FINAL
Meeting Summary
WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed
October 25, 2006

Location: Lakeside High School Library, Nine Mile Falls, WA.

Planning Unit members and guests recorded on the sign-in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane
Bill Gilmour, Spokane County
Hank Nelson, Avista Corporation
Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe
Jay Landreth, Landowner
Craig Volosing, Landowner
Jerry Warner, Palisades Neighborhood
Bea Lackaff, Citizen
Cynthia Carlstad, Tetra Tech/KCM
Bryony Stasney, Golder Associates Inc.
Keith Holliday, WA State Dept. of Ecology
Tony Delgado, Stevens County
Dick Price, Stevens PUD
Bart Haggin, Lands Council
Ann Fackenthall, Lake Spokane Protection Assoc.
Fran Bessermin, Lake Spokane Protection Assoc.
Lynn Wells, Stevens County Planning Commission
Bruce Smith, Landowner
Bob Derkey, WA Department of Natural Resources

Call to Order

Bryony opened the meeting at 6:00 pm, noting that this is the second of two advertised WRIA 54 Public Meetings. Attendees introduced themselves and the interest / organization they represent. Bryony requested that each attendee complete the sign-in sheet.

Review and Approve September 27, 2006 Meeting Summary

The draft September 27, 2006 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting summary was reviewed page by page with the following requests for changes: 1) Cynthia noted that under Water Rights on page 6, second paragraph, 359 should be replaced with 389; 2) Cynthia noted that under Future Water Needs on page 8, the second paragraph, second sentence should be clarified to read, "This issue (water system planning to provide for future growth) could potentially be partially addressed through a water storage project and should also be addressed through regional water supply planning."; 3) Cynthia noted that the first Water Quality section on page 8 should be deleted (since it is repeated in the following paragraph); 4) Brian Crossley asked that the first sentence under public comment on page 9 be changed to read, "Brian noted that the Spokane Tribe is considering contracting the USGS to ~~gage~~ model Chamokane Creek."; and, 5) Keith asked that the third paragraph under public comment on page 9 be changed to read, "West Branch of the Little Spokane River group will be hosting a public meeting ~~in Spokane Valley~~ at Riverside High School from 6:30 – 8:30 pm on September 28, 2006.". With these changes, those present accepted the September 27, 2006 meeting summary as final. The final summaries will be posted on the County's web site at http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm.

Public Comment

Jay Landreth commented that on page ES-5 of the draft Phase II Technical Assessment Report, data on outflows from and inflows to the watershed are provided. Jay asked what years the data represents. Cynthia replied that it is a collection of the years of record for the various water balance components and varies for each of the components. Cynthia said that she would get the information on the periods of record for the water balance components to Jay.

Bart Haggin noted that he was shocked by the water storage proposals that he read about in the paper. The proposals involve pumping water from the Columbia River and potentially storing the water in canyons. The stored water would be used to raise crops.

Keith Holliday noted that the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Columbia River Water Management Program is out for public comment and that this document describes these storage options. The Programmatic EIS can be viewed and comments submitted at Ecology's website at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/WR/cwp/crwmp.html.

Bea Lackaff noted that there is a public meeting in Spokane to consider these proposals.

Bill Gilmour noted that Spokane County has been asked to comment on this Programmatic EIS.

Dick Price said that this proposal is very involved. Irrigators in the Odessa area were asked to use groundwater to irrigate until surface water could be provided by the second phase of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project. The Odessa Aquifer is now being depleted and many of the irrigation wells can no longer be operated. Part of this project is to complete the second phase of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project and fulfill what these farmers were told 50 years ago.

Bart noted that it would be cheaper to pay off the farmers than to build multi-million dollar dams.

Keith noted that the Columbia River Water Management Program includes consideration of other areas in addition to Odessa. The feasibility studies for the storage projects are being completed by the US Bureau of Reclamation and include work that was started in the 1950s. Many of these are old projects that are being reconsidered.

Lloyd noted that none of these proposed storage locations are within WRIA 54. Keith noted that WRIA 54 may be eligible for funding through the Columbia River Management Program.

