Off channel reservoirs – Agree (But last option)
- Dams (instream storage) – Strongly disagree
- Ground water recharge from surface water – Need more information (It doesn't store – it's not a workable solution here; so well connected)
- Forest management – Need more information (Still questions about cutting trees or not. Harvest seems to increase streamflow. Would just soon see forests stay in natural state. Science points to after fire.)

56. Which sub-basin do you live in?

Lower Methow River reach.

OWL has statewide interest, because water is a statewide resource.

57. Additional thoughts?

Certain things in a rule change would be appealable.

1. Sell/transfer water way before you open it up for more.
2. Create more efficiencies with the towns.
3. Twisp has all the water they need from MVID, but they just have to pay for it. And there has already been an OCPI.

Would like to see a general adjudication for surface and groundwater in the Methow Basin, as petitioned in 1992 and 2018 (see attached petition). An adjudication would show what water we have, then determine what to do going forward.

Noted issues with Aspect Consulting study:

- They're using averages of year round use, when heavy use is occurring in August and September during the fish priority period. Flawed legally from get-go.
- Can use up to 5,000 gallons per day. People irrigate heavily in August and September. Instantaneous issues. Not separating indoor and outdoor use.

Methow Water 2066
Interested Party Meeting
Towns of Twisp & Winthrop

October 30, 2019, 1:00 pm
Winthrop Barn (Hen House)

MEETING NOTES

Participants:

Twisp

Mayor Soo Ing-Moody
Andrew Denim, Public Works Director

Winthrop

Mayor Sally Ranzua
Jeffrey Sarvis, Public Works Superintendent

Meeting Questions & Notes:

58. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?

Winthrop built out. Restrictions on lot sizes in the county. Maintain current integrity in the valley. Commercial and industrial use to occur in the towns where services are available. This will require comprehensive plans from both the towns and the county. Would like to see higher density around towns.

Seeing a lot of growth in the last 2-5 years (moratorium lifted/Twisp). Towns will continue to grow because it's more affordable. Twisp is making a multi-million dollar investment to prepare for growth. There is more room for commercial, industrial and residential growth. Winthrop doesn't have the same level or room for growth.

It's (water?) incredibly important for fire suppression.

Without water the towns will be forced to un-incorporate, therefor contributing to sprawl.

59. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)

Twisp:

1. Vibrant towns
2. Commercial/Industrial use
3. Instream flow for recreation
4. Instream flow for fish
5. Agriculture
1. Rural residential

Winthrop:

1. Vibrant towns
2. Commercial use
3. Instream flow for recreation
4. Instream flow for fish
5. Agriculture
6. Rural residential

60. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?

Prioritizing towns for development puts less pressure on fish and instream flow, specifically through: 1) effluent contributions; 2) density and greater control of consumption; and 3) efficiency and regulation of systems that promotes conservation.

61. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?

Yes. Water is available, but water law ("use it or lose it") doesn't promote conservation. More conservation is better.

62. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?

Not having enough water for the towns' use. Concerned about having to unincorporated if can't meet the needs.

[Insert background on Twisp's water rights for context]

Also concerned about drought impacts.

63. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)

Winthrop –
Needs approximately double its current storage and production for 2028 buildout. Would like to get second well up and running; needs water right certified.

Twisp –
Needs water; hard to quantify how much. It depends on what type of development occurs. Has land undeveloped for residential, commercial and industrial use.

64. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?

In and as close to towns as possible. Limit individual wells in the county.

Some are saying building continues in the county, but no one has been quantifying. The 2 cfs reserves have been used. Need to look county-wide for fixes.

Regarding 2 cfs reservations, we need:

1. Accounting of 2 cfs water use and all of use (single family, ag, towns – all water users, including county; and
2. Accountability; metering of single family rural residential and agriculture.

Both towns are working on conservation measures and have made significant investments, to date.

65. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Yes. Growth should occur in Town's vs rural County development

66. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

It depends, we want to encourage zoning that maintains the rural character. Reduction of wells to serve existing communities may be acceptable. In the event of a potential rule revision, the towns would not support clustering residential development around small community water systems.

67. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Twisp –

Yes, there will be some level of growth, it should happen in a way that maintains the character of the communities.

Winthrop –

Yes, but it depends. Important to maintain existing tourism economy, including commercial and restaurants.

68. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

Winthrop –

Would like to see diverse and affordable housing. Would like a diversified light industry, clean manufacturing (i.e. tech, bike and small scale manufacturing similar to yurt manufacturer).

