

FINAL
Meeting Summary
WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed
May 24, 2006

Location: Airway Heights Community Center, Airway Heights, WA.

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

Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane	Rob Lindsay, Spokane County
Keith Holliday, WA State Dept. of Ecology	Judy Kaufman, Spokane Fly Fishers
Bill Gilmour, Spokane County	Cynthia Carlstad, Tetrattech/KCM
Bryony Stasney, Golder Associates Inc.	Doris Dietrich, Landowner
Hank Nelson, Avista Corporation	Dick Price, Stevens PUD
Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe	Jim DeGraffenreid, Lincoln County Planning
Bruce Smith, Landowner	Jerry Warner, Palisades Neighborhood
Vic Castleberry, Landowner	Jay Landreth, Landowner
Bea Lackaff, Citizen	Mark Curtis, Stevens County Conservation District
Craig Volosing, Landowner	Bob Derkey, WA State Dept. of Natural Resources
Dean White, Lincoln County CD	Jon Rudders, GeoEngineers
Ben Bonkowski, WA State Dept. of Ecology	Fred Rajala, WA State Dept. of Ecology
Todd Ableman, City of Cheney	Don MacDonald, City of Cheney
Craig Schwyn, Spokane County Water Conservancy Board	
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 10:02 am. Attendees introduced themselves and the interest / organization they represent. Bryony requested that each attendee complete the sign-in sheet.

The April 26, 2006 WRIA 54 meeting summary was reviewed with the following requests for changes: 1) Randy Connolly (landowner) noted by email that on page 3 under the heading Future Land Use, 4th line, the word "east" should be replaced with "west"; 2) Randy Connolly (landowner) noted by email, page 2 under the heading Hydrology, an active gage exists on Blue Creek. Brian Crossley confirmed this and noted that there is also a gage on a tributary to Blue Creek. With these changes, the April 26, 2006 WRIA 54 meeting summary was approved by consensus as final and will be posted on the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>. Bryony asked the group if they are comfortable with the length and detail of the meeting summaries. The Planning Unit said yes.

Public Comment

Rob Lindsay handed out copies of an article from the May 18, 2006 Spokane Inlander on the Columbia River Water Bill. Rob said that the purpose of the article is to provide information to the Planning Unit and that he could not vouch for the accuracy of the article.

Presentation by the Washington State Department of Ecology on Water Right Adjudication – Mr. Ben Bonkowski and Mr. Fred Rajala

Ben thanked the group for taking the time on the agenda. Ben described adjudication as a process that determines the validity, extent and priority date of water rights. Information on adjudication in WA is available on Ecology's web site at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/rights/adjhome.html>. Ben noted that the Yakima adjudication is coming to a close after nearly 30 years. Ecology wants to be very deliberate about where to conduct the next adjudication and would like it to be an area where an adjudication will provide benefit and

where the stakeholders are interested in participating. Ecology recently received news that the State of Idaho has passed legislation to support an adjudication of the five northern Idaho Counties. Funding has currently been authorized to adjudicate the Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer. Ecology is waiting for recommendations from their legal team and Director on how to respond. Washington and Idaho are working well with the United States Geological Society (USGS) in this area on a technical study on the aquifer. Current thinking is that it would be best for this study to proceed and see what science says before undertaking an adjudication on either side of the state line.

There is initial concern that if Idaho adjudicates the area bordering Washington, this may put Washington in a disadvantaged position if there is a dispute over shared waters. The initial thought is that WA will need to respond in a similar fashion since WA has the responsibility to look out for the interests of the waters of the state and WA water users. So far, Ecology has raised the following questions with the Attorney General's office: 1) what is the risk to WA if ID adjudicates and if a shared water dispute goes to negotiation / litigation? and, 2) What options are there to reduce any risk? These questions are being addressed now.

Ken Slattery (Water Resources Program Manager at Ecology) has been talking to Carl Dreyer (his counterpart at the Idaho Water Resources Department). Jay Manning (Ecology Director) will be meeting with Carl Dreyer (Idaho Water Resources Department Director) in early June. Legislators are aware of the situation. If the decision is made to move ahead with an adjudication it will require significant funds and will be a Governor level decision. Ecology expects the decision on how to proceed to be made sometime this summer. Apart from the Idaho question, is often a good thing to do an adjudication to define water rights so as improve water resources management.

