

**FINAL**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed**  
**April 26, 2006**

**Location:** Lakeside High School Library, Nine Mile Falls, WA.

**Planning Unit members and guests recorded on the sign-in sheet were:**

Jim DeGraffenreid, Lincoln County Planning	Bob Derkey, WA State Dept. of Natural Resources
Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane	Rob Lindsay, Spokane County
Keith Holliday, WA State Dept. of Ecology	Dick Price, Stevens PUD #1
Bill Gilmour, Spokane County	Mike Hamilton, WA State Dept. of Natural Resources
Hank Nelson, Avista Corporation	Commissioner Merrill Ott, Stevens County
Victoria Leuba, WA State Dept. of Ecology	Lucas Braden, Spokane Regional Chamber of Commerce
Bart Haggin, Lands Council	Fran Bessermin, Lake Spokane Protection Assoc.
Jay Landreth, Landowner	Mark Curtis, Stevens County Conservation District
Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe	Charlie Peterson, Spokane County Conservation District
Bruce Smith, Landowner	Guy Tillman, Landowner
Jerry Warner, Palisades Neighborhood	Bea Lackaff, Citizen
Judy Kaufman, Spokane Fly Fishers	Craig Volosing, Landowner and Palisades Neighborhood
Cynthia Carlstad, Tetrattech/KCM	John Herrmann, Tetrattech/KCM
Jonathon Rudders, GeoEngineers	Bryony Stasney, Golder Associates Inc.
Wes McCart, Landowner, Stevens County Farm Bureau and Stevens County Water Conservancy Board	
David Luders, Fairchild Airforce Base and Indian Village Estates Water Assoc.	
Jeanne Barnes, Spokane Association of Realtors and Lake Spokane Park Homeowners Association	
John Patrouch, Northwest Whitewater Assoc. / Spokane Canoe and Kayak Club	

**Call to Order**

Bryony Stasney opened the meeting at approximately 6:00 pm. Attendees introduced themselves and the interest / organization they represent. Bryony asked all to document their attendance on the sign-in sheet.

The draft March 22, 2006 WRIA 54 meeting summary was reviewed page by page with the following requests for changes: 1) Judy Kaufman noted on the last page, second paragraph under public comment that "April 29" should be replaced with "April 19". Bryony asked the group for approval of the March 22, 2006 WRIA 54 meeting summary, including Judy's suggested change. With this change, those present accepted the March 22, 2006 meeting summary as final and will be posted on the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

**Public Comment**

No public comment was received.

**Instream Flow Technical Team Update**

Cynthia Carlstad informed the group that the Instream Flow work is ongoing. Since the last meeting the scope has been finalized and the transects have been selected. There are 7 transects on the mainstem of the Spokane River plus 3 photo transect sites. Bea Lackaff will be taking photos at these sites at a number of different flows. In addition, there will be toe width done on 4 tributaries - Deep Creek, Coulee Creek, Little Chamokane Creek and Spring Creek. The tributary work will be done collaboratively by Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Spokane Tribe with help from this Planning Unit. The Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the study is complete and has been signed all parties. The project team is now waiting for the flows to be at a level for the first set of measurements. The

team is aiming for flows between 5,000 – 7,000 cfs on the mainstem of the Spokane River. This is expected in June / July this year. The Spokane River mainstem flow is now at 17,000 cfs.

At the last meeting it was asked that there be documentation of the discussion that occurred regarding transect selection for the Spokane River instream flow work. This summary has been provided to Spokane County and will be posted on the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

### **Phase II Technical Assessment Update**

Cynthia Carlstad gave a progress report on the Phase II Technical Assessment work. This work is the compilation of available data that pertains to water in WRIA 54. The work began 2 months ago and is about 1/3 complete. The project team is aiming to have the draft report ready at the end of June 2006. The project team is comfortable that this target can be met.

Cynthia gave a PowerPoint presentation to show some of the maps and data collected so far. Cynthia's presentation is available at the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>. The following summarizes the presentation and discussion.

