

Water Transfer Work Group Meeting Minutes

November 7, 2011 @ 1:00PM

Attendees: Dave Brown, Stuart Crane, Melissa Downes, Ingrid Ekstrom, Chuck Garner, Candy Graff, Dan Haller, Teresa Hauser, Anna Hoselton, Trevor Hutton, Brian Iller, Stan Isley, Mark Kemner, Paul LaRiviere, Chris Lynch, Larry Martin, Scott Revell, Tom Ring, Ron Van Gundy, Kurt Walker, via phone: Bill Ferry, Tom McDonald, Aaron Penvose, Anne Watanabe

Previous Proposals: None

New Proposals:

2011-66: KID Water Project, Scott Revell presented the change application for KID, which moved the Point of Diversion from Prosser to Kiona to serve Red Mountain. The 1905 water right period of use will remain the same but change in point of diversion will occur, primary production will be agriculture and residential. Water quantities were taken directly from the water settlement agreement. The long term trust is 20 years and the short term trust is governed by the notes in agreement. The conveyance water savings and crop differential is not in trust but added to the flow target at Prosser dam (Yakima River at Prosser, YRPW). Stan Isley noted that in the interest of efficiency can this group agree to thumbs up for the trust water right application even though the specific application before the group is the change application but includes all the information for the trust water right application inevitably to follow? Tom Ring objected, noting that we can't agree to anything we haven't see yet, unless it agrees with what we have already agreed to. The trust water right application will come back to this group if it does not agree with what has already been agreed to in the agreement. Thumbs up by this group for 2011-66. Note: Tom Ring explained that our thumbs up in no way agrees with the sentence on the project description legal sentence: "By no later than 2010, the KID and USBR had established a Determined Future Development, which provides protection from relinquishment under 90.14.140(2) (C)."

2011-68: Cle Elum Ridge/Suncadia Lamb-Anderson, proposing 75 gpm, requesting 3 wells (Curry Canyon), not yet drilled, for an annual quantity for 1.371 acft, there will be incidental lawn and garden, and this is not part of a larger development. Question of why the 75 gpm was so high, they shouldn't have the ability to exceed their water right? Answer the Mentor Law Group has used 75 gpm for administrative purposes, but an applicant won't get that amount, at most they only get 10 gpm. This group can agree to the annual quantity, not the instantaneous 75 gpm, otherwise approved with thumbs up.

2011-69: William Riss/Suncadia Lamb-Anderson, proposing 220 gpm, use of 5 existing wells for 13 applicants near Spring Creek. Ecology would allocated the same amount that already been allocated to the other wells, in a range of 4-20 gpm per well, collectively 50 – 100 gpm collectively, all wells will be metered as per requirement. A water association in the works for this group, total 27 connections for the five wells. Paul LaRiviere wanted it noted that the application must reflect the need for a hydraulic permit to work below the normal high water mark for the lots/parcels that cross Spring Creek. Thumbs up.

2011-70: Chapin/Suncadia, water budget neutral request, 350 gpd for domestic use, 500 sqft of lawn and garden, annual quantity is 0.414 acft, located above the KRD canal, this will be assigned to the BOR contract for the out of season use. Thumbs up.

2011-71: Ederer/Suncadia and 2011-72: Emmons/Suncadia, both water budget neutral requests, above Cle Elum Lake, use of existing wells in the area, 350 gpd and 500 sqft lawn, 0.414 acft/yr. Well impacts are to Mill Creek, Cle Elum River, and Cle Elum Lake, the inquiry of fish concerns had no comments. Both will be assigned to the BOR contract. Thumbs up

2011-73: Carollo 03, 2011-74: Carollo 04, 2011-75: Badda, 2011-76: Tidwell, these are Point of Diversion for the 3M ditch downstream with the help of the Kittitas Conservation District. The 2011-73 and 2011-74 will divert out a pond when available and when not available then will divert from river with portable screened pumps. No information was available for calculations on the savings of water due to conveyance loss. The ROE states that the ditch is going away. Stan Isley noted that this was an old ditch, and didn't see any enhancement or increase in water use. Thumbs up on all four.

2011-77: Jerke/Swift Water Ranch, water budget neutral request relying on Swift Water Ranch trust water rights, near the outlet of Thorton Creek, 1 connection, 500 sqft of lawn and garden, 350 gpd, and 0.414 acft/yr. Thumbs up.

2011-78: Roseburg Elk Heights, Tom McDonald on phone explained that this was an application for donation into trust, maximum 10 yrs. They have filed motion with Aquavella, to be heard this week, with no intent to have this water protected down to the Columbia River. Ron Van Gundy asked if this can be done without extent and validity? Stan Isley answered, yes, if it is going into trust to the extent that it is valid. Melissa Downes added that Ecology is required to look at the last five years and Ecology has reviewed the motion for water day. Stan Isley noted that this is a primary reach trust water right, no fallowed acreage, no protected water over Parker and Prosser. Paul LaRiviere questioned the validity of declaring this as biological benefits without having investigated the connectivity with the Yakima River. Tom Ring expressed that better background work should have been done on this, there is a minimum level of effort needed for this paperwork and it appears that hasn't been done, we expect to see a document that clearly defines fallow land, protection of water at targets, etc. Thumbs up.

Other Issues:

We are now in a new water year, 2012; therefore we need to have these proposals retroactively labeled with 2012 to coincide with the water year.

Next Meeting:

Monday, December 5, 2011, @ 1PM, at which time we will schedule the additional meetings for the next year.