If there is an interstate dispute over water, there are 3 resolution avenues: 1) an informal agreement between States; 2) negotiation of an agreement under an interstate compact (which requires congress to authorize and approve); and, 3) disputes requiring litigation go to the US Supreme Court. The Supreme Court appoints a master, the master takes information and makes recommendations to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court makes decision using equitable apportionment. This considers relative population, expected population growth, whether or not water is being used reasonably (not wastefully) etc. – i.e., the Supreme Court will make decisions on factors broader than which State had use of the water first.

Ecology has been talking to watershed groups to make sure these groups are aware and sufficiently educated to make a decision on whether or not to recommend an adjudication that would be beneficial to their watershed. Ecology also feels that there is a benefit to talking to watershed groups since there is representation from a lot of different interests.

Ben introduced Fred as someone who is very experienced with the adjudication process. Fred noted that the Yakima adjudication is not typical and that there are a number of smaller adjudications that have occurred at the same time as the Yakima adjudication.

Q: At a water conference in Idaho a couple of weeks ago, the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources said that it would be his preference to pursue a more informal agreement between WA and ID rather than a formal agreement such as a compact or litigation. Do you have a sense of where Ken Slattery and Jay Manning are with respect to this?

A: Jay has said this too.

Q: Regarding a dispute between states that went to litigation: the Walla Walla River headwaters in Oregon flow into WA. The US Supreme Court gave all the water to Oregon. How does this fit in with equitable apportionment?

A: That's one of the cases that Ecology is looking at. It is a 1920s case. Oregon was adjudicated and WA was not. Law has evolved since this time and this is not necessarily an indication of what would happen now. But it is a concern.

Q: What value are our watershed technical documents to an adjudication process? Can you give us any guidance on what we might be able to do now?

A: Although we are not familiar with the exact content of these documents, there are some things that provide the foundation for an adjudication. These include description of the geographic area of the watershed, the waterbodies within the watershed and the characteristics of the water supplies in the basin. It is also important to know the relationship between water rights in terms of priority since in WA older water rights must be satisfied first, before the next in line can use water. An adjudication begins with considering the hydrology of a basin – and a watershed assessment helps with this. Some effort to map water rights is also a helpful head start for an adjudication. Helpful information includes identification of the water rights documents in the watershed, the properties the water rights are associated with and the sources of water for the water rights. Cynthia said that in WRIA 54 there are little over 1,000 water right claims. Reanette (Spokane County water resources) is taking the first crack at screening this information.

Ecology is looking at ways to get water rights parties together early in the adjudication process and come to some agreements so as to concentrate the judicial process on those water rights that are disputed. Early agreements would be helpful in terms of time and \$\$ involved. These early agreements would then have to be reconciled with any court decisions.

Fred and Ben passed out flow chart describing the adjudication process.

The adjudication process was set up as a means to package water rights together and get clarification in court on the extent and validity of existing rights. Prior to the adjudication process, disputes between water rights holders were resolved separately in court. In some cases contradictory decisions were made and the process became very expensive. The WA Water Code adopted 1917 to:

1. Set up adjudication process to determine the extent and validity of existing rights;
2. Set up a permanent system that was based on knowing about existing rights so that impairment to existing rights could be assessed; and,
3. Set up a system for statewide regulation of water rights based on seniority of the right compared to others.

There are two ways a petition for an adjudication:

1. Watershed Planning Unit can petition; and,
2. Individuals can petition

Ecology can decide on its own to adjudicate if this is in the public interest. In practice, legislative authorization is needed since the process is usually very expensive. Ecology tries to reach early agreement on issues since there is a lot of flexibility in early stages of the process.

Once a petition is filed and the court is involved (box 4 on the flow chart), there are fairly rigid rules. The law says that the court will refer the case to a referee. The referee is typically not a judge and is considered a fact-finder. The referee holds hearings and can accept information that a court may consider hearsay. The referee can also ask leading questions to draw out the information. The referee writes a report and recommendations to the court. One of Ecology's largest tasks following an adjudication petition is to determine who is involved in an adjudication. Ecology's interest is in conducting public outreach, making sure that the court follows water law and that the results can be administered. Ecology will also conduct site visits and submit short reports to the court (box 9 on the flow chart). If agreements can be reached, this streamlines the adjudication process. If the court will accept Ecology's recommendation (assuming there is an allowance for this in the court's rules), individuals involved in the agreements may not have to be present in front of the court.