**Study Area** – the WRIA 54 Planning Area was described.

**Subwatersheds** – The subwatersheds are consistent with DNR watershed administrative units (WAUs) and represent surface water drainage areas. These areas are not necessarily representative of groundwater divides.

**Hydrology** – The hydrology of WRIA 54 includes the rivers, gaging stations and dams in the watershed. Important rivers include Spokane River, Coulee Creek, Deep Creek, Chamokane Creek, Little Chamokane Creek and other fairly major tributaries such as Blue Creek, Mill Creek and Spring Creek. The active gages include:

1. Spokane River gage at Monroe Street (actually just upstream of WRIA 54 in WRIA 57);
2. Spokane River gage below Long Lake in the middle of the watershed;
3. Blue Creek;
4. Chamokane Creek; and,
5. Rob Lindsay noted that there is also an inactive gage on the Spokane River across the road from the rifle club in the area where there are 3 instream flow transects.

**Hydrograph** – Hydrographs are a way of showing available flow data with flow (in cfs) plotted on the y-axis versus time (on the x-axis). For the tributaries, there is very limited flow data.

- Tributaries outside the WRIA with flow data include:
  - Little Spokane River
  - Hangman (Latah) Creek
- There is also limited flow data for tributaries within the WRIA:
  - Chamokane Creek
  - Blue Creek

**Geology** – A generalized geology map was presented for the WRIA with units combined for purposes of thinking about groundwater flows. Three units were described:

1. Crystalline basement – the oldest rocks that do not appear to provide much water;
2. The Columbia River Basalts – which tend to be important aquifers in some places; and,
3. Unconsolidated deposits - deposits that can be dug with shovel, including sands and gravels of the Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie aquifer in the southeast of the watershed and smaller deposits of sand and gravels elsewhere in some of the subwatersheds.

**Hydrogeology** – The hydrogeology (i.e. groundwater flow) is tied closely to the geology. There are three main unconsolidated aquifers:

1. The Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie aquifer in the southeast of the watershed;
2. Palaeochannels in the Airways Heights / West Plains area which are sands and gravels inside basalt channels; and,
3. The Chamokane Valley aquifer system which comprises glacial deposits (both river and lake) that can be up to a couple hundred feet thick in some places. This aquifer is important to supply groundwater to this area of the Spokane Reservation.

The bedrock aquifers include:

1. The Columbia River Basalt aquifers. While basalt tends to be impermeable, the flow tops and bottoms tend to be rubbly and are sometimes good places to find groundwater. The Wanapum and Grande Ronde basalts are the major formations in WRIA 54 and are made up of a number of flows.
2. Sedimentary interbeds. In between volcanically active times, sediments accumulated, often in lakes, and formed interbeds between the basalt flows. These interbeds can sometimes be good aquifers.
3. Basement rocks are also a water supply unit for individual household use but do not tend to yield sufficient water for larger uses.

**Soils** – This information was compiled from the Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey data and is very detailed. For watershed planning, it is important to have understanding of the hydrologic properties of the soils. The mapping shows soils grouped into classes that are more or less permeable since this property controls how much water runs off or infiltrates. This understanding is important for issues such as Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), hydraulic continuity and stormwater runoff.

**Jurisdictional Areas and Land Ownership** – This mapping indicates that the vast majority of the watershed is privately owned with Spokane Reservation land and a scattering of state and federal land.

**Current Land Use** – This mapping presents 1995 USGS data which will need to be updated with more current information in some areas. The mapping indicates a lot of land considered as forest and agricultural land.

**Future Land Use** – Since it is based on zoning, this mapping presents potential full build out. Better information for the Spokane Reservation will be provided by Brian Crossley. This information indicates that much of the area defined as forest land in the land use mapping is zoned as low density residential in the southeast of the WRIA (i.e., west from Spokane along the Highway 291 corridor). This could indicate a significant water demand to support this growth if it were to happen. The project teams will be looking at water system plans to see if planning for future water supply needs are reconciled with zoning. If not, the Planning Unit should identify this in the Plan and plan for the future in terms of where the water will come from to support this growth.

