Dawn Wiedmeier started the meeting with a request for any revisions to the minutes from the previous meeting. The group approved the minutes.

The next agenda item was a new proposal 2007-39 for Lang. Anne Watanabe stated that the one-pager had a mistake, that it is not a change in season of use. This only involves Lang’s portion of the stipulation order (3.25), he is the last diverter, and the new place of use is 90 acres and zoned light industrial. Gene St. Godard presented the CU calculation. The group asked several questions with Stan Isley commenting that the three methods used for calculating the CU and WIG with evaporation loss are close to each other, and the group is comfortable with the calculations. Even though it is a change in POD upstream, in September Reclamation is trying to reduce the flow in this area, so this would help, and he feels it does not have a negative effect on fish, and in the summer, it adds to fish benefit in Stan’s opinion. Paul LaRiviere said he wanted to see what else they had to put on the table and the measurable benefits to fish life. The group still was cautious as the new future use is not identified and it is a move upstream. Paul L would like more information, but the group agreed that as long as it was not a change in season of use, they gave a thumbs-up.

The group continued with the next agenda item discussing the contract between Reclamation and Ecology. Bob Barwin started with reviewing where we were at and took the group through the changes made by Ecology. Those include: 1) page 2, paragraph 4 – “exchange” was replaced with “assignment”. Bob added that things might not stay the same (unassign a water right and mitigate in another area.) This will balance out in the review process, as not everyone will participate; 2) page 2, paragraph 7 – changed wording as someone may be turned off in favor of a senior water right; 3) there are three groups – the first group is clear (knows who they are), the second group is abstract (not sure who they are), and the third group is in the future; 4) the MOU is broad and the contract is more narrow. It needs to be very clear so the environmental review and consultation can be completed; 5) added in some definitions on page 3; 6) on page 4, it will be a permit format, we want clarity, (municipality or cabin owner). These will be done at the same time as contract annual payments, measuring & reporting, terminate if not followed, risk of impairment if interferes with Reclamation’s operations, could be further calls in winter, and not the same for everyone; 7) in article 21, he felt it needed 120 days instead of 60 days. The key to all of this is that it works its way through a screening process and through the WTWG. We still have fishery issues above the reservoirs with listed species impacts, i.e. those permittees that impact bull trout habitat – no year-round water. The group then discussed what is needed for the NEPA process with Dave Kaumheimer. Dave K said we cannot do the NEPA process on a program - it
needs certainty. You have to identify up front that you are doing “X”. His desire is to do one consultation and complete it. The group talked about that it is not just determined at Parker, each reach needs to be evaluated, so there are no holes in the river.

A workshop was suggested to discuss this in greater depth. It was set for August 17, 2007 at Ecology.

Dawn W asked for a date for the next WTWG meeting, and it was set for August 27, 2007 at 1:00 PM. (It was later changed to October 1, 2007 at 1:00 PM to accommodate Charlie Roe’s transfers.)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM