Attendees: Stuart Crane, Chuck Garner, Carron Helberg, Stan Isley, Danielle Jansik, Paul LaRiviere, Chris Lynch, Sage Park, Tom Ring, Mitch and Julie Williams.

Chuck opened the meeting with asking for the approval of the April meeting minutes, and with no changes from the group, they were adopted as written. Chuck proceeded to the next agenda item of new proposals.

**2013-23 Amerivest/Knapp** - Sage began by explaining this proposal is about a mile East of Ellensburg, it is an existing well, 10 gallons per minute and 500 square feet of lawn/garden irrigation, with 1.37 acre-feet of consumptive use and the suitability is in the yellow area. This is a water budget neutral permit with mitigation provided by the Amerivest water bank trust water right. Tom talked about the fact that the G4-35592 permit is a new water right permit, and it is being done differently as it is not done under the upper Kittitas County groundwater rule. Tom said he had been looking at the water budget neutrality of moving from Manastash to Naneum Creeks. Stan looked at the map, which shows the proposed new well is located about 2 miles due east of Ellensburg and one-half mile west of Naneum Creek. The well is about one-half mile downgradient of the Cascade Canal and one-half mile upgradient of the Ellensburg Water Company’s Town Ditch. Stan said he thinks the well’s impact on Naneum Creek, which is generally not flow-limited in this reach, would be negligible, and felt it was approvable. He also said it would need the USBR/Ecology Exchange Contract to mitigate for its out-of--season (‘winter’) use. Tom thought it was approvable, but would like to talk internally, as it is a change in watersheds. Tom said if it is OK, he will let Nea know by email. The group gave a tentative thumbs-up, subject to Tom’s decision on this proposal.

Mitch added he wanted some local vetting on this as immediately 1½ miles south is the Grasslands Development that will seek 8 connections in the future, within the urban growth area outside of Ellensburg, with 2 additional connections below the KRD Highline Canal. Paul added he has information on this, that the goal is restoration of long term normative flows, and that WDFW will be looking for: 1) the minimum request of 350 gallons/day; and 2) looking individually at where it goes upstream will need more scrutiny. Sage said that lower Kittitas County will have lots more applications in the future.

**2013-24 Downs** – Sage began with explaining Jason McCormick had brought a related proposal to this one to the group before. The old currently-unused Teanaway River point of diversion (3M Ditch POD) will remain in place unchanged, as the applicant is wishing to retain this as an authorized POD, but the two other authorized POD’s will be moved small distances from their current authorized locations along Mason and Musser Creeks to locations upstream on Mason and Musser Creeks. Tom asked Stan to explain, and Stan said the two water rights for Downs are a 22-acre water right for an upstream field and an 8-acre water right around their home. This proposal relates only to their 8-acre water right around their home. Jason McCormick/WWT brought WTWG 2013-14 to WTWG back in March and got a thumbs up approval for WWT’s 3-year lease/donation of the 22-acre Downs water right to instream flow use. Both Mason and Musser Creeks flow all the way into the Teanaway River. It is a minor upstream diversion point
move on each creek that will be more convenient for the Downs, since the 3M Ditch is not being operated right now. He does not see any complications or problems. Paul said he found resident salmonids in lower Mason and Musser Creeks. Stan said Paul needs to talk to Brent Renfrow, as the Downs’ are working with him to improve both creek diversions to provide fish screening and fish passage. It was asked, “Why retain the old Teanaway River 3M Ditch diversion point?”

The reason is the Downs could install a pipe in the ditch in the future if they choose to utilize their Teanaway River diversion. The Downs are working with Mark Crowley of KCCD to install a pump site (a site for a ring well or other options like a small screened pump intake from the Teanaway River downstream of the 3M Ditch POD and nearer the Downs property). Paul asked is there a separate diversion for the 22 acre parcel. Stan said the 22-acre parcel has only one diversion point (Teanaway River 3M Ditch POD) and the 8-acre parcel has three points of diversion (3M Ditch, Mason Creek, and Musser Creek), with the 22-acre parcel’s water right now being placed in the state water trust through 2015. Ultimately, the 3M Ditch will go away forever, and all the 3M Ditch water diverters will be switched to either well water sources on their property or other individual Teanaway River screened pump diversions downstream of the old 3M Ditch POD. Paul said they have talked with Brent extensively, and from a fish benefits perspective it is a plus, and we are OK with this proposal, but we would object to going back to the original Teanaway River diversion and putting the water back into the 3M ditch. Paul supports the change. This is a fish restoration benefit with all the proper screening process. Tom suggested to Ecology to ask for the 30-day extension. Paul talked about WDFW’s policy on this change, and will email the group to detail WDFW’s position. The change has no impact on the future use of 3M Ditch, thus preserves WDFW’s ability to object if the Downs revert to using the ditch. The group talked about the diversion, how much water was in each creek, the Downs’ use of a sprinkler system, and the stream flow last year. Tom said he would like to talk to his fish folks first on this one, and Paul will be providing a briefing to Tom. Tom will reply to Sage and Nea with the decision on this proposal. The group gave a tentative thumbs-up, subject to Tom’s decision on this proposal.

Sage introduced Danielle Jansik as a new member of Ecology’s team.

The next meeting is set for June 3, 2013.

Chuck adjourned the meeting at 1:45 PM