

Meeting Notice

A meeting of the Planning Unit for the WRIA 55 and 57 Local Watershed Planning program will be held at:

Time: 10:00 am
Date: June 19, 2002
Place: Conference Room
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Agenda

- 10:00 am** **Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members**
Facilitator Lead
- 10:05** **Discuss and Approve May 15, 2002 Meeting Summary**
Facilitator Lead
- 10:10** **What Did We Learn from the Last Meeting?**
Review consensus building and voting process
Facilitator Lead
- 10:30** **Continue Discussion of Decision Making Process for Plan Recommendations**
Facilitator Lead
- 10:50** **Update on Instream Flow Work**
Review outcome of Initiating Agency meeting, two Instream Flow Work Group meetings,
and recommendations for revised instream flow scope of work
Stan Miller
- 11:20** **Planning Unit Discussion and Decision on Revised Instream Flow Scope of Work**
Facilitator Lead
- 11:40** **Upcoming Planning Unit Meetings – What’s Next**
Stan Miller
- 11:45** **Other items of Public or Committee Concern**
Facilitator Lead
- 11:55** **Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**
- 12:00** **Adjourn**

If you have any questions regarding this notice contact Stan Miller at (509) 477-7259 or via e-mail at smiller@spokanecounty.org

Meeting Summary Planning Unit

Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan
June 19, 2002

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen	Karin Divens	Rick Noll
Jim Wilson	Julia McHugh	Dave Jones
Lloyd Brewer	Ty Wick	Rachael Pascal Osborn
Harry McLean	Ken Kuhn	Tom Hargreaves
Terry Liberty	Gus Koedding	Ann Murphy
Don Comins	Susan McGeorge	Stan Miller
Jane Cunningham	Steve Silkworth, for B. Howard	Reanette Boese
Megan Harding		

Consultants that attended the meeting were: Sarah Hubbard-Gray of Hubbard Gray Consulting and Bryony Hansen of Golder Associates.

Guests that attended the meeting were: Lee Mellish, Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District, and Virginia Darrell, Washington State Department of Health.

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah provided an overview of the agenda and asked if there were comments on the May 15, 2002 Meeting Summary. Several typographical errors in the meeting summary were noted. In addition, Bryony Hansen explained that the 2nd bullet on page 2, last sentence was not correct, and that it should be changed to say that the “Toe Width Method adds a factor of safety into the evaluation” (not the Wetted Perimeter method). There were no other comments on the meeting summary.

What Did We learn from the May 15, 2002 Meeting: Sarah Hubbard Gray suggested that it would be good to review the voting process used at last month’s Planning Unit meeting on whether or not to move forward with the instream flow analysis using the Wetted Perimeter as outlined in the scope of work. She explained that there may be some confusion on how to apply the voting method established at the April 17, 2002 meeting for developing plan recommendations and that it is important for everyone to have the same interpretation of the protocol. Sarah explained that she wanted to make sure that everyone agrees on how the Planning Unit votes are tallied, and whether the implementing agencies are part of the vote after they have reached consensus. The following comments and concerns were raised:

- Some Planning Unit members indicated that they felt the issue should not have been brought to vote without more explicit notice that a vote would occur at the meeting. Some representatives indicated that they would have tried to adjust other commitments so they could have participated in this important decision.
- The Planning Unit needs to clarify what constitutes the voting body. Different opinions were expressed. Some representatives felt that the implementing agencies should be part of the

voting body, while others felt that an initiated vote, followed by implementing agency consensus, should only include the Planning Unit members that are not implementing agencies.

- Sarah confirmed with the Planning Unit that the decision not to proceed with the wetted perimeter method, as outlined in the April 2002 scope of work, would stand whether or not it is decided that the voting process used at the June 19, 2002 meeting should be changed.
- Doug Allen read RCW 90.82.080 (ii) to the Planning Unit, which pertains only to instream flow recommendations. It explains that for an instream flow to be recommended, there must be unanimous decision by the implementing agencies and a simple majority of the non-implementing (or non-governmental) members of the Planning Unit. He further explained that the decision to apply for instream flow supplemental funding is made by the implementing agencies, but the methodology used for instream flow analysis is decided on by the Planning Unit. Stan Miller indicated that the Planning Unit should note that the process outlined in the RCW applies only to the actual instream flow recommendation made to Ecology following the study/analysis; and that the Planning Unit could decide to make other routine and important decisions in a different way.
- Doug Allen said that the Planning Unit needs to clarify the decision making process for plan recommendations (made during the April 17, 2002 Planning Unit meeting) and to decide if they want to use a different process for other routine and important decisions.
- A discussion followed, with some suggesting that only one process be chosen so decisions don't have to be made on what is important and what is routine. The discussion items were:
 - Should the implementing agencies be allowed to vote as Planning Unit members?
 - Should the Planning Unit constitute one individual from each of the entities listed on the sign in sheet?
 - For plan recommendations, do all the implementing agencies need to come to consensus or can an implementing agency disagree with an element and, as a result, not have to implement that element?
 - For plan recommendations, do all the implementing agencies need to come to consensus before the Planning Unit votes?
 - Should the Planning Unit discuss and vote prior to the implementing agencies discussing an issue and going through the consensus building process?

