

Meeting Summary
Planning Unit
Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan
November 30, 2004

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer & Harry McLean, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water</i> Jane Cunningham, <i>The Lands</i> <i>Council</i>	Keith Holliday, <i>State Caucus,</i> <i>Department of Ecology</i>
Megan Harding, <i>Department of</i> <i>Health</i>	Dave Jones, <i>Water Quality</i> <i>Advisory Committee</i>	Reanette Boese & Rob Lindsay, <i>Spokane County</i>
Dick Price, <i>Stevens County PUD</i>		

Consultants that attended the meeting were: none

Guests that attended the meeting were: Dale Gill, Greg Sweeny.

Introductions: Rob called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. Committee members and guests introduced themselves. Reanette requested comments and/or corrections to the meeting summaries of the two prior meetings – November 8 and November 17.

Rob and Megan Harding explained that water purveyors now need to get endorsement of their comprehensive water system plans from the Planning Unit of the watershed their system is in. Stevens County PUD is in the process of updating their plans and needs this Planning Unit to endorse the plans of their systems within WRIAs 55 and 57.

Storage Assessment Report: Chapter 3 of the Storage Assessment Report is now available at a Golder file transfer site on the web. Copies were handed out. Reviewers were asked to get comments on chapter 3 turned in by December 10 and comments on the rest of the report by December 3.

Discussion of the Implementation Matrix: Rob called attention to the new column that indicates whether a recommendation in the plan is an obligation or a suggestion (recommendation). This was Rob and Reanette's attempt at distinguishing between the two, and want input from planning unit members on whether there is agreement on the designations. Keith likes the concept because then Ecology and the other state agencies will be able to prioritize the recommendations. He asked for an electronic copy so the state can work on filling it in. The State was asked to put any costs they know or can estimate to the recommendations. Reanette pointed out the changes to the recommendations since the 1st draft are included in this matrix.

Planning Unit members made various suggestions to add information to the Implementation Matrix, as follows. Obligation and recommendation need to be defined at the beginning of the matrix. Additional explanations such as that some money is available for a 5-year period, not annual, and other conditions of availability (i.e., if other funds such as grants become available, the amounts in the implementation matrix may be reduced).

Stevens County PUD Comprehensive Water System Plan: Dick Price explained how the Stevens County PUD runs several small water systems within WRIA 55. They are one of the few water systems approved to bail out struggling water systems. None of the comprehensive water system plans (CWSPs) conflict with the draft watershed plan for WRIAs 55 & 57. Growth for the systems is projected to be the 1.6% projected by

Spokane County or less. The Planning Unit authorized Rob Lindsay to send a letter to Stevens County PUD saying that to our knowledge their CWSPs do not conflict with the draft WRIA 55/57 Watershed Plan.

Discussion of Comments from the WRIA 55 / 57 Watershed Plan: The focus turned to the comments from the public to incorporate them into the plan. The comments were divided into several categories.

Conservation Comments (pg 3): Add conservation examples from Whitworth Water District and contact Pasadena Park Irrigation District.

Exempt well restrictions are appropriate Comments: Change to “It is unlikely that there is political support for a moratorium on domestic exempt wells at this time”.

Land management methods are a good idea Comments: Remove the first sentence.

Water users should pay Comments: No changes.

Municipal water reserve doesn’t make sense Comments: No changes.

Idaho water rights Comments: The Planning Unit looks forward to working cooperatively with the State of Idaho on watershed planning. At this time the Planning Unit does not have the authority (mechanism) to ask for alterations to water use in Idaho. Also, our technical studies did not provide information on changes in the amount of groundwater crossing the state line. The bi-state aquifer study may provide this information and give us direction for working with the State of Idaho.

Multi-county approval comments: Add that this goes both ways, Spokane County can “control” water resources planning in Stevens & Pend Oreille Counties. Reword the last sentence.

The “opt-out” issue comments: Add sentences about the spirit of cooperation and that no recommendation has been vetoed by one planning unit participant.

Public Process comments: Remove last sentence. Add information on all of the groups invited to be on the planning unit. Add information on the number of people kept informed about all the planning unit actions. “We continue to search for additional ways to ask the public for review and comment.”

Continuation of the WRIA 55/57 Planning Group Comment: Comment noted.

Wrap Up: The next meeting will be held December 15, 2004 (Wednesday), from 9 a.m. to noon, at the Spokane County Conservation District upstairs conference room. The implementation matrix discussion will be continued.