**Next Steps** – Cynthia reiterated that the draft Technical Assessment report is expected to be ready at the end of June 2006. The project team is finalizing water use calculations and working on the water budget. The project team plans to tackle water rights (permits, certificates and claims) next. This information has been acquired and will be screened by Reanette Boese of Spokane County for duplicate and anomalous records within Ecology's database.

Cynthia opened the floor for questions.

**Q:** Is there any water entering the watershed through the basalt aquifers?

**A:** There is likely to be groundwater both entering and exiting via the basalt aquifers. This will be difficult to quantify. We can do some relatively crude hydrogeological calculations for groundwater flow based on a number of assumptions including hydraulic conductivity of the material. We can attempt to do this but the results may be unsatisfying.

**Q:** The Little Spokane River and adjacent aquifer is over allocated (in terms of water rights) at this point. Are we going to consider the instream flow of the Little Spokane River as a part of our study?

**A:** Our analysis will be considering the Little Spokane River as a tributary to the Spokane River and, since WRIA 55 (the Little Spokane River watershed) has its own Watershed Plan, we will use this work where relevant. For the WRIA 54 instream flow project, we will review instream flow work done in the vicinity of WRIA 54 (i.e., WRIA 56 - Hangman Creek and WRIA 55 - Little Spokane River and WRIA 57 - Lower Spokane River). Rob Lindsay clarified that the Little Spokane River enters into the Spokane River in the Long Lake Reservoir and that this area is not included for work as part of the WRIA 54 instream flow study because it is not free flowing.

### **Presentation by Victoria Leuba from the Washington Department of Ecology on “Water Rights and Claims”**

Late-comers were asked to introduce themselves and Bryony reminded everyone to sign in.

Ecology handouts were passed around including the most current information from Ecology on claims and relinquishment. Victoria noted that the rules and regulations change every year. The handouts are available on Ecology's web site (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/pubs.shtm>) and included:

- Focus on the Ground Water Permit Exemption. Publication #F-WR-92-104 Revised February 2006.
- Frequently Asked Questions about Water Rights in Washington. Publication #96-1804-S&WR. Revised February 2006.
- Frequently Asked Questions about Claims. Publication #97-2022-S&WR. Revised February 2006.
- Focus. Water Right Relinquishment. Publication #98-1812-WR. Revised July 1998.
- Washington State Water Law – A Primer. Publication #WR-98-152.
- Washington State Water Right Adjudication Process – A Primer. No Publication #.

Victoria noted that this presentation is a modification of a presentation she gave a month ago for a seminar and that she is here to take Kevin Brown's place. Kevin has 13 years of experience in water rights and is a good resource for questions. The following summarizes the presentation and discussion.

#### ***BACKGROUND***

The use of water has changed little over time (e.g., stock watering, drinking). One new use is for hydropower and this use has changed over time. Settlers in WA began arguing over rights and demands on streams become significant. At this time, the State was using the riparian doctrine which made all the stream available for use and had the potential to dry up the stream for downstream users. In 1914 WA State identified this problem as something causing legal tie-ups in courts and built a commission to develop strategies to address the problem. In 1914-1915, WA State began to think about changing from a riparian to a prior appropriation doctrine. Authority for water rights became vested in the State of WA and state rules, regulations and laws were developed. In 1917, WA State adopted the Water Code. In 1945, the water code was extended to allow the State to manage groundwater as well as surface water. Regulations and policies have been developed over time from these codes. Also, there is a lot of case law. The riparian doctrine was formally retired in 1932/33.

#### ***WHAT IS A WATER RIGHT?***

Active code doctrine is now prior appropriation doctrine (i.e., first in time is first in right). This doctrine says if you put water to beneficial use you have a right to that portion of water that you are beneficially using and senior rights have to be satisfied first. Prior appropriation doctrine is applied to both surface water and groundwater.

A water right is a usufructory right (i.e., you can use this commodity but cannot own it). You own the right to use a water right based on public benefit or public good.