Twisp –

Small-scale industry geared toward ecological practices (i.e. biochar) and commercial, needed and desired – suited to our area using natural resources. Diversified industry, including tech and retail.

69. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process

goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

How can we talk about setting other water aside, when we don't know how much water is being used? "Put a meter on it!"

It really depends on the size and use of the water. Industrial water use in the rural landscape may not be appropriate.

70. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

Yes.

71. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

N/A

72. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

No!

73. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

Strongly agree.

74. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

- Floodplain restoration – Need more information
- Beaver Dams – Strongly agree, if on USFS land
- Constructed beaver dam analogs – (not recorded in notes)
- Off channel reservoirs (no direct impact to rivers or fish) – Agree
- Dams (instream storage) – Strongly disagree
- Groundwater recharge from surface water – Agree
- Forest management –
Twisp: Strongly agree, if responsible forest management
Winthrop: Agree, with more information

75. Additional thoughts.

A rule revision needs to include water for towns (which is a domestic use).

The rule would not or should not be used for single family development in the towns.

Methow Water 2066
Interested Parties Meeting

Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife

Meeting held November 6, 2019

Participants: Jonathan Kohr, WDFW Water Science Team

Facilitator: Kristina Ribellia, Water 2066 Co-Facilitator

These notes are in addition to the responses sent by Jonathan Kohr on 10/22/2019 (see attached).

Meeting Questions & Notes:

- 76. What do you want the Methow to look like in 40 – 50 years? If you imagine the Methow in 2066, what do you hope it looks like?**
- 77. What uses do you want to support with our limited supply of water? (Choose your top three; 1 = highest priority)**
- 78. There are three fish species listed as threatened or endangered in the Methow Watershed. How would you prioritize future water allocation to provide a balance, and to sustain the fisheries in our valley?**
- 79. Are you concerned that there may not be enough water in the valley to achieve the vision that you have for this community in 2066?**
- 80. What are current and future water-related issues you are concerned about?**
- 81. What do you consider to be your unmet needs that are driven by water availability? (What do you need? How much, when and where?)**
- 82. Recognizing that a certain level of future residential and commercial development is inevitable, where and how would you ideally like to see it occur?**

As downstream as possible.

Not a lot of sprawl in the floodplains.

83. Do you want to see more residential development in towns versus outside of towns?

Wants to see towns more development to preserve open space.

84. Currently most of the water available in the valley for future growth (e.g. water from the 2 cfs reservation) can be used only for a residence located outside of towns with one well per parcel. Would you be in favor of allowing houses on adjacent lots to share a well and/or clustering residential development around small community water systems?

85. Would you like to see more economic opportunities/economic development in the towns in the Methow Valley?

Would like to discuss with others. Winthrop is the hub for recreation. Twisp is the town for necessities.

Fairly neutral, but there should be a robust mitigation package with net ecological benefit for impacts from economic development.

86. What type of broader economic development opportunities would you like to see in the valley by 2066 that could support local jobs?

87. Currently you cannot use water from exempt wells in rural areas for wedding venues, seasonal rentals, nightly rentals, small shops, light industry or to process goods from small farms. Do you support having water set aside for small scale use in rural areas?

Reservations are set aside for exempt well uses, not for small-scale businesses. We should look to other solutions for business needs, including other existing water rights.

Ask Kittitas County, what would they do?

88. Did you know that in certain circumstances you can change the use and location of a water right? Would you support changing an agricultural water right to other uses, such as for towns, community water systems, or instream flow for fish?

89. If not, would you support such a transfer if the land stayed in agriculture use (for example by using crops requiring less water and the remaining water could be transferred)?

90. Should we allow the permanent transfer of water rights out of the Methow Basin?

It should be up to the water right holder.

91. Storage options come in several forms from natural storage options (i.e. beaver dams) to enlarging floodplains to building new reservoirs and underground storage in existing aquifers. Do you think we should explore storage options for the Methow?

92. I could strongly support different water storage options in the Methow Valley, including:

93. Which sub-basin do you live in?

94. Additional thoughts?

Should possibly look at the science again.

Recommendations:

- Twisp gets 1 cfs from Early Winters, the money used to purchase the 1 cfs goes toward a robust mitigation package.
- For towns, restrict lawn size and/or require xeriscaping. Also, for example, the City of White Salmon is very good at letter patrons know its low water times.
- Review other areas that are dealing with water rights beyond the rule – look to Kittitas County, get a hold of City of White Salmon – learn from them.