WRIA 54 Multi-Purpose Storage Assessment Update

Bill noted that comments were received on the multi-purpose storage grant application at the end of September / first part of October. These comments were incorporated and the grant application was sent in to Ecology in mid October. The strategy includes an overview of potential storage options for WRIA 54 followed by focused studies on geographic areas that would benefit the most. Cynthia said that two criteria had been discussed to identify geographic areas for more detailed study: 1) areas where there is a water supply need to provide for future growth; and, 2) areas where hydrogeologically there are opportunities for water storage. Cynthia noted that the West Plains is an obvious area where additional water is needed to support future growth and also areas along the Spokane River may be warranted for further study. Cynthia noted that an assessment of water system infrastructure needs also must be completed within the multi-purpose storage project to fulfill Ecology's grant requirements.

Bob Derkey from the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has been mapping along the Spokane River and has some exciting findings that may support water storage in this area. The concept would consider aquifer recharge and / or infiltration at sites close to the Spokane River to avoid piping river water to sites located at significant distances from the river. An advantage of storing water underground is that there is no evaporation.

Dick noted that Washington State requires that the water be treated prior to aquifer recharge using wells and then treated again when the water is removed. Water recharge via surface infiltration does not require the recharge water to be treated prior to infiltration. Infiltration can be put in place by scraping the surface soils and allowing the water to percolate into the ground. Keith noted that treatment needs for infiltration would depend on the quality of the infiltration water.

Bart asked about the process of designing wetlands that would not be as evaporative as open water. Cynthia said that, although wetlands are good for lots of reasons, it is generally not possible to store as much water in wetlands in comparison to a surface or underground reservoir. Therefore wetlands tend not to be viable in terms

of a storage solution for water supply. Craig noted that wetlands should be considered as part of the overall water storage strategy for WRIA 54. Cynthia agreed.

WRIA 54 Instream Flow (ISF) Assessment Update

Bill noted that Pete Rittmuellor of EES Consulting (a subconsultant to TetraTech/KCM) returned on September 12 to collect low flow measurements in the transects below the rifle club. The project is on schedule with the draft report due in January, 2007 and potentially a presentation at the January 2007 Planning Unit meeting.

Drainage Basin Prioritization

Bryony explained that the purpose of this exercise is to poll the Planning Unit members at this early stage of the project to understand where people's priorities lie geographically in WRIA 54. This exercise will be repeated in 2007 once the Planning Unit has had an opportunity to become familiar with the technical assessment information and become involved in the supplemental projects (i.e., instream flow, storage and water quality). Bryony passed around stickers and asked each person present who had not completed this exercise in August or September 2006 to place one sticker on the subbasin map of the watershed at the location they feel is their highest priority in terms of water resources issues. Bryony noted that a summary of this information will be provided at the next Planning Unit meeting.

Watershed Issue Development

This exercise was also completed at the August and September 2006 meetings and is being repeated at this meeting to give those interested in the WRIA 54 watershed planning process additional opportunity to identify their watershed issues. Bryony noted that a watershed issue can be defined in a number of ways, including a risk area within the watershed, a watershed concern, a problem or a challenge.

Bryony brought people's attention to the large white paper sheets at the back of the room with issue category headings. Bryony asked those present to write their watershed issues on the sticky paper provided and to post them anonymously on to the large white sheets under the appropriate category. The exercise was opened to all those present – so that those who posted issues at the August and September 2006 meetings were able to post any additional issues. The categories presented on the large white sheets included:

- Surface Water and Groundwater Supply
- Instream Flow
- Water Quality
- Water Management (e.g., Water Rights)
- Habitat
- Growth and Land Use
- Education

The purpose of this exercise is to poll the Planning Unit members at this early stage in the project to obtain a baseline record of the Planning Unit's watershed issues. The results of this exercise will be recorded word for word in Spokane County's project file. A summary of the issues, in which similar issues will be combined, will be presented to the group for review at the November 2006 Planning Unit meeting. The group will have an opportunity to comment on how their issues have been represented. This issue identification exercise represents initial work for Phase 3 Planning and will be repeated again in six months to a year, after the Planning Unit has become more familiar with the watershed technical information.

WRIA 54 Mission Statement

Bryony asked those present to review the September 2006 version of the draft WRIA 54 Mission Statement:

> ***Draft WRIA 54 Mission Statement (September 27, 2006):*** The WRIA 54 Planning Unit will create a living watershed management plan providing implementation strategies to manage water resources while improving water quality. The plan will support economic well-being, and protect and enhance the environment through collaborative citizen, business and government partnerships.