Q: Do you ever see a separation between land and the water right?

A: There can be and this is recognized. For example, in the Yakima adjudication there are a number of irrigation districts whose water supply is dependant on contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). In

these situations, the BOR is recognized as the water right trustee to the irrigation district. The district is recognized as the water right trustee for the water subscribers. In most cases, the water right is associated with the land on which it is used and that the landowner owns the right. But this may not be the case for irrigation districts and municipalities.

After the referee submits his/her report to the court, the court typically only hears objections (box 10 and 11 on the flow chart). The Federal government has agreed to allow the States to adjudicate federal and tribal rights since 1952. The Director of Ecology has expressed interest in working with the tribes to settle tribal rights in a manner that is comfortable to the tribes involved.

After the court hears objections, etc. and any appeals are addressed, the final decree is issued and becomes the basis on which Ecology issues adjudicated water rights certificates.

Q: If a developer purchases land without water rights, do they have to go through the same process of water right application or is there a different process for residential water use?

A: Yes they do have to go through a process. But, to initiate or develop a water right, the developer does not need to go through the court. If there is no valid water right associated with the land, the developer will file an application for a new water right from Ecology or file an application for a change to an existing water right.

Q: Can a landowner sell a water right to the developer?

A: Yes, but the place and maybe the purpose of use of that water right would also have to be changed. If the water is from a groundwater source, it would need to be shown that the new source is the same body of groundwater as the original source and that the rights of others are not impaired. As demand for water in an area increases, we generally see more and more changes and transfers of existing water rights.

Fred handed out a map of WA state showing adjudicated areas. This map is available on Ecology's web site at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/rights/Images/pdf/adjinstatemap.pdf>. Fred then handed out a corresponding list of adjudications (82 in total) and petitions. There is nothing in state law allowing for a petition to be removed from the system. Chamokane Creek was settled as a federal adjudication. Until recently, those petitioning had to pay their costs and the court costs for the adjudication so it was very expensive and a lot of the petitions were not acted on. That was changed in the early 1980s when the state agreed to bear the expense of the adjudication. Individuals pay costs to present their own cases.

There has been discussion of establishing a Water Court instead of using the Superior Court but this would require a constitutional amendment. Ecology believes that there is some flexibility within existing law to take advantage of new technology and mapping and experience to make recommendations on how the court should conduct an adjudication. This could make a big difference in terms of the level of effort and time.

Q: Does an adjudication consider exempt well water use?

A: Domestic exempt wells do have water rights - they are only exempt from the permit requirement. Domestic exempt wells could theoretically be considered in an adjudication. It might be possible to reach a decision upfront on how to address and if to address permit exempt wells (box 3 and 9 on the flow chart). For example, unless there is evidence otherwise, we could make the assumption that permit exempt wells use e.g. 800 gallons per day and irrigate no more than ½ acre lawn / garden. If anyone is not satisfied, they could provide evidence to the court that their right is larger. If satisfied, people could file a claim but would not have to prepare a court case.

Q: If instream flows are not completed until after an adjudication, could Ecology come back after the instream flows are set and say that they are shutting down pre-existing water rights?

A: If an instream rule exists at the time of an adjudication, the instream flow right would fit into the scheme of all the other existing rights and its priority date etc. would be validated like other water rights. If an instream flow is set after an adjudication, the right for the stream is junior to pre-existing water rights.

Q: Are there other mechanisms (other than instream flow rules) to put more water in streams:

A: There are a number of other mechanisms to hydrate flows e.g., water right acquisitions and water trusts.

Fred and Ben can be contacted through Keith Holliday (WRIA 54 Ecology Watershed Lead) – at 509-329-3431 and khol461@ecy.wa.gov.