As an outcome of the discussion, Sarah Hubbard Gray, framed and posted 5 options for decision making and voting. These options will be discussed at the next meeting and the Planning Unit as a whole will decide on an option to adopt as the decision making process or processes. **Note: There will be a Planning Unit meeting on July 8, 2002 at 9:00 am. At this meeting, a decision making process will be chosen through a consensus building process and possible vote.** The 5 decision making and voting options include:

Option #1 – for Plan Recommendations only:

Initiating Agency Decision Making – Step 1:

- Per the Memorandum of Agreement, all Initiating Agencies shall conduct decision-making by consensus. In addition, since governments will be asked to implement the plan elements, authorized government representatives, in addition to the Initiating Agencies, will be asked to agree to plan recommendations through consensus.
- All Initiating Agency meetings will be open to Planning Unit members to observe.

Planning Unit Voting Process – Step 2:

- All Planning Unit members will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. Voting will only occur when consensus can not be reached.
- If a vote occurs, all Planning Unit members listed in Attachment B of the Memorandum of Agreement, or their designated representative, **including Initiating Agency representatives**, plus a new City of Liberty Lake representative, can vote.
- Planning Unit members must be at the Planning Unit meetings to vote, however, vote by proxy will be allowed.
- Simple majority vote will be used and there will not be a quorum requirement.
- When applicable, Planning Unit meeting notices will indicate in bold that consensus decision making, and possible voting, will occur.
- All recommendations will be discussed at a meeting prior to the meeting where a decision is made. Typically, discussions and consensus building will occur at one meeting, with a wrap up discussion and decision making occurring at a second meeting.

Option #2 – for Plan Recommendations only:

Initiating Agency Decision Making – Step 1:

- Per the Memorandum of Agreement, all Initiating Agencies shall conduct decision-making by consensus. In addition, since governments will be asked to implement the plan elements, authorized government representatives, in addition to the Initiating Agencies, will be asked to agree to plan recommendations through consensus.
- All Initiating Agency meetings will be open to Planning Unit members to observe.

Planning Unit Voting Process – Step 2:

- All Planning Unit members will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. Voting will only occur when consensus can not be reached.
- If a vote occurs, all Planning Unit members listed in Attachment B of the Memorandum of Agreement, or their designated representative, **excluding Initiating Agency representatives**, can vote.
- Planning Unit members must be at the Planning Unit meetings to vote, however, vote by proxy will be allowed.
- Simple majority vote will be used and there will not be a quorum requirement.
- When applicable, Planning Unit meeting notices will indicate in bold that consensus decision making, and possible voting, will occur.
- All recommendations will be discussed at a meeting prior to the meeting where a decision is made. Typically, discussions and consensus building will occur at one meeting, with a wrap up discussion and decision making occurring at a second meeting.

Option #3 – for Non-Plan Recommendation Decisions only:

Initiating Agency Decision Making:

- No separate Initiating Agency consensus/decision making process used.

Planning Unit Decision Making Process:

- All Planning Unit members, **which includes Initiating Agencies representatives**, will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. Voting will only occur when consensus can not be reached.
- If a vote occurs, all Planning Unit members listed in Attachment B of the Memorandum of Agreement, or their designated representative, **including Initiating Agency representatives**, plus a new City of Liberty Lake representative, can vote.
- Planning Unit members must be at the Planning Unit meetings to vote, however, vote by proxy will be allowed.
- Simple majority vote will be used and there will not be a quorum requirement.
- When applicable, Planning Unit meeting notices will indicate in bold that consensus decision making, and possible voting, will occur.
- All recommendations will be discussed at a meeting prior to the meeting where a decision is made. Typically, discussions and consensus building will occur at one meeting, with a wrap up discussion and decision making occurring at a second meeting.

Option #4 – for both Non-Plan and Plan Recommendations:

Planning Unit Decision Making Process:

- All Planning Unit members, **including Initiating Agencies**, will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. If consensus can not be reached, proposals will be re-worked/revised and the Planning Unit will again make a good faith effort to reach a decision through consensus. No voting will occur if consensus can not be reached.
- When applicable, Planning Unit meeting notices will indicate in bold that consensus decision making will occur.
- All recommendations will be discussed at a meeting prior to the meeting where a decision is made. Typically, discussions and consensus building will occur at one meeting, with a wrap up discussion and decision making occurring at a second meeting.