After discussion, those present agreed by consensus to finalize the WRIA 54 Mission Statement as:

> ***WRIA 54 Mission Statement (October 25, 2006):*** The Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) 54 Planning Unit will create a living watershed management plan providing implementation strategies to manage water resources on a sustainable basis while improving water quality. The plan will support economic well-being, and protect and enhance the environment through collaborative citizen, business and government partnerships.

Bryony noted that there will be opportunity to revisit the mission statement during Phase 3 Planning.

Phase 2, Level 1 Technical Assessment, Presentation and Discussion - by Cynthia Carlstad (TetraTech/KCM)

Cynthia noted that the presentation at today's Public Meeting will be the same as the presentation given at the September 2006 Public Meeting in Airway Heights with some revisions of the information noted based on Spokane County's data review. Cynthia passed out a copy of the conclusions section of the draft report with the important points highlighted.

Brian asked who to provide comments to. Cynthia responded that comments could be passed on to Bill Gilmour at Spokane County. The comment period for the draft report is open until October 27, 2006 (two days after this meeting). Cynthia said that she is hoping to have the report finalized in mid November. The following paragraphs summarize Cynthia's presentation. A copy of Cynthia's PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the County's web site at http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm.

Overview of the Watershed Planning Process

Cynthia provided an overview of the WRIA 54 Watershed Planning process, including the linkages between Phase 1 – Organization, Phase 2 – Technical Assessment, Phase 3 – Planning and Phase 4 – Implementation. WRIA 54 is currently within Phase 2, working to finalize the technical assessment. This group has also chosen to complete supplemental projects for instream flow, water storage and water quality. Adjacent upstream watersheds, including WRIA 55 (Little Spokane), WRIA 57 (Middle Spokane) and WRIA 56 (Hangman Creek), are currently within Phase 4 of the Watershed Planning process. Cynthia noted that work completed in WRIA 54 will likely have to tie in to work completed within the upstream watersheds, particularly in the case of instream flow and water quality work related to the Spokane River. Cynthia noted that about 75% of the length of the Spokane River in Washington State occurs within WRIA 54.

Q: What is the role of the Planning Unit in Phase 4?
A: It varies from group to group but usually some form of the Planning Unit will continue. Sometimes it makes more sense for the Planning Unit to divide into implementation groups based on the interest of the members.

What is a Level 1 Assessment?

Washington state law notes that the following is required within a Level 1 Assessment:

- Estimate of surface and ground water present
- Estimate of surface and ground water available
- Estimate of water represented by water right claims, permits, certificates, minimum instream flow rules, federally reserved rights
- Estimate of surface and ground water actually being used
- Estimate of water needed in the future (for consumptive use and instream flows)
- Aquifer recharge and discharge areas
- Estimate of surface and ground water available for further appropriation

Q: How is water quality included?
A: Water quality is a separate optional element under Watershed Planning and there are specific requirements.

Q: How is it optional?
A: In Watershed Planning there is one required element – water quantity. There are three additional optional elements – instream flow, water quality and habitat. In WRIA 54, this group has opted to complete water quality and instream flow in addition to the mandatory water quantity component. Instream flow and water quality will be addressed as supplemental projects and therefore have not been addressed in any detail in the Phase 2 Technical Assessment report.

Q: When will the water quality work start?
A: Bill said that he expected to submit an application for grant funding for water quality during the first three months of 2007 and that about 35% of the $100,000 grant would be spent by July 1, 2007. Bill anticipates that the water storage work will be complete in September 2007 and the instream flow will be complete in May 2007. A sub-committee will likely be developed to work on the water quality scope of work.

A: Why was habitat not chosen by this group?
Q: It was a decision made by the initiating governments during Phase 1. Under Watershed Planning, habitat refers to fish habitat. However all the Watershed Planning elements are interrelated and some aspects of fish habitat will be addressed in the instream flow work.

Ecology Guidance
Current Ecology policy and opinion acknowledges that it is a tall order to expect quantification of all these components within a Phase II, Level 1 Assessment. Ecology now acknowledges that Planning Units have the discretion to complete a broad-type assessment to support development of policies or to focus on specific areas if the Planning Unit feels this is warranted. The WRIA 54 Phase 2 Technical Assessment is a broad, framework-type assessment.

Where did the information in the Level 1 Assessment Come From?
The TetraTech/KCM consultant team and Spokane County staff compiled information from as many existing data sources as reasonable considering available resources. Spokane County staff made a significant effort to compile and assess data from water utilities and water users to determine how much water is being used. No new data collection work was done specifically for this report.