Planning Unit Membership Roster

Bryony handed out copies of the Planning Unit Membership Roster that had been agreed to by consensus of those present at the April 2006 meeting. The roster will also be available on the County's website at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>. This roster will be used from this meeting forward to develop the Planning Unit meeting sign-in-sheet. Bryony encouraged everyone to review the roster and asked for comments / questions. Rob Lindsay asked that the list of Landowner / Citizen members be alphabetized so that people can more easily find their names on the sign-in-sheet. The sign-in-sheet will be used to track attendance and Planning Unit membership in accordance with the Operating Procedures.

Phase 2 Data Compilation Update – Ms. Cynthia Carlstad of TetraTech/KCM and Mr. Jon Rudders of GeoEngineers

Cynthia informed the group that she and Jon had about 5 topics to address in their presentation along with time for discussion. The PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the County's website at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>. The sections below summarize the presentation and discussion.

Grant Opportunities

Planning Unit has opportunities for two additional supplemental grants:

- Water Storage (\$100,000 per WRIA)
- Water Quality (\$100,000 per WRIA)

These supplemental projects are typically completed in Phase 2 (Technical Assessment) and Phase 3 (Planning) of Watershed Planning. It may be appropriate to start thinking about scope ideas now. Ideally work on these supplemental projects should begin in August / September 2006.

Water Storage Grant Ideas

There are two typical options for the water storage supplemental work:

1. General feasibility evaluation for various types of above ground (e.g., reservoir) or below ground storage (e.g., Aquifer Storage and Recovery) options for the WRIA; or,
2. Focus on the feasibility of a couple of promising storage projects.

For this watershed it appears to make good sense to consider a couple of focus projects, e.g.,

- Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) in the West Plains (both in paleochannels and basalts) to recover declining aquifer levels and / or to store water for later recovery.
- Above ground storage in the Chamokane subbasin.
- Evaluation of storage options related to the Columbia River Water Bill.

ASR is typically expensive and involves a relatively long pilot testing phase. The available funding (\$100,00) would get project feasibility started and would not result in an operational ASR project.

Q: What water would you use for storage?

A: In this area there is a surplus of surface water at certain times of the year. The concept would be to store water when in surplus for use later in the year. The stored water could be used for any appropriate beneficial use such as irrigation, water supply for population etc.

There are a wide variety of scales of storage projects that could be completed. For the available budget (\$100,000), it is most likely that the feasibility of a storage project or a couple of projects would be completed. Additional steps would be needed to put the project into operation.

Q: Could this type of a project slow groundwater level decline.

A: Yes. An ASR project (if this is what the Planning Unit selects) would be completed to see if this type of project is feasible to slow or halt groundwater level declines.

Q: Could you speak to the project you are doing on the West Plains.

A: GeoEngineers has done a number of projects related to the paleochannels and basalts of the West Plains and have kicked around the idea of ASR as a potential way to recover declining water levels, particularly in the basalts. We are working on a project for Spokane County looking at the use of paleochannels for infiltration of stormwater. I am not aware of any operational / pilot scale storage project in the area. It is safe to say that any work that has been done to understand the aquifers in the West Plains would contribute to this work.

Rob Lindsay noted that Spokane County stormwater has selected a consultant team to assess the feasibility of routing stormwater into a paleochannel in the West Plains. Brenda Sims gave a presentation on this project (available on the County website at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>). This project will look at the physical capacity of these paleochannels and the potential environmental impacts associated with stormwater infiltration. There will be opportunities for the WRIA 54 Planning Unit to benefit from these studies. Jon Rudders noted that this project is associated with the sediments in the paleochannels and would not have an impact on declining levels in the basalts. Cynthia noted that Jon and GeoEngineers are working on this project for the County.

Q: Is it assumed that if the channels are used for infiltration of stormwater that they could also be used for storage of water for potable supply?

A: There is a water quality component to the County's stormwater feasibility project that will look at potential water quality impacts of stormwater infiltration. There are a number of treatment options that can be considered such as pre-treatment of stormwater if needed.

Q: How does the timeline for the storage supplemental work fit in to the schedule for this study?

A: Ecology has some desire that the technical assessment work is completed and that Planning Unit members understand where the water surpluses and deficits are geographically and temporally (i.e. over the year) prior to starting the storage supplemental work. There is flexibility in scheduling. Typically the supplemental projects are completed during Phase 2 (Technical Assessment) and transitioning into Phase 3 (Planning).