A water right is defined by WA State as “A right to the beneficial use of a reasonable quantity of public water for a beneficial purpose during a certain period of time that occurs at a certain place”. A water right holder has an exclusive right to the water at that place and at that time. A claim is a water right that is not documented by state paper.

Ecology uses the 4-test criteria to determine whether or not to issue a water right (note that this is slightly different if changing a water right rather than applying for a new one):

- Is it a beneficial use?
- Is there available water? – in many places in WA the answer to this is becoming “no”.
- Is it in the public interest? – usually judged by public protest to the water right application.
- Is it going to cause impairment to a senior user? – i.e. will there be prior appropriation problems?

Beneficial use has generated a lot of case law. Beneficial uses include: aesthetics, recreation, instream values etc.. The intent of a project is important to beneficial use. For example, if you apply to use water to create a fish pond and then build a pond but do not put fish in it – the water is not being put to beneficial use. But if you apply for water to create a pond for aesthetics, you do not have to put fish in the pond for the water to be used beneficially. Also, if apply for 17 acre-feet of water and you only use 12 acre-feet, then only 12 acre-feet has been put to beneficial use and a water right will only be granted for 12 acre-feet.

Elements of a water right that describe all rights are:

- **Purpose of use** is the intended purpose e.g., domestic, municipal, irrigation, aesthetics, recreation, instream values, hydropower generation.
- **Source of water** is the documented source of water (i.e., a specific point form a body of public water, both surface water and a groundwater aquifer).
- **Priority date** is the time application is accepted.
- **Amount of water used** which is limited to what is reasonably necessary to accomplish the beneficial use. For irrigation this is usually defined by crop water duty. The amount of water is given in  $Q_i$  – instantaneous quantity diverted from SW (cfs) or withdrawn from GW (gpm) and  $Q_a$  – annual quantity in acre-feet.
- **Place of use** is the land or facility that benefits by the use of water (i.e. where the water is applied).
- **Period of use** is the time over which the water can be put to beneficial use (e.g., seasonal for irrigation, continuous typically for drinking water supply)

The place of use language for municipal water users is currently changing based on water system planning, with the place of use becoming their “service area”.

### ***WATER RIGHT DOCUMENTATION***

Water rights are documented in a State paper stream by:

- File application (new or change).
- Application investigated (property location OK, can be put to beneficial use, is project buildable, is water available?).
- Report of examination issued (if meets 4 test, this will be documented and application will be approved).
- Permit issued or denied, if issued:
  - Development of water use (i.e. have permit that allows for a development schedule).
  - Right established through infrastructure development
    - Once developed, applicant files a completion of construction form and puts the water to full beneficial use and then files a proof of appropriation form.
    - Ecology staff will field check the development and water use.
  - Water right certificate is issued to document:
    - Perfected right under water code (for new right).

- Approved change (for change application).

Note that claims are water rights that are not documented by this paper trail and represent use of water before the 1917 and 1945 codes. The State has a record of claims that were filed through the claims registration process. The claims registry has been opened 3 or 4 times. Claims have been registered in this way on short forms or long forms. These forms are a statement that asserts that the water was used prior to 1917 for surface water and prior to 1945 for groundwater. The State has no authority to validate claims. If there is a dispute between a water rights permit / certificate holder and a claims holder, it has to be resolved in court.

### ***WATER RIGHTS CHANGES***

A water right permit is personal property and its place of use can be changed. Once a water right is perfected and a certificate is issued, the water right becomes appurtenant to the place of beneficial use. If a water right certificate is sold, unless the right is withheld or a change for the right is requested, the water right is sold along with the property. If property with a permit is sold, the permit stays with the seller.

As well as water rights permits, certificates and claims, watershed planners also have to consider group domestic and single domestic water uses. There is an exemption to water rights permitting for group domestic and single domestic water groundwater use. These do not have paper work on file with Ecology except for a well drilling record. Permit exempt groundwater use is limited if it is for single or group household use to 5,000 gallons per day. A lot of places have tried to develop using a "six-pack" since about six operable homes can be supplied by 5,000 gpm if water use is conservative.

The following record the questions and answers made during and after the presentation.

**Q:** In an area west of Spokane (the Airway Heights area) 280 new houses are being built and yet Airway Heights is supposed to be running out of water. They must have a permit to build these homes that addresses the need for water supply and stormwater drainage. Is this a case of the biggest check-book? Is this a bad way to say this?

**A:** It may be or may not be a bad way to consider this. Ecology has some permits with long development schedules (some up to 20 years + long) on file for 16+ years (informally called "permits that are old enough to drive"! ). Many of these permits have not been developed due to insufficient water but Ecology has no way to go back and revoke the permit unless the applicant ultimately fails to develop. Sometimes these developments are a way to put in use a permit that has been languishing. So for this development, maybe an entity owned / purchased a permit like this and it is now being developed to put the permit to use.

In 2003, the WA State Legislature passed new law saying that if you are a municipality and you have a water right that was issued in the past based on your capacity to serve, and have not used it, WA will allow you to grow into the water right without subjecting you to possibility of relinquishment (see handout on relinquishment). For example, if you were granted a water right in 1960 for 5 acre-feet and in 2006 you are only using 2 acre-feet, your water right is only for the water that you are beneficially using. The 3 acre-feet portion relinquishes automatically if not used for a period of 5 years or more. This is the case unless you are a municipal provider.

**Q:** Often see ads for water right sales. How do people sell water rights if they are connected to the land?

**A:** When a water right certificated, it can be assumed that: 1) the ground that it is appurtenant to is being sold; or, 2) the right is being disconnected from the ground and it has to go through a change authorization in order to have validity elsewhere. Typically for surface water in a watershed, the change is relatively easily. For groundwater, there are some restrictions that have to do with whether or not the original and new groundwater sources are within the same body of public groundwater.

**Q:** So if someone builds a new development, they have to apply for the needed amount of water from Ecology (say 1,000 acre-feet) and it is up to Ecology to say yes or no. Has Ecology ever said no?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Airway Height purchased a water right permitted in the 1960s for 1,400 gpm but can pump at only 700 gpm because pumping affects wells in the vicinity.

**A:** There are definite impairment issues in Airway Heights but it is sometimes difficult to define the direct cause and effect when the water is withdrawn from several hundred feet below the ground.

**Q:** What is the typically response time on a water right application?

**A:** It can be at least 20 years. In 2001, the Legislation provided extra funds to Ecology to process water rights. The first application in the door has to be the first application out. When Ecology receives an application such as in Airway Heights and we do not know what the impairment cause is, we can't issue the right and we don't want to issue a denial unless the issue is clear and we absolutely have to. We also could not process change applications because changes were processed in the same way as new water rights. It was felt that if there were no issues with a change application, Ecology should be able to process these in a separate line to new applications. The Legislature provided authorization to process new and change applications along two separate tracks and gave Ecology direction to process the backlog of change applications. To date, Ecology has processed >2,000 change applications in the past 4-5 years. But we have not been working new applications and won't until the change application backlog is cleared. This is the direction that has been given to Ecology by the Legislature.

Ecology processes water rights in regions. In the NW region, except for about 30 complex municipal water rights applications, the change backlog is cleared. In our region (i.e., the Eastern Region), we are about 2 years from clearing the change backlog. When these changes are processed, we will begin processing applications for new water rights.

**Q:** Why has this backlog occurred?

**A:** Part of this is not having enough people. Partly this is also because we tend to be very cautious making decisions to avoid having to go to court. Ecology will tend to hold out if we can get more information to make our decision more defensible.

**Q:** So what should I do if I want to become a farmer and need water to farm?

**A:** Best advice I can give is to buy a piece of ground that has been watered in the past 5 years.

**Q:** What if, when the permit was initially issued, the 4-test criteria were met but now (years later) the water right is being developed, and it would fail the 4 test? Logically denial should be the price for procrastination?

**A:** It would be sensible if we could do something about this but we can't. This will get resolved in the courts.

**Q:** Is there any difference in processing surface water rights for navigable versus non-navigable waters?

**A:** No – not for the water right permit. But, for navigable waters, there are some permitting requirements related to the diversionary structure which are not needed for non-navigable waters.

