

**Meeting Summary
Implementing Agencies and Governments
WRIA 54 Lower Spokane River
June 16, 2004**

Initiating Agency and Implementing Government members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen, Dept. of Ecology	Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane
Dick Price, Stevens County PUD #1	Rob Lindsay, Spokane County
Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe	Jane Cunningham, Lands Council
Bill Gilmour, Spokane County	Rick Rosa, Fairchild
Jim DeGraffenreid, Lincoln County	Harry McLean, City of Spokane Water
John Gibson, Fairchild	Mike Coster, City of Spokane, Wastewater Mgmt
Rick Noll, Spokane Conservation District	Claudia Michalke, Stevens Co. Conservation Dist
Christy Brown, CLB Planning	

Meeting began 10:00 am

Christy Brown opened the meeting thanking on behalf of Spokane County, the initiating agencies, the implementing governments and herself everyone in attendance for their support of this project and their volunteering of time and ideas. Around the room introductions were made.

Official meeting minutes for the May 12, 2004 WRIA 54 were accepted with the change of:
Meeting Adjourn 4:30 pm to Meeting Adjourn 11:30 am.

Discussion of Scope of Work

Bill discussed the two main goals of the Phase I work, to organize a Planning Unit and develop a scope of work for Phase II. Bill proposed forming a Work Group to develop the Phase II scope of work over the summer with the goal of having a draft for the September Planning Unit meeting. The Planning Unit agreed and a volunteer sign-up sheet was passed around.

The question of timelines regarding submission of the Phase II application and watershed plan was asked. Doug Allen informed the group the only deadline that needs to be kept in mind is from the date funds are received for the Phase II portion of the project, the Planning Unit has 4 years to complete the watershed plan. Deadlines between the funding receipt date and completion of the watershed plan are guided by the Planning Unit's own goals to stay on track with progress. Bill and Christy agreed to put together a proposed schedule with milestones keeping in mind that unforeseen issues will undoubtedly change the proposed schedule.

Bill Gilmour agreed to send an electronic copy of the MOA to the group for their information.

Discussion of Code of Conduct

Christy presented the draft Code of Conduct to the Planning Unit. The Planning Unit agreed to eliminate the first bulleted item under the Conduct between Meetings; to reword the bullet:
Communication with the news media and/or legislative authority on watershed planning will occur through Planning Unit authorization to Individuals may represent their own opinion in public forum or interviews as their own opinions and not the opinion of the entire watershed planning unit. The

addition of one bullet to address *draft documents not being released to the public* will also be added to the Code of Conduct by request of the Planning Unit.

Discussion of printed documents was also discussed. It was agreed that written material released with the representation of the Planning Unit, will be first reviewed and approved by the Planning Unit.

Discussion of Information Distribution

Christy asked the members present how they would prefer to receive information such as meeting summaries, pre-meeting information or other necessary communication from the lead agency regarding watershed planning. Postal mailing and/or electronic mailings are possible options. The Planning Unit agreed that electronic mailing would be best if some paper copies were available at the meeting in case someone forgot to bring their own printed version. Bill and Christy agreed there would be extra copies of the distributed packets available at each meeting and that each member would be responsible for bringing a copy of what is emailed to them to the meeting. All agreed that would be an acceptable information distribution procedure.

Goal Development

Christy opened the discussion about goal development for the Planning Unit. Goals provide a necessary road map. Rick Rosa said his goal and the reason he attends the meeting was to ensure Fairchild's best interest was kept in mind by the Planning Unit during the planning process. With that comment Christy added that there are individual goals that are important and group goals that will help drive the process of decision-making. Doug Allen interjected that the legislature has goals for the process of watershed planning. It was also mentioned that the Watershed Planning Act has specific goals to be accomplished during the Phase II portion of the project. Education of the public was brought up as a possible goal. Christy added that during the summer months and throughout the planning process educators could be brought to the group to provide further education on issues important to the group that also could be shared with the public.

Rob Lindsay suggested the group discuss possible goals for the group and come up with a list that can be made present at each meeting for the group to see. Christy and Bill agreed that a large poster of the group goals could be displayed at the meeting for all to read and keep in the forefront of their minds while going through the watershed planning process. Members will consider their individual goals as part of the Planning Unit and goals for the Planning Unit as a whole. Further discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

Other Items of concern

Each agenda will allow a few minutes for Public Comment. The group discussed providing time at the beginning and ending of each meeting for public comment. Christy cautioned the group that time at the beginning of the meeting would need to be monitored to ensure Planning Unit agenda items were still addressed. Public comments often become discussions which in-turn can delay the Planning Unit meeting goals and agenda items, sometimes with necessary decision making items needing to be addressed. Claudia Michalke wanted to note that she did not feel the Planning Unit should restrict time when it comes to public comment because comments from the public are rare and need to be heard. Controlling the flow of the meeting is the facilitator's responsibility and should be addressed accordingly if it gets out of hand. The Planning Unit agreed that the agenda should provide two

opportunities for public comment. Ten minutes at the beginning of the meeting and ten more minutes near the end of the meeting.

When the next Planning Unit meeting will occur was discussed and decided that there are enough items of concern to meet in July and take August off. A date of July 21, 2004 was agreed upon. Bill will arrange for the meeting location with emphasis on trying to get the Airway Heights location.

The first meeting for the Phase II scope of work Work Group was set for July 6, 2004 10:00-12:00 at the Spokane County Conservation District (upstairs conference room). The Work Group will provide its first update regarding the Phase II scope of work to the Planning Unit.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be July 21st, 2004

Wrap-up and Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.