Focus for Today's Presentation – Major Findings and Supporting Data
Previous presentations and discussions have focused on specific data elements:

1. April 2006 – Study Area Characteristics
2. June 2006 – Water Balance
3. July 2006 – Water Use and Water Rights
4. September 2006 – Major Findings and Conclusions

Today's presentation will also focus on findings and conclusions.

Surface Water
In terms of the water balance and managing water, the Spokane River dwarfs the remaining surface water courses in terms of its size. The Spokane River is also the best understood surface water body in WRIA 54. Of the tributaries to the Spokane River, Chamokane Creek has been studied to support a federal adjudication and other activities. Most of the other smaller water courses, such as Deep Creek, Coulee Creek, Little Chamokane Creek, Spring Creek, Blue Creek and Mill Creek are also important but we do not know much about them. Some data is being collected within the ongoing WRIA 54 Instream Flow study. In terms of potential future work, it would be a good thing to understand these tributaries better.

Q: Would it be fair to say that even at its lowest flow, the Spokane River would be higher that the highest tributary flows?

A: That may not be entirely true, but this may be close. The minimum flow out of Post Falls dam is currently 300 cubic feet per second (cfs).

Aquifers

An aquifer is a saturated and permeable geologic unit that is capable of transmitting useable and economic quantities of water. Aquifers may be unconsolidated (e.g., comprise sand and gravel) or occur in rock formations. An aquitard is a low permeability unit (such as a clay) that restricts the movement of groundwater.

Aquifers are particularly important in terms of managing water availability into the future. There are five major aquifers in WRIA 54 and other smaller / minor aquifers (such as those associated with alluvial aquifers adjacent to streams). The five major WRIA 54 aquifers in terms of current and potentially future water supply are:

- Unconsolidated aquifers:
    - Spokane Valley – Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer (SVRP Aquifer)
    - Palaeochannel Aquifers
    - Chamokane Valley Aquifer
- Rock aquifers:
    - Wanapum Basalt Aquifer
    - Grande Ronde Basalt Aquifer

A small portion of the Spokane Valley – Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer occurs within the upstream end of WRIA 54. The SVRP Aquifer provides water to a large number of people and significant flow to the Spokane River. Studies indicate that the SVRP Aquifer within WRIA 54 discharges about 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) of flow to the Spokane River. This is important in terms of the quantity and quality of this water since it is such a significant portion of flow within the Spokane River, especially at low flow times of the year (when Spokane River flows are 1,000 cfs and sometimes lower).

Q: Is there more groundwater inflow to the Spokane River below the Little Spokane River than above and within the Little Spokane River drainage?
A: Cynthia said that she was not sure and that the USGS – Bistate aquifer study may provide additional information on this. Bill said that there may be about 300 cfs of groundwater discharging to the Little Spokane River and to the Spokane River below the Little Spokane River confluence.

The Chamokane Valley Aquifer comprises remnant glacial sediments from the Ice Age. Existing information suggests that there may be an upper and lower aquifer separated by a clay aquitard. The upper aquifer is used for groundwater supply and is in hydraulic connection with Chamokane Creek. There may be a potential opportunity to develop the lower aquifer for groundwater supply in the future and/or to consider utilizing the system for groundwater storage and recovery. Wes McCart noted at the September 2006 meeting that there may be another deep aquifer in the upper (i.e., northern) portion of Chamokane Creek, close to the boundary with WRIA 59. Wes said that he would check with the Hydrogeologist that told him about this aquifer and give the information to the consultant team.

There are two basalt aquifers, which are important locally in WRIA 54 for groundwater supply. The Wanapum Basalt Aquifer is stacked on top of the Grande Ronde Basalt Aquifer. It is probable that the Grande Ronde occurs below the Wanapum Basalt in all locations that the Wanapum Basalt is mapped at surface. The basalt aquifers provide water to the cities on the West Plains and to populations in the southwest of WRIA 54. In the West Plains area, the data is clear that more water is being pumped from these aquifers than is being recharged. We do not know if there is additional groundwater supply from these aquifers in the southwestern portion of WRIA 54. However, there are few wells in the southwestern portion of WRIA 54 and no reason to believe that the basalt aquifers in this area would not be productive. In general, there is a lot that is not known about the basalt aquifers – both in terms of opportunities and limitations.

Q: How do we know that there is water in the areas that are mapped as basalts?
A: The map shown is a geologic map that shows the occurrence of the geologic units. The depth to water will vary with location. The land surface over which the basalt flowed at the time of emplacement was irregular so there is uncertainty in terms of basalt aquifer thickness and groundwater production at any one location.

Q: Are we assuming that the basalts are interconnected in terms of groundwater flow?
A: Yes and no. There is likely to be some relationship between the basalts throughout the watershed.

Q: Experts have noted that the basalts comprise disconnected aquifers with interconnections at some points. Is this true?
A: Yes, this is true.

Bob Derkey noted that the time break between the Wanapum and Grande Ronde is about one million years and that the water bearing zones in the basalts may be offset or separated by structural features such as folds. Current geologic mapping and research by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources is improving understanding of the basalts in WRIA 54.

Q: Is there a water divide in the basalt aquifers, with a portion of the aquifer flowing towards the Spokane River and a portion towards the southwest?
A: Yes, there does appear to be a divide. However, we do not have good information on the location of the divides in either the Wanapum or Grande Ronde basalts.

Palaeochannel deposits can also be significant unconsolidated aquifers. These sand and gravel deposits filled in depressions in the basalt flows during the ice age floods. They probably connect to the Deep Creek – Coulee Creek system and likely discharge groundwater to these surface water systems.

Land Use / Land Cover

Current land use / land cover throughout the watershed includes: 49% forest; 25% agriculture; 18% open land; 3% barren; 2% low density residential; 2% water; 1% commercial / industrial / transportation; < 1% high density residential; and, < 1% wetland. The urban area in WRIA 54 is relatively small.

Based on zoning information (which provides an indication of what build-out may look like) future land use may result in a significant change of land use / land cover to: 48% agriculture; 38% low density residential; 9% forest; 3% open land; 1% commercial / industrial / transportation; 1% water; and, < 1% high density residential. Cynthia said that the team hoped to obtain more applicable GIS information for the Spokane Reservation.

Q: Is the agricultural zoning information based on soils?
A: Depending on the date the information was obtained, the zones that were developed by Stevens County are based primarily on soil types. The Stevens County information was finalized in July 2006.

Water Rights

Water rights have been divided into three broad categories: claims (an assertion of water use that predates the water code); permits and certificates that are issued by Washington State Department of Ecology; and, permit-exempt wells (small water uses that serve e.g. a single family home or small business). The information shown on the slide has changed slightly following data review by Spokane County. However, the conclusions remain the same.

Understanding of actual water appropriation is clouded by the number of water rights claims and this represents uncertainty in terms of water management in WRIA 54. Of all the authorized water uses, there are about 1,723 water right claims (which are assertions about use of water prior to 1917 for surface water and 1945 for groundwater). This accounts for 30% of the number of water rights in WRIA 34 and 30% of the water allocation volume. An investigation of each claim would be needed to understand actual water use by claims.

The only way to determine if claims are valid is through adjudication. Due to potential duplication between paper water rights and permit exempt wells, the estimate of permit exempt well water use is considered to be conservative (i.e. higher than actual permit exempt well water use).

In terms of number of rights, the following are estimated: 3,600 permit exempt wells; 1,723 water right claims; and, 389 water right permits and certificates. In terms of the allocated annual volume, the following are estimated: 88,188 acre-feet for water right permits and certificates; 37,739 acre-feet for water right claims; and, 5,800 acre-feet for permit exempt wells. Cynthia noted that it would be good for the group to think about how to address claims since these represent a significant amount of allocated water.

Water Use

Cynthia presented a map showing the WRIA 54 public water system service areas. Outside of these service areas, people are considered to be self supplied or on a very small system (i.e., supplied by permit-exempt wells). Annual water use is estimated as: 24,923 acre-feet (43%) by irrigation; 20,587 acre-feet (36%) by Group A water systems; 5,800 acre-feet (10%) by permit exempt wells; 5,752 acre-feet (10%) by Group B water systems; 548 acre-feet (1%) by other uses; 259 acre-feet (0.4%) by stock watering.

Cynthia presented Table 3-10 from the draft report which lists water allocation and actual water use by subbasin. In most cases, the amount that is being used is much less than the amount allocated. For the watershed, it is estimated that actual water use is only about 46% of water allocation. Cynthia noted that the information in the table is being reviewed and may be slightly different in the final report.

Water Balance

This is a required component of a Phase 2 Technical Assessment. Cynthia noted that a water balance is a useful tool to account for water inflow to and outflow from the watershed and to help identify data gaps and/or areas to target more effort in the future. However, there are limitations to developing a water balance – including available data and the scale of WRIA 54, which makes the water balance of limited use as a water allocation or management tool.

Inflows to WRIA 54 include: surface water; groundwater; precipitation; and, imported water. Outflows from WRIA 54 include: surface water; groundwater; evapotranspiration; and, net water demand (i.e., consumptive water use). The water balance equation can be summarized as:

Inflows = Outflows +/- Change in Storage

Table ES-1 summarizes the WRIA 54 average annual water balance. As indicated on Table ES-1, the inflow of water to and outflow of water from WRIA 54 via the Spokane River dominates the average annual water balance. In an average year, about 6 million acre-feet of water flows into WRIA 54 and about 6.2 million acre-feet of water flows out of the watershed. By far the largest component of the inflow and outflow is the Spokane River.

Important water balance conclusions include:

- The Spokane River dominates the water balance and is the best understood component.
- Other components are not well understood. These are critical for managing water at the subbasin level.
- The results of the water balance are useful for educational purposes and targeting future detailed studies.
- The water balance resolved to within 3.9%, a very close resolution, and within the anticipated error of the water balance calculations.

Future Water Needs

Cynthia noted that comprehensive plans, population projections and water system plans were reviewed to provide information on future water needs. This review indicates:

- Additional water needs are anticipated for domestic supply and commercial/industrial uses.

- The increase in domestic supply and commercial/industrial water demand is expected to be 33% by 2025 (based on population projections and water system plans).
- Water rights and water system infrastructure may not match where water is needed.

By overlaying projected land use (based on zoning) with water system service areas, there are some areas where water system service areas do not align with where water demand is likely to be.

Role of Water Conservation in Future Water Demand

Water conservation could play a huge role in reducing future water demand. As an example, outdoor water use between April and October dwarfs the amount of water used indoors. For the City of Spokane, outdoor water use is about 75% of the total water use.

Water Quality

Cynthia noted that the technical assessment report includes a very general look at water quality in WRIA 54. The information in the draft report provides primarily an overview of total daily maximum load (TMDL) water quality issues for the Spokane River, including phosphorus and other nutrients (which result in low dissolved oxygen levels), dissolved metals and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). More water quality work needs to be done through the water quality supplemental grant.

Report Review Schedule

Cynthia outlined the following schedule for the Phase 2, Level 1 Assessment:

- July 26, 2006 – Draft report available
- September 27 – Public meeting
- October 25 – Public meeting
- October 27 – Comment period closes
- November 17, 2006 – Final report available

Questions and comments can be directed to:

- Cynthia Carlstad – cynthia.carlstad@tetratech.com
- Bill Gilmour - (509) 477-7260 bgilmour@spokanecounty.org

Public Comment

Tony Delgado said that he met with Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on October 24. There are 4,000 acres in the Suncrest area that will be up for land exchange and may potentially be developed. There will be a workshop at the middle school in Suncrest on November 14 at 6:30 pm. About 1,100 acres of this land is currently used by the public for recreation. Senator Morton has been invited to attend. There is program whereby the State can purchase land for recreation and could be considered. Tony encouraged people to attend.

Bill informed the group that Keith Holliday will be moving positions within Ecology and will no longer be Ecology's watershed lead for WRIA 54. Mimi Wainwright and Brian Farmer will be the Ecology contacts until a permanent replacement is confirmed. The group thanked Keith for his assistance.

Bryony noted that the Society of Inland Northwest Environmental Scientists (SINES) will be hosting a presentation by the Spokane County Conservation District on xeriscaping on Wednesday November 8 at 6:30 pm at the Shilo Inn in Spokane. Bryony said that she would forward details to the group.

General Schedule Announcements

The following meetings are scheduled:

- The next WRIA 54 Steering Committee is scheduled for Wednesday November 8, 2006, 10 am – noon at the Spokane County Public Works Building, Conference Room 4A, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA 99260. This meeting is open to everyone.

Next Meeting Date and Adjourn

The next Planning Unit meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2006, 10:00 am – noon at the Airway Heights Community Center. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 pm.