

**Meeting Summary
Planning Unit**

Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan
November 16, 2005

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Mike Lithgow and Jim Marthaller, <i>Pend Oreille County</i>	Walt Edelen, <i>Spokane County Conservation District</i>
Harry McLean, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Dave Jones, <i>Water Quality</i>	Reanette Boese, Melissa Burchell, <i>Spokane County</i>
Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water</i>	Keith Holliday, <i>State Caucus, Department of Ecology</i>	
Dick Price, <i>Stevens Count PUD</i>		
Steve Skipworth, <i>Vera Water & Power</i>		

Consultants that attended the meeting were: none

Guests that attended the meeting were: Tom Wimpy, Diamond Lake Homeowners; Greg Sweeney, Eloika Lake Assn; Jeff Storms, Sacheen Lake; and Ed Haig, Meadowcroft Wetland Mitigation Bank.

Introductions and Meeting Summary: Reanette called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Committee members and guests introduced themselves. The meeting summaries for October 19th and September 14th were reviewed. Both were accepted and become final.

Tom Wimpy, a Diamond Lake homeowner, stated the homeowners’ interest in Watershed Planning but hadn’t found someone to attend in the past. They want to make sure their concerns are represented when solutions to Sacheen Lake’s problems are being discussed.

Ed Haig of Meadowcroft Wetland Mitigation Bank explained wetland mitigation and announced that their wetland is now certified by the Department of Ecology for mitigation of wetlands from WRIAs 54, 55, and 59. They have 10.5 acres and when the whole wetland has been restored, the Loon Lake Land Conservancy will take over management of the wetland.

Update on the Middle Spokane Instream Flow Scope of Work: Rob Lindsay was not in attendance, so there was very little to report about the Instream flow scope of work. Rob has received comments from the workgroup members. They will have a meeting Friday, November 18 at 10 a.m. in the Spokane County Public Works Building.

Review of Issues and Recommendations given preliminary approval on September 14, 2005: Reanette handed out copies of the Issues and Recommendations and asked for comments. A typo in VIII.E.01.a was noted and corrected.

Policy VIII.E	The Watershed Plan should be responsive to new information and changing needs within the watersheds.
Issue VIII.E.01	How can the Watershed Plan adapt to new information and changing needs of the Watersheds?
VIII.E.01.a.	The Watershed Plan should be reviewed and revised as needed, if funding is available, at five year intervals after the completion of the detailed Implementation Plan.
VIII.E.01.b.	Amendments to the Watershed Plan can be made, as required, by approval of the Planning Unit or its successor and adoption by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties.
VIII.E.01.c.	The detailed Implementation Plan will be reviewed and revised as funding allows on an ongoing basis.

The discussion was limited to Policy VIII.E and the associated issue and recommendations because the other recommendation falls under the next agenda item - Pend Oreille County issues. The Plan already called for “adaptive management” but the Commissioners from both Spokane and Stevens Counties asked for a more specific review mechanism. Lloyd Brewer had some questions because he missed the September meeting. He wondered if these issues should be dealt with in an MOA or if there should be a monetary trigger mechanism. The Planning Unit worked on explaining the recommendations to Lloyd. The recommendations are for several levels of changes. The first is a periodic review, the second is for amendments to the Watershed Plan, and the third is for changes to the detailed Implementation Plan. Changes to the detailed Implementation Plan won’t require approval of all boards because any change in how money is spent requires a new agreement between the agencies supplying the money. Lloyd said he can live with the language, and the Policy, Issue, and Recommendations were confirmed.

Because these are seen as a clarification rather than a new course of action and because they are not water resource issues and do not require extra expenditures of money, they do not substantively change the plan and we will not go back to public hearings.

Update on Pend Oreille County Issues: Jim Marthaller told about the Pend Oreille County Commissioners’ meeting yesterday. About 50 people attended the meeting concerning Sacheen Lake and the beavers. The commissioners agreed on a short term policy where the Pend Oreille Conservation District will take the lead. They will get the interested parties together to work on solutions. They would like the Watershed Planning group to help with the long term solutions. They liked Keith Holliday’s response and would like to have an MOU between Pend Oreille County and the state agencies. When they have the MOU, they will not need the additional recommendations in the Plan and will be willing to adopt it as it is so we can go forward and apply for funds to help solve the problems.

The Planning Unit suggested Spokane County work to set up a joint session of the three sets of County Commissioners. The timing of the meeting will depend on Pend Oreille County and the state agencies signing an agreement. The upcoming holidays may make it difficult to schedule a meeting. A barbeque was suggested as an incentive.

Local Priority Ranking of Centennial Clean Water Grants: Walt Edelen explained the grant the SCCD applied for to complete TMDL work in the Little Spokane Watershed. The money will help complete the TMDL detailed implementation plan and study the effects of reducing phosphates in automatic dishwashing detergent and fertilizer. This is the only grant application for WRIA 55 this year. The group agreed this grant is our highest priority in WRIA 55.

Wrap Up: The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday December 13, 2005, from 10 a.m. to noon, at the Spokane County Conservation District upstairs conference room.