Q: If you are looking at pumping water for storage, where does a water right come in?

A: A water right would be needed and identification of this need and water availability for storage would be part of the feasibility study.

Cynthia asked if it would be OK for her to see if the Planning Unit wanted to form a Committee to work on the storage scope. Keith asked if the consultant team have identified the watershed surpluses and deficits – because as a Planning Unit, we do not know if this is done yet. Cynthia responded that the team is working on the water balance now. The team knows that the West Plains area and Chamokane Creek subbasin are two areas where all evidence points to a shortfall of water but this is not quantified. Keith noted that we do not have the full list of surpluses and deficits and that there may be other areas that could be considered, such as Ninemile. Cynthia agreed that growth projections are indicating considerable population growth in the Ninemile area.

Rob Lindsay said that he was not prepared to jump into the storage supplemental at this meeting. Rob suggested that the Planning Unit set up Storage Committee to work on the storage supplemental scope. Rob asked those interested in being involved to identify themselves (about a quarter of those present raised their hands). In order to keep the meeting moving, Rob suggested that Spokane County send an email notice asking for interested

people and go from there. The Planning Unit agreed that this was a good approach. Craig Volosing asked for a consensus decision on this. Bryony asked if there was any opposition from the Planning Unit to setting up a Storage Committee. Hearing no opposition, consensus approval was reached to set up a Storage Committee. Spokane County will send out an email requesting interested individuals to respond. Rob asked anyone present who does not have email to inform him now of their interest. The City of Cheney responded that they are in the process of completing a water reuse study and are interested. The City of Cheney is on the email list. Doris Dietrich also expressed her interest in being involved in the Storage Committee.

Cynthia said that she would not address the water quality slides at this meeting and would move the discussion on to the water balance.

Water Balance

Cynthia explained that a water balance can be considered analogous to a check book – with water coming in to a basin (e.g., precipitation and inflow via streams), water being stored in a basin (e.g., above ground reservoirs and as groundwater within aquifers) and water leaving a basin (e.g., evapotranspiration, stream outflow into the Columbia River and water withdrawn for use).

The Watershed Planning law (RCW 90.82) requires a water balance to be completed. In the context of watershed planning and considering existing information, a water balance does not always provide enough detailed information to answer specific questions e.g. the water availability for water rights applications. The project team has thought about this in terms of the requirements of the law and the expectations of this Planning Unit.

Ecology Guidance – Functions of a Watershed Assessment

Ecology has updated their guidance on their website on what should be included in a technical assessment:

- Identify the water supply and demands within the watershed
- Analyze the relationship between surface water and ground water
- Analyze the connection between water quality and water quantity
- Integrate short-term and long-range water planning
- Address and integrating water quantity, quality, and habitat needs
- Provide part of the information that is crucial to making water-right decisions

Ecology Guidance – Choices and Tradeoffs in Funding a Watershed Assessment

Ecology is also acknowledging that there are choices and tradeoffs since there is not enough funding to do all the technical assessment work necessary in a watershed to, for example, support water rights decisions throughout the watershed. Options identified by Ecology include:

- Broader-scale, less-detailed assessment to support policy framework and provide basis for further studies;
- Detailed information for select sub basins; and,
- Phase the assessment work.

Ecology Guidance – Water Right Approval Statutory Tests

For Ecology to issue a new water right, there are statutory tests:

1. Will water be put to beneficial use?
2. Will the additional water right impair existing senior water rights?
3. Is water available for appropriation?
4. Will issuing the water right be detrimental to the public's welfare?

The Planning Unit has influence over #2 and #3 – since the technical work may quantify water and where it is available. The Planning Unit may also have some influence over #4 since the Planning Unit may define what they believe to be in the public good.

Ecology Guidance – Obligations and Expectations

Ecology is now saying that these are the obligations and expectations of Watershed Planning Units:

- Adopt comprehensive watershed rules that will fold in water management strategies identified in the plans. The rules and plans will be binding on participating state agencies and local planning units.
- Plan and track its work obligations under the local watershed plans. Early-action items are already being included in this biennium's work plan.
- Work to the best of its ability to meet those obligations.
- Give priority to making water rights decisions in watersheds that have developed sufficient information and agreement to make decisions.
- Continue to make the case for sufficient funding to support local watershed planning and implementation, including water-rights decision-making.