**Q:** How does Ecology check if water rights are being used?

**A:** We do not do this. The law says that if there has not been beneficial use for a period of 5 years, the water has been relinquished. So it is an automatic operation of law. If you come in to change your water right, one of the things we do is to ask for records of water use because we can only change that portion of the water right that has been put to beneficial use.

**Q:** Are all permit holders required to meter water use?

**A:** As of today they are. In the past this was not the case.

**Q:** So how can you relinquish if the water right holder has not been required to record water use?

**A:** Typically we have demonstrated relinquishment using aerial photos. From aerial photos, it is relatively easy to prove whether or not a piece of ground has been irrigated. For groundwater use, we also use power records to show water pumpage. It is more difficult for other uses.

**Q:** Can this watershed planning process “fix” these problems in our water rights laws?

**A:** This is one of the things our water resources group has been struggling with. We have received direction to aggressively enforce development schedules. This will likely result in a number of permit cancellations. Permit cancellations will need to happen prior to new water rights applications being processed. If all the water that we have paper for was in use, we would be blowing in the dust.

**Q:** Can you give us some general numbers for the numbers of applications and claims?

**A:** 100s to 1,000s ranges in areas and much higher in some areas. I do not have specific numbers on the top of my head.

**Q:** Are there any issues with permit exempt wells?

**A:** We have lots of people every summer complaining that their domestic exempt wells are going / have gone dry in the Airway Heights area and east Spokane. We have had several dry years and issues with dehydration of surficial aquifers.

**Q:** Are there misunderstandings as to whether domestic exempt wells are a right?

**A:** It is a water right since it is a beneficial use of water that is recognized by the State. Ecology will not regulate impairment between domestic exempt wells but a court will (in favor of the senior right) since they are both water rights. It is a water right but is not managed by the State.

**Q:** This process (i.e., Watershed Planning) was set up for people to make recommendations in a Watershed Plan to government and the legislature on how to solve some of these problems because the Legislature and State departments could not work these things out.

**A:** Ecology has heard from Planning Units around the State that there is a belief / perception that there is a lot of illegal water use. Ecology has been asked by several planning units in WA to enforce the current laws. However Ecology does not have the resources to do this effectively. But we are hoping that enough Planning Units will say we need enforcement of water law so Ecology can go to the Legislature and request additional funds to hire a few more compliance staff.

**Q:** How much water can a permit exempt right use?

**A:** 5,000 gallons is the maximum allowed use for any day of the year for household use. Based on the recent Attorney General’s opinion, there is no longer a limit on the amount of water that can be used for stock watering from an exempt well. For all permit exempt water use, the water cannot be wasted.

**Q:** For a 6-pack, does the 5,000 gallons per day cover all uses?

**A:** Yes. A domestic exempt well may produce up to 5,000 gallons per day for household use. The recent Attorney General’s decision includes no gallon per day limit for watering non-commercial lawn or garden and for providing stock water. But note that water cannot be wasted. Ecology’s publication (Focus on the Ground Water Permit Exemption – Publication # F-WR-92-104 – Revised February 2006) clarifies this exemption. This publication is the yellow handout.

**Q:** Who is enforcing water use this in this area? The Watermaster?

**A:** Ecology’s compliance person in the Eastern Regional Office in Spokane should be – but we do not have a compliance person. Watermasters are rare in this region. Up until two years ago, we had one – in Walla Walla - which is a fully adjudicated basin. Now there is one in the Methow (Twisp), two in the Yakima area and one in Ephrata. Ecology is hoping for two more Watermasters in the Eastern Region in the next couple of years.

**Q:** What about federally appointed water masters?

**A:** There are federal watermasters (who have no state authority).

**Q:** Rob Lindsay informed the Planning Unit that the State of Idaho is starting an adjudication process for the five northern counties of Northern Idaho. The State has currently authorized funding to adjudicate water rights on the Rathdrum Prairie aquifer. Rob asked if this is something we should be concerned about?

