



**Monthly Meeting Minutes**

March 21, 2019

5 -7 p.m. – River Bank Building, Twisp, WA

**Council Members Present:** Dick Ewing, Mike Fort, Andy Hover, Perry Huston, Greg Knott, Bill Tackman, and Ashley Thrasher.

**Others in Attendance:** Vanessa Brinkhuis, Lee Bernheisel, Natalie Kuehler, Mary McCrea (MWF), Melanie Rowland (MVCC), Marcy Stamper (MV News), Sandra Strieby, Bill Sullivan (Aspect Consulting, by phone), Lorah Super(MVCC), Parker Wittman (Aspect Consulting, by phone)

Minutes recorded by: Sarah Lane, Administrative Assistant

**Non-Procedural Motions**

Motion #	Short Title	Yeas	Nays	Abstain
	No Motions were made			

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ashley Thrasher at 5:02

**2. Introductions**

**3. Agenda – Review and Approval**

The Agenda was approved.

**4. Introduction to Database by Technical Committee**

Mike introduced Aspect Consulting’s Bill Sullivan and Parker Wittman, who were attending by phone in order to present on the database. Bill Sullivan was involved in the work on the original database, which included the first calculation of debits against the Methow Reserve, to estimate exempt well use for indoor and outdoor use. The next task is to figure out how many parcels were developed re the ‘76 Rule.

**5. Agenda Item 3.19-01 Presentation on Database**

Parker Wittman and Bill Sullivan presented the new Instream Flow Reservation tracking database via a slide show on Go to Meeting and teleconference. (Recordings available.) The database looks at consumptive values rather than single use assumptions. Aspect coordinated with state and local data sources to update the IFR database.

The original was built eight years ago to see where the basins stand in regard to the reserve. This upgrade includes more datasets.

The database is a Microsoft Access program with parcel by parcel look-through capability, with output by parcel export summary. It calculates how many parcels by basin have exempt wells. It includes data from Okanogan County parcel database, county building permits, and well logs. It has boundaries based on land use type. In general, no boundaries for group B systems is included, but information for these has been added where known. Conservation easement, closed basins, public service, reach and watershed and planning zone information is all included. It is designed to do a

buildout analysis through water resource and zoning estimates by reach. Data gaps exist where parcels were developed prior to 1976.

Aspect provided several test cases involving closed basins, exempt wells, conservation easements, and group systems. Some well-parcel associations are missing or wrong. In many cases, assumptions based on development/building permits etc., correct for that missing information.

Aspect looked at Ecology's well log updates to test accuracy regarding the building permit assumptions. Other methods of fact checking looked at population growth data against numbers of exempt well parcels. New parcel and building permit info can be added to correct/ update the database. Upper numbers for buildout projections assumes that everything that is sub-dividable and developable is. To get more realistic, excluding realistic barriers such as steep slope and areas of water from building projections gives a better number. Excluding closed basins and applying buildout without maximum subdivision also gives a more realistic number.

Lee asked how much ground truthing of data was done. Aerial photos and cross reference were done, but not on the ground checking. There was no field component to the project. Lee also asked if stock watering and campground use were considered in use numbers. Bill replied that campgrounds generally have a water right. Water use associated with a water right isn't debited from the reserve. Stock watering was calculated rate of 30 gallons per day.

Lee also asked about group A and B water use. Lee states most A and B use is not allowed since 1976, and he believes it should be debited from reserve. Parker stated that in the database, Group A and B do not count against the reserve because it is served by a permitted source of supply. Mike noted that in the database, these items can be turned on or off. Parker said that yes, if Ecology directs certain uses to be changed and counted against the reserve, those items can be changed in the database to change the assumption. Parker said they have tried to capture all group B systems and delineate boundaries, but that info is not available from the DOH.

Perry asked about looking a zoning codes the same way we can look at the database by DOR codes. And yes, that can be done, to look at buildout analysis by minimum lot size.

#### **6. Minutes – Review and Approval**

Move to Greg to approve, Mike second, minutes approved as corrected.

#### **7. Report from the Chair**

Conflict of Interest Statements need to be completed and returned to Sarah.

#### **8. Ecology Report**

Vanessa reported regarding grants. The \$10K increase for 2066 is pending and there may be an answer in one to two weeks. She is looking for official approval to move funds from Wolf Creek over to the Metering project. Vanessa is staggering the timing of requests to improve clarity in the requests.

Natalie asked if there was any new information on the drought predictions. Vanessa said northern basins have a different forecast. Tyler Roberts at the Office of Columbia knows more. Perry noted that Lake Osoyoos level will be raised earlier due to low snowpack.

Greg asked if Trevor can come up for the next series of outreach meetings. Vanessa said that Trevor wants to know more, and asks that Greg send him an email. Mike said that realtors in particular need more information about exempt wells. Greg will initiate an email chain to collect topics to address to Trevor. Sarah will send out a request for topics for Trevor to the MWC email list.