Option #5 – for Non-Plan and Plan Recommendations:

Planning Unit Decision Making Process – Step 1:

- All Planning Unit members, **including Initiating Agencies**, will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. Voting will only occur when consensus can not be reached.
- If a vote occurs, all Planning Unit members listed in Attachment B of the Memorandum of Agreement, or their designated representative, **excluding Initiating Agency representatives**, can vote.
- Planning Unit members must be at the Planning Unit meetings to vote, however, vote by proxy will be allowed.
- Simple majority vote will be used and there will not be a quorum requirement.

- When applicable, Planning Unit meeting notices will indicate in bold that consensus decision making, and possible voting, will occur.
- All recommendations will be discussed at a meeting prior to the meeting where a decision is made. Typically, discussions and consensus building will occur at one meeting, with a wrap up discussion and decision making occurring at a second meeting.

Initiating Agency Decision Making – Step 2:

- Per the Memorandum of Agreement, all Initiating Agencies shall conduct decision-making by consensus. In addition, since governments will be asked to implement the plan elements, authorized government representatives, in addition to the Initiating Agencies, will be asked to agree to plan recommendations through consensus.
- All Initiating Agency meetings will be open to Planning Unit members to observe.

It was asked that all members of the Planning Unit be provided with a list of the Planning Unit members, including the Initiating Agencies and the current implementing agencies before the next meeting. It was also asked that the terms “initiating agencies” and “implementing agencies” be defined in writing for each of the Planning Unit members at the next meeting.

The Planning Unit agreed to schedule the next meeting for Monday July 8 at 9:00 am at the Spokane County Conservation District. If a Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife representative can not attend, the meeting date will be changed and the Planning Unit informed.

Update on Little Spokane River Instream Flow Work: Stan Miller indicated that since the Planning Unit could support moving forward with the instream flow work as outlined in the scope of work discussed at the May 15, 2002 Planning Unit meeting, the Little Spokane River (LSR) Instream Flow Work Group met twice and revised the approach and scope of work. Stan passed out 1) Summary of June 12, 2002 LSR Instream Flow Work Group Meeting, and 2) June 19, 2002 Action Item – Instream Flow Proposal for the Little Spokane River. Stan informed the Planning Unit that the June 4, 2002 conference call with Hal Beecher, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, had been very productive. At the meeting the work group agreed that the wetted perimeter method, plus the following items, would be the best way to proceed:

1. A description of the substrate at transects,
2. Transect information from the vegetation line and information of the vegetation of the riparian zone, and,
3. The depth of the water above the substrate.

It was explained that Hal Beecher felt that this approach would be adequate to create a defensible recommendation on instream flows. Stan then informed the group that Hal Beecher had conference called with the Hangman Creek group on June 5, 2002 and had said that only one transect representative of a reach (and not five as originally defined by Golder within a traditional wetted perimeter method) would be needed and suggested that the group complete 7 measurements of the parameters at this one transect at 7 different flows.

Stan asked the Planning Unit to read over the items passed out as well as the Summary of the June 4, 2002 LSR Instream Flow Work Group Meeting (which was included with the June 19, 2002 meeting notice/agenda) before the July 8, 2002 meeting. Stan stressed to the Planning Unit that a

decision on the following items would need to be made by the Planning Unit at the July 8 meeting so the necessary instream flow work can be completed over the summer:

1. Verify that the Planning Unit agrees to proceed with the wetted perimeter method plus the three items described above.
2. Decide if the Planning Unit wants to adopt Hal Beecher's approach of using one transect and 7 measurements (which will allow study of additional sites over and above the four defined by Golder).
3. Decide on sites to study in order or priority.

Stan also provided: 1) copies of Golder's October 17, 2001 memo on the Spokane October 10, 2001 instream flow meeting; and 2) a review of instream flow study methods used in Washington State.

Other Items of Public or Committee Concern: The following items were shared with the group:

- Rachael Paschal Osborn provided copies of:
 - Richter, Baumgartner, Wigington, Braun et al, 1997. How much water does a river need?
 - Poff, Allan, Bain, Karr, Prestegard, Richter, Sparks and Stromberg, 1997. The Natural Flow Regime.
- Bryony Hansen said that Golder would be providing a hard copy of Varela's water use and wastewater production memos to the County for review and asked the Planning Unit to expect these in the mail over the next couple of weeks for their review.

The next meeting was set for Monday July 8, 2002 at 9:00 am at the Spokane County Conservation District. **Note: This is a non-routine meeting date and time!!**