**A:** An Ecology representative from Olympia will be coming to the May 2006 Planning Unit meeting to give a presentation on this and the adjudication process. My hope is that there will be discussions between the States (i.e., WA and ID) at the highest levels possible to coordinate the adjudication across the state line.

The Planning Unit thanked Victoria for her presentation. Vicki can be contacted at her desk in Spokane at 509-329-3616. Ecology's Eastern Regional Office reception number is 509-329-3400. People can call 509-329-3400 and ask for available Water Resources staff.

### **Review the WRIA 54 Planning Unit Member Roster and Approval**

Bryony said that we are hoping for approval of the Planning Unit membership today. Bryony passed out the draft membership roster and informed the group that the Steering Committee recommends that the initial membership be those that have actively attended since May 2004 and the last meeting. Bryony asked those present to review the membership roster and identify corrections. Guy Tillerman noted that he is a landowner.

Rob Lindsay said that the Steering Committee felt it was important for the membership to be inclusive and for those that have attended at least one meeting between May 2004 and March 2006 to be grandfathered in as a Planning Unit member. Spokane County reviewed the list of potential members developed at the beginning of this process. The County has sent out 10 letters to entities on this potential member list that have not attended.

John Patrouch asked if all the regulatory agencies and those who should have a say are on this membership list. Bill Gilmour said he felt he would like to see Medical Lake represented. Spokane County staff has met with Medical Lake but they have not attended any meetings. There is some discussion in WRIA 34 and WRIA 43 processes as to whether or not the boundary between WRIA 34, WRIA 43 and WRIA 54 is correct in the Medical Lake area and which WRIA Medical Lake is located in. Rob Lindsay said that Spokane County would send a letter to Medical Lake inviting them to attend.

Bryony suggested that, since membership is an administrative procedure, she would like someone to make a motion to approve the initial membership roster.

Lloyd responded that since the WRIA 54 Planning Unit is striving for consensus, that Bryony instead just ask if anyone has concerns or objections. Bryony asked the group if anyone had any objections on the draft membership roster and the recommendation by the Steering Committee to have the initial membership be anyone who has attended between May 2004 and March 2006. No objections were voiced. Bryony noted that since no one voiced any objections, that there is consensus approval of the initial membership roster. A formal sign-in sheet will be prepared for the next meeting using this membership roster. The membership roster will be posted on the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

### **Discuss Ecology's Project Budget Request for 2007-2009 Biennium**

Rob Lindsay said that the Legislature has asked Ecology to forecast the financial needs of Watershed Plan implementation for each of the WRIsAs in the State. Ecology has requested that each WRIA with an approved Watershed Plan or with projects that have been approved by Planning Units, provide Ecology with an estimate of funding needs for 2007 – 2009. In WRIA 54, we are still working on our Technical Assessment and do not expect to have a Plan completed until we are well into the 2007-2009 biennium. At this point Spokane County (as the lead entity) has not put together proposals since WRIA 54 is not ready to do this yet. Keith Holliday noted that the funding needs for Phase II and Phase III for WRIA 54 have been projected and provided to the Legislature.

Keith Holliday said discussion at the Steering Committee meeting concluded that the WRIA 54 Planning Unit needs to complete the Technical Assessment Phase (Phase II) and start planning before the Planning Unit can forecast project costs.

Rob Lindsay noted that the last Steering Committee meeting was well attended and invited anyone interested to attend the next meeting on May 10, 2006, 10 am to noon at the Spokane County building, conference room 4A.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was received.

### **Upcoming Meetings and Adjourn**

The following meetings were scheduled:

- The next Planning Unit meeting was scheduled for May 24, 2006 from 10:00 am to 12:00 noon at the Airway Heights Community Center.
- The next Steering Committee was scheduled for May 10, 2006 from 10:00 am to 12:00 noon at the Spokane County Public Works Building, conference room 4A.

Bill Gilmour noted that an alternative room – the cafeteria across the hall – is available for future use and during the summer months when the library is closed. Spokane County will look at this room and consider it for the June 2006 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 pm.