Ecology has stated that if a Planning Unit does good technical work and planning, Ecology will commit to using this information and will support the Planning Unit's priorities.

Caution! Let's talk about Expectations

Water balance work can sometimes lead to disappointment if the technical work is unable to answer water rights questions. However, water rights questions are often not addressed because of the specifics involved with water rights and the necessarily general nature of a WRIA-wide water balance.

Water Budget Approach

A water balance is a required part of the process and is useful to identify data gaps. For this watershed, there is a significant amount of flow data for the mainstem of the Spokane River but limited surface water flow data sets for the subbasins. We are proposing a WRIA-wide water balance which will quantify the inflows (e.g., precipitation, the flow of the Spokane River into the watershed, pumping into the watershed from the City of Spokane) and outflows from the watershed (e.g., surface water outflows, groundwater outflows, water use and evapotranspiration). If appropriate, we can also take a more detailed look at specific areas (e.g., West Plains hydrogeology) to provide a basis for future storage work.

Q: Could you bring specifics to propose to the Planning Unit at the next meeting?

A: Yes.

There is an existing water balance completed in the 1980s for the Chamokane subbasin. In this study, we propose to take another look at this work along with new hydrologic information and report back on water balance surpluses / deficits.

So in summary, we propose completing a general water balance for the WRIA and more focused water balances for the West Plains area and Chamokane subbasin. This will meet the requirements of the law.

Q: Do we know how much water we are using in the West Plains now?

A: We do know what we are using now and also what use is projected in 20 years.

Q: I want to reinforce looking at water provider service areas particularly in light of the potential for build-out. If one area is close to build-out there may not be a big issue with the 20-year projection. I am hoping that we are looking at the Stevens County PUD and what they are planning in Stevens County and also hope we are looking at what is planned for in the Ninemile area. I would also encourage you to share your assumptions on current and projected water use as soon as possible.

A: We will do this at the next meeting. Reanette Boese (Spokane County) is putting together the information on water use currently and this will be ready to present next month.

Q: What is your impression of the Chamokane instream flow.

A: There is a minimum instream flow set that is regulated by a federal watermaster. The tribe is concerned that the watermaster is regulating only about four or five agricultural users and is not considering exempt well use. This is currently being considered by the court.

Cynthia said that there appear to be significant aquifers in the Chamokane watershed, including an upper and lower aquifer that may be separated. The upper aquifer appears to be hydraulically connected to surface water.

Q: I understand that a water balance has been done for Chamokane Creek. Are you going to be re-doing this work? Do you not think the previous work is sufficient?

A: We will be reviewing this work, looking at the hydrogeology and deciding whether this work can be built upon.

Instream Flow Assessment Update – Ms. Cynthia Carlstad of TetraTech/KCM

Cynthia Carlstad informed the group that the Instream Flow work is ongoing. Instream Flow Incremental Method (IFIM) is planned for the mainstem of the Spokane River. Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Spokane Tribe are working to confirm the tributary sites where the toe-width method will be used. The Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the study is complete and has been signed all parties. The QAPP is posted on the County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>. The project team is now waiting for the flows to be at a level for the first set of measurements. This is expected in June / July this year.

Public Comment

Doris Dietrich asked if the consultant team will be studying the stream in the vicinity of Rearden. Jon said that they are compiling the data for the Spring Creek area but do not think there is the necessary data to develop a sub-basin water balance. Cynthia noted that instream flow work will occur on Spring Creek.

General Schedule Announcements

The following meetings are scheduled:

- The next WRIA 54 Steering Committee is scheduled for Wednesday June 14, 2006, 10 am – noon at the Spokane County Public Works Building, Conference Room 4A, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA 99260. This meeting is open to everyone.

Next Meeting Date and Adjourn

The next Planning Unit meeting is scheduled for June 28, 2006, 6:00 – 8:00 pm at the Lakeside High School cafeteria. The cafeteria is located opposite the library and the main office.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm.