

Meeting Notice

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

Time: 9:00 am
Date: Monday, July 8, 2002 (Note different date and time than usual!)
Place: Conference Room
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Agenda

- 9:00 am** Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members
Facilitator Lead
- 9:05** Discuss and Approve June 19, 2002 Meeting Summary
Facilitator Lead
- 9:10** **Continued Discussion:** Non-Plan and Plan Recommendation Decision Making Options
Planning Unit Decision on which Option(s) to Adopt
Note: The Planning Unit will be asked to make a decision at this meeting; consensus building and possible voting will occur!!
Facilitator Lead
- 10:10** **Continued Discussion:** Revised Instream Flow Scope of Work
Planning Unit Decision on using Wetted Perimeter Plus method
Note: The Planning Unit will be asked to make a decision at this meeting; consensus building and possible voting will occur!!
Stan Miller and 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
July 8, 2002

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen	Ty Wick	Dave Jones
Lloyd Brewer	Susan McGeorge	Rachael Pashcal Osborn
Harry McLean	Steve Skipworth	Tom Hargreaves
Terry Liberty	Roger Krieger	Dave Jones
Don Comins	Walt Edelen	Stan Miller
Jane Cunningham	Megan Harding	Reanette Boese

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: Kevin Robinette, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah provided an overview of the agenda and asked if there were comments on the June 19, 2002 Meeting Summary. One typographical error in the meeting summary was noted. There were no other comments on the meeting summary.

Continued Discussion on Non-Plan and Plan Recommendation Decision Making Options, Planning Unit Decision on which Option(s) to Adopt: Stan Miller passed out a handout that provides a composite set of Planning Unit invitee/member lists. The five options for decision making developed at the June 19, 2002 Planning Unit meeting were displayed on the walls. Sarah Hubbard-Gray asked the Planning Unit representatives to place green dots on all of the options they “can live with” and red dots on all the options they “can not live with”. The results of the dot exercise are summarized below:

- **Option #1** – 9 can live with and 3 can not live with
- **Option #2** – 1 can live with and 12 can not live with
- **Option #3** – 13 can live with and 0 can not live with
- **Option #4** – 7 can live with and 6 can not live with
- **Option #5** – 5 can live with and 8 can not live with

After reviewing and discussing the dot exercise results, the Planning Unit representatives agreed by consensus that Option 3 should be used for non-plan decision making, including Little Spokane River instream flow decisions. They also agreed that Options 2, 4 and 5 should be eliminated from further consideration, and that further Planning Unit discussion on how to structure plan recommendation decision making is needed. It was decided that a couple options derived from Option 1 and the comments, concerns, and suggestions raised at the meeting would be developed and discussed at the

September 18, 2002 meeting – with the goal of finalizing the decision at this time. Some of the comments and discussion associated with plan recommendation decision making included:

- Don't want implementing agencies to be able to veto recommendations, would prefer if they could opt out of implementing some of the recommendations rather than veto a recommendation altogether from the plan.
- Concerned about agencies implementing different elements of the plan, e.g., lack of consistency.
- Want Planning Unit representatives, along with initiating agencies, to be able to review recommendations and have the chance to build consensus prior to any separate initiating agency decision making step.
- Want minority opinions to be able to be part of the process.
- Concern about ability of initiating agencies to get a revised Memorandum of Agreement with a revised decision making process approved and signed.
- It was requested that Spokane County provide clarification on definitions and Section 6.1 of the current Memorandum of Agreement at the next meeting.

The Plan Recommendation Decision Making Options that will be considered at the September 18, 2002 meeting include:

Option #A – for Plan Recommendation Decision Making:

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. If there are minority opinions, they will be discussed and considered. 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**, 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 current 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.

Option #B – for Plan Recommendation Decision Making:

Planning Unit Decision Making Process – Step 1:

- All Planning Unit members, **including Initiating Agency representatives**, will make a good faith effort to reach decisions through consensus. If there are minority opinions, they will be discussed and considered. 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.

Initiating Agency Decision Making – Step 2:

- If the Initiating Agencies were not in consensus during Step 1, then a follow up meeting will be held to discuss the recommendation and make a good faith effort to reach consensus.
- If consensus can not be reached, individual Initiating Agencies can opt out of implementing specific recommendations – in this case the individual agencies would not oppose the recommendation, but by opting out would not be required to implement the recommendation. (*Note: this option could require a new Memorandum of Agreement to be approved and signed by all initiating agencies.*)

Continued Discussion on Revised Instream Flow Scope of Work, Planning Unit Decision on using Wetted Perimeter Plus method: Stan Miller provided an overview of the modifications made to the previous Little Spokane River instream flow scope of work and handed out the June 19, 2002 proposal that summarized the revised approach for the Planning Unit's consideration. He explained that the Instream Flow Work Group had met on June 4 and 12, 2002, that Department of Fish and Wildlife representatives had attended those meetings and provided input, and that members of the Work Group support the modified scope of work which uses the wetted perimeter method plus supplemental data collected on aquatic biota, substrate, water depth, and velocity.

Kevin Robinette, from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, passed out a July 3, 2002 memo from Jason McLellan titled "Little Spokane River Fish Habitat Requirements and Distribution Table". Kevin went over the memo contents, explained that rainbow trout and mountain whitefish are the appropriate fish to consider as indicator species for the study, and explained that Hal Beecher supports the revised Wetted Perimeter Plus method for the Little Spokane River instream flow study. The Planning

Unit members then asked questions and provided comments. Members of the Little Spokane River Instream Flow Work Group (including Doug Allen, Tom Hargreaves, Susan McGeorge, and Rachael Pashcal Osborn) confirmed their support for the modified approach and explained why.

Stan Miller explained recent input from Hal Beecher and proposed modifying the June 19, 2002 Instream Flow Proposal scope of work items to reflect his recommendations. The modifications include:

1. Perform field data collection for wetted perimeter analysis on at least six selected ~~sites~~ reaches.
 - ~~a. Measure five transects at each primary site~~
 - ~~b. a. Reaches should be 300 to 1000 feet long~~
 - ~~c. Measurements will be made at High, Medium and Low flow for each site~~

2. ~~Alternative approach to wetted perimeter~~
 - ~~a. b. Select a representative transect on each study reach, selected by a fisheries expert~~
 - ~~b. c. Measurements will be made on the transect at seven flows in the range from near low flow to near high flow~~

In addition, it was recommended that the following phase be added to the scope of work:

- Over the course of the study, project staff will work with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as appropriate and as much as they are available.

The Planning Unit was asked if they support the June 19, 2002 Instream Flow proposal for the Little Spokane River with the scope of work modifications listed above. It was approved by consensus.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 pm. The next meeting was set for Wednesday September 18, 2002 at **9:30 am** at the Spokane County Conservation District. Note that the meeting will start one half hour earlier than typical.