

## WTWG Minutes for May 15, 2006

Stephanie Utter called the meeting to order at 10:40 AM

The group approved the previous minutes, with one correction from Joe Mentor, as written.

Stephen Fanciullo continued with a discussion on Cowiche Creek by saying we are in the process of making additional changes. Stan Isley is checking on the water right and the numbers look to be the same. He hopes to have the documents in place by the first of the year. SF discussed the contract process and it is moving forward. The investment involved a long-term investment and that reversion would be allowed. SI explained the fish benefits and how this proposal would work. Jim Esget sent SI a draft water wheeling agreement with a copy to Bill Ferry. It is neutral to TWSA; it is based on water right availability with no third party detriment or injury. Tom Ring asked why is it not an inter sub-basin water transfer? Joe Mentor commented it is creative. Is it a new surface water right and is there an issue with Reclamation's withdrawal? Ron Van Gundy said it is not subject to withdrawal. SF continued to explain that this does not affect TWSA, the parties will be impacted by this. If there were a hit, it would be less flow in the Tieton River. The impact is neutral to the river. A monitoring station is to be installed with daily monitoring to show the taking. RVG asked if Reclamation is going to do the daily readings. Mike Tobin said that the users, Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District (YTID), and others would do this work. TR added you must have verified that the water is available year round due to the investment. RVG said only a short water year concern. SF continued that they will have the first call when water is available, if not available then no diversion, since they are the highest. JM asked if it is going into the water trust and what federal facilities. SI stated yes, in the YTID's facilities, and will install measuring device. Ecology's approval is based on installing the measuring device. This will include YTID ditchriders, Cowiche Creek water users, the court retains jurisdictional responsibility and Ecology will have a stream patrolman to ensure compliance. The group continued to discuss the target flows, SOAC support, metering. TR does not believe it is possibly neutral, pre flip-flop and YTID is diverting. SF said it is coming out for project operations at 30 cfs. SI added there are other diversions that need to be satisfied. The group discussed target flows. TR explained that if there is not a target flow, then we can deliver. If there is not, then we cannot. Projects that are TWSA neutral, help tributaries, help flows, and seasonally target flows. The when and how we do these things need to be refined. JM said give us guidance, it is a good thing and a help to fish. TR added yes it is, in the irrigation season. The group discussed the costs that would be paid at length. TR commented we need consistency. The group agrees that the contract process needs to be looked at deeper to solve inconsistencies.

The group continued with the next agenda item of new proposals for Cromarty 2006-08 with Kelly McCaffrey explaining it is an extension and not irrigated. TR asked if it was the same. JM asked how many years was it in effect and how far in the future. KM said it is an extension for 2 more years (2006, and 2007) and it started in 2003 and ended in

2005. SI asked are these by the grocery store, KM said no, the land has been fallowed. The group recommended this proposal.

The next proposal is 2006-12 for Snow Mountain Ranch.

Tom Tebb, Tom Ring and Joe Mentor made a side comment that the one-pager should be more of a before and after picture. This would make the changes easier to understand. Bill Ferry added that including a map would be nice, when possible.

KM explained this proposal. It is an instream transfer and Suzanne did the CU calculation. They will be going to court with the Pendente Lite. The group recommended this proposal with a thumbs-up.

SI explained the next new proposal 2006-13 for McCormick. TT asked if it was permanent or temporary. The group recommended this proposal with a thumbs-up.

Paul Dempsey explained the last new proposal 2006-14 for Sorenson. TR asked what the ultimate plan for this water right is. PD said unknown, they took the opportunity to put this in the water trust. TR talked about what is protected. PD said there is a habitat benefit to Little Wilson Creek. TR said it is a different place of use, if not budget neutral then it would be a thumbs-down. The group discussed various scenarios and discussed spilling of Ellensburg Water Company water. SI said it could benefit the creek, just a primary reach benefit. SU asked what the action was, and TR replied this would fly. The group recommended this proposal.

SU asked if there were any other issues before the group. JM asked about the MOU and at which meeting would it be ready. TT he would like the transfer group meetings to be monthly and the group agreed. Bob Barwin is working on the draft form of the MOU with Reclamation. Bill Ferry stated he hoped to have it by the June meeting, and that the court has no jurisdiction over the MOU.

The group decided on Monday, June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006 at 10:30 AM for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.