#### **9. MWF Report**

Today we got notification that we received the North Central Community Foundation Methow Valley Fund grant for \$2000 for the pamphlet. At next month's meeting, long term funding will be discussed. Mike asked if we have a schedule for wrapping up TLAC. Mary said George will submit final report soon.

#### **10. Initiating Government Reports**

**Town of Twisp-** no report

**Town of Winthrop-** - no report

**Okanogan County-**

The County had meeting with Ecology re: mitigation for closed basins in WRIs 48 and 49. Specifically for WRIA 48, discussion was about replacing consumed water by hauling water into an infiltrator, or pumping to infiltrator. Both ideas open to exploration. Discussed SDU somewhat in relation to trucking water into closed basins. County needs to figure out an implementation plan so that it can be vetted. Vanessa, Trevor, Sage and John Kirk attended from Ecology.

Andy went back and re-read the rule on MWC website. He sees that Ecology is on board with one well one parcel, until the valley comes together and presents rule revision or Water 2066 develops ideas to present to Ecology for what we want, if we can come to agreement on SDU or group domestic use.

Melanie asked to clarify if single well/parcel refers to before or after subdivision potential. Andy says under the rule, people are entitled to part of the 2cfs, until either the water is gone or the people determine that's too much water. Melanie asked if that referred to when SDU was assumed 5000 gpd. Andy noted that these rules were created when it was just surface water withdrawals. Now we are dealing with groundwater withdrawals, which weren't even contemplated at that time. Natalie asked about SDU re: single parcel or if subdivided. Vanessa thought it referred to pre- subdivision. Ecology hasn't officially defined this. County policy is one parcel one well, and parcels can be subdivided. This is not creating a public water system, so that rule applies. Perry added that he went on website to see if parcels are viewable in relation to restricted areas. They are not linked to parcels, but you can zoom in and see a particular parcel with that overlay. Greg asked if the county is following the same protocol as Aspect (center of parcel determines in or out)? Perry replied no, County is acting on definitively, you're in or you're out. Ecology is OK with a well outside the boundary, water can serve inside the boundary at this time.

Agenda Item 3-19.01 Andy reported that Dave doesn't prefer cisterns as an option, it is a possibility for closed basin mitigation, but doesn't want to be county wide.

## **11. Sub-Committee Reports**

### **Technical Review Committee, Chair – Fort**

The database will be put to use and the Tech Committee will work with Aspect on bugs. The center of the parcel being the deciding point was decided on by council as a determining factor years ago for the database. Metering will be helping to determine how much water is used. Bill asked if there is progress with County about requiring metering. County replied no, and that it used to put on plats how much water could be used, but after review of AG, it was something that then wouldn't be able to be changed, so county stopped doing that. Perry said several plats were approved with allocations, but none went through to final approval.

Ashley asked about getting a group together to discuss next outreach meetings on database/metering. Will that happen soon? Bill T. says a planning meeting will happen soon.

Andy asked if we are getting meters. The metering project will be getting some, but it depends on amount of money and type of meter. Telemetry meters are preferred and more accurate but also more expensive. Vanessa said to talk with Ron Dixon re meters.

Greg stated regarding the Aspect report, that he likes the idea that if we have personal knowledge, we can update the database. This could help with ground-truthing. Mike stated that it will not help with accuracy of the database function, however. Greg and Andy brought up that ground truthing will help with accuracy with pre-76 wells, however.

Mike said that the database tells us current numbers of wells and future build out. This is not considering pre-76 wells, but the numbers should be accurate. Once we know how much water people are actually using, we should know buildout accurately. Andy said there are less than 3000 parcels per reach, that there is more water than needed.

**Political Action Committee, Chair – Knott**

No report

**Outreach and Education Committee, Chair – Knott**

Greg reported that the next presentation is set for April 16, and he is still working on the third one.

**Water 2066 Committee, Chair – Thrasher**

Ashley updated that a request was made for increased funding from Ecology, the edits were made in EAGL and the grant is ready to submit.

**12. Agenda items for next meeting**

Long term funding will be discussed at the May meeting.

**13. Public Comment**

Lee commented regarding the Aspect report. He stated that the database is based on 2cfs, as an instantaneous number. Fish need water during the most consumptive use days. Heavy water days correspond with water most important for fish days. Based on Lee's understanding that Ecology assigned 9 gpm which equals 24,741 gpm, use equals 54 cfs on instantaneous basis. Lee states we're over appropriated on heavy use days based on this calculation. Ecology using a yearly rate doesn't account for worst case basis. Worst case is required for SEPA and NEPA reviews. Most pumps run 9 gpm. Use does not include irrigation, forest, or group system uses. Averaging the daily use over summer/winter is not fair to the resource. Mike and Lee discussed assumptions of 24 hours for instantaneous data.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

---

Ashley Thrasher, Council Chair

Approved at the April 18, 2019 Council meeting.