

Meeting Summary Planning Unit

Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan April 19, 2006

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water</i>	Reanette Boese, Rob
Ty Wick, <i>SAJB</i>	Dave Jones, <i>Water Quality</i>	Lindsay, and Robbin
Dick Price, <i>Stevens County PUD</i>	Keith Holliday, <i>State Caucus,</i> <i>Department of Ecology</i>	Paeper, <i>Spokane</i> <i>County</i>

Guests that attended the meeting were: Tom Wimpy, Diamond Lake, Howard Rowley, Horseshoe Lake, Stan Miller, Greg Sweeney, Eloika Lake Assn., Ben Bonkowski, and Fred Rajala.

Introductions and Meeting Summary: Rob called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. Committee members and guests introduced themselves. The meeting summary for March 15, 2006 was reviewed and accepted as final after a typo fix.

Update on the Middle Spokane Instream Flow committee: Some members of the Spokane River Instream flow technical committee toured the proposed transect locations. The two transects in WRIA 57 are both in run sections. Pictures will be taken of riffle sections because it is too expensive to do transects in these riffles. They will try to do the field work at 7,000 cfs in late spring, 3,000 cfs in the early summer, and 1,000 cfs in the fall. TetraTech will take temperature measurements while they are in the river. The Spokane Tribe is contributing to the instream flow work being done in WRIA 54. Keith still needs the new detailed scope of work and budget for the instream flow grant. Greg Sweeney informed the group about the planned construction of a whitewater park in the Spokane River in the summer/fall of 2007. Fortunately, the instream flow study should be done before that construction begins.

Steering Committee Update: The steering committee met Wednesday April 5 with Lloyd, Keith, Ty Wick, Rob, and Reanette. The steering committee discussed the agenda, the MOA, and the Idaho legislation for the adjudication of north Idaho water rights. Rob reported that Spokane County probably can not contract with a consultant selected by another agency with a different selection process.

Update on the West Branch LSR lakes committee: The organizing group had a second organizational meeting with a facilitator. They want a draft mission statement, operating procedures, and code of conduct before the first meeting of the complete committee. They also need to identify all the interested parties. Michele Vasquez can facilitate the meetings for 6 months. They want to begin identifying the issues at the first meeting of the full committee. Greg suggested applying for grant money for a facilitator for the committee to keep a facilitator beyond the 6 months. There is \$75,000 in the state budget for the Little Spokane River – Keith will find out what it is for.

MOA: Lloyd discussed the draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) passed out at the meeting. This MOA draft does include an addition in 5.0 “The WIT is composed of the parties signing this MOA and those members of the WRIs 55 & 57 Planning Unit...”. Comments from the State Attorney General’s (AG) office are not yet included. Lloyd will send out another draft after he receives the final comments from the AG. Lloyd also needs the names for the signatures. All time spent on Phase IV Watershed Planning that is not reimbursed by Ecology can be used for the 10% match. The sign in sheet can to be changed to keep track of those hours.

Information on Idaho Adjudication: Ben Bonkowski and Fred Rajala from the Dept of Ecology Water Resources reported on the State of Idaho's plan to adjudicate all water rights in northern Idaho. They are not sure of all the implications for the parts of Washington bordering Idaho. They still want to find out the sequence and timing of this adjudication process. Past experience shows that states with adjudicated rights have an edge when disputes over water rights occur between states. There are four ways to deal with water rights issues between states. One is an informal agreement. The second is an interstate compact. The third is equitable apportionment by the Supreme Court of the U.S. Congressional apportionment is the fourth. The courts look at the validity and extent of water rights while the interstate compact can look at other factors such as the instream flow needs for fish. The McCarran amendment allows federal rights to be adjudicated in state courts.

Adjudication can be a very long process in the State of Washington. Sometimes adjudication is done one basin at a time to shorten the process. Ecology is looking at possible ways to streamline the process. Some ways would require changing the state constitution, some would require legislative changes, and some may require just a change in the way Ecology does the adjudication.

Inchoate rights may be viewed as permits in an adjudication process.

Project Proposals: These project proposals are meant to be place holders in Ecology's budget for the biennium 2007 – 2009. They are not supposed to be just a wish list, but actual projects. These requests are somewhat premature for this group since we don't have a detailed implementation plan (DIP), but we should have a DIP before the biennium is over. We can refine the projects after we have the DIP.

Ty Wick handed out 2 water conservation proposals and Lloyd handed out one. There still may be proposals for the Little Spokane, wetlands restoration, and gaging. All project proposals are due Wednesday April 26 at noon. Spokane County will email them to the Planning Unit. We'll hold a meeting on Thursday morning to make final decisions on which to send to Ecology. Everyone is welcome.

Public Comment and other issues: Howard Rowley asked if any one knows the status of a bridge proposed for the Horseshoe Lake area. Keith believes Howard should talk to Jeff Lawler of the Dept of Fish and Wildlife.

Wrap Up: The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 31, 2006, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., at the Spokane County Conservation District upstairs conference room.