

**FINAL**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed**  
**September 26, 2007**

**Location:** Lakeside Middle School, Suncrest, WA.

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

Mike Hermanson, Spokane County	Rob Lindsay, Spokane County
Sara Hunt, WA State Dept. of Ecology	Charlie Peterson, Spokane County Conservation District
Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane	Tony Delgado, Stevens County Commissioner
Hank Nelson, Avista Corporation	Craig Volosing, Landowner and Palisades Neighborhood
Al Bendle, Landowner	Jay Landreth, Landowner
Bea Lackaff, Citizen	Dave Moss, Spokane County Water Reclamation
Lynn Wells, Riverside State Park Advisory	Ann Fackenthall, Lake Spokane Protection Assoc.
Amanda Deakins, Lakeside High School	Jamie Lure, Lakeside High School
Haley Hyer, Lakeside High School	Dustin Erickson, Lakeside High School
Cynthia Carlstad, TetraTech	Bryony Stasney, Golder Associates Inc.
Wes McCart, Stevens County Farm Bureau and Stevens County Water Conservancy Board	

**Call to Order**

Bryony opened the meeting at 6:03 pm. Attendees introduced themselves. Bryony requested that each attendee complete the sign-in sheet. Bryony requested that the meeting start be delayed due to the unusual meeting location (Lakeside Middle School rather than Lakeside High School) to allow people to find their way.

**Review and Approve August 2007 Meeting Summary**

The draft August 22, 2007 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting summary was reviewed page by page. Those present accepted the summary with no edits and approved the summary as final. The final meeting summary will be posted on Spokane County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

**Public Comment**

None.

**Operating Procedures Refresher**

Bryony provided copies of the WRIA 54 membership roster, a few copies of the Operating Procedures (last revised in February 2006) and presented a refresher on the WRIA 54 Operating Procedures supported by PowerPoint slides. The slides will be posted at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

***WRIA 54 Planning Unit Membership***

- The Planning Unit established membership in February 2006 with approval of the operating procedures.
  - New voting members eligible after attending 3 consecutive Planning Unit meetings. Planning Unit may accept new voting members by majority.
  - Members may be removed from voting status if member or alternate fails to attend 3 consecutive meetings.
- Current members listed on the WRIA 54 membership roster.

Wes noted that he is also a landowner and should be listed as such on the WRIA 54 membership roster.

Bryony reminded the group that the WRIA 54 operating procedures guide the group to make decisions by consensus and resort to voting only if the majority of the Planning Unit decide to move the discussion to a vote.

### ***Quorum***

- A quorum is required to qualify an official WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting.
- Quorum could be clarified in the operating procedures as:
  - Percentage (e.g., 50% + 1 of members).
  - Number (e.g., 10).

After discussion those present agreed on:

1. Definition of a quorum as attendance of ten (10) members in good standing at a WRIA 54 meeting. Bryony will clarify the definition of quorum on the first page of the operating procedures.
2. Spokane County, as part of Phase III outreach, will send letters and call those WRIA 54 Planning Unit members that have not attended meetings to see if they are interested in becoming involved now that the process has moved into Phase III.

### ***Planning Unit Members and Votes***

- Planning Unit members will receive votes as follows:
  - Invited Federal Agencies (e.g., National Park Service and Fairchild Air Force Base) shall receive one vote each.
  - State Governments shall receive one vote total.
  - Local Governments, Tribes, Public Utility Districts (PUDs), Municipalities, Municipal water suppliers and Conservation Districts shall receive one vote each.
  - All Non-Governmental Groups and individual citizens shall receive one vote each.
  - Ex Officio Members will be relied upon for technical advice and are considered non-voting members (e.g., Stevens and Spokane County Water Conservancy Boards)

### ***Members and Voting***

- Any Planning Unit member not present forfeits right to vote, unless:
  - Member writes to Lead Agency / agent (i.e., facilitator) with their vote before the next meeting.
  - Member designates an alternate or another Planning Unit member as their proxy vote.
- Planning Unit members who do not attend cannot request a re-vote at future meetings.
- One vote per membership.
- An individual may represent more than one membership. The individual must clearly state which agency or group they represent when speaking / voting.

### ***Decision Making***

1. By consensus (i.e., unanimous agreement) as much as possible.
2. Three types of WRIA 54 Phase III decisions:
  1. Administrative (excluding Operating Procedure Amendments/Supplements).
  2. Watershed Plan Contents or Operating Procedure Amendments/Supplements.
  3. Watershed Plan Approval.

### ***Administrative Decisions***

- All decisions that do not involve operating procedures, watershed plan contents or plan approval.
- Quorum needed (including alternates and proxies).
- Simple majority vote of Planning Unit members in attendance and good standing decides the issue.

### ***Watershed Plan Contents or Operating Procedure Amendments***

- Requires a two-meeting approval process:
  - Initial meeting to develop and approve language by consensus.
  - Second meeting to confirm language by consensus.
- Planning Unit members may designate an alternate or proxy if they cannot attend the meetings.
- Majority of Planning Unit members present can vote to move from consensus discussion to voting.
- Voting by two steps:

1. Requires consensus of governmental Planning Unit members (i.e., units of government).
2. Requires majority vote of non-governmental Planning Unit members present.

### ***Watershed Plan Approval***

- Process detailed in Chapter 90.82.130 RCW. By consensus of the Planning Unit as much as possible.
- Majority of Planning Unit members present can vote to move from consensus discussion to voting.
- Watershed Plan Approval voting by two steps:
  1. Requires consensus of governmental Planning Unit members (i.e., units of government).
  2. Requires majority vote of non-governmental Planning Unit members present.

Those present agreed that governmental planning unit members include all entities that have legislative and regulatory authority and whose jurisdiction lies wholly or partly within the boundary of WRIA 54 (i.e., invited federal agencies, state governments and local governments, as defined above).

After discussion, Bryony agreed to revise the operating procedures to reflect that no decision may bind any governmental and non-governmental entity to an obligation without agreement from the entity.

### **Watershed Plan Terminology**

Bryony provided an overview of terminology for the issue papers and Watershed Plan. The presentation slides will be posted on Spokane County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

### ***Issues***

- Issues are water resource concerns, usually written as problem statements, needs or challenges.
- Some examples of watershed issues are:
  - There is a need to better quantify groundwater resources across WRIA 54 (location and size / capacity of aquifers).
  - Surface water quality standards are not being met for point and non-point pollutants.
  - The water rights appropriation process for water rights takes far too long to occur.

### ***Goals***

- Goals are a vision for the future of the watershed. The question, "Have you achieved the goal?" often cannot be answered in the absolute affirmative.
- Some examples of watershed goals are:
  - Maintain and protect water quality to protect public health and safety.
  - Protect and restore the natural resources of the watershed(s).
  - Protect and preserve the cultural and aesthetic resources of the watershed.

### ***Objectives***

- Objectives are specific, concise, clear, measurable and **achievable**. Objectives are quantifiable steps in the direction of the goal.
- A clear objective would read: "Our objective is to deliver X results by Y date at a cost of Z dollars."
- Some examples of watershed objectives:
  - Decrease outdoor water use ... by 50% by 2015.
  - Increase trout population in Blue Creek ... by 225% by 2020.

### ***Difference between Goals and Objectives***

- Goals are broad; objectives are narrow.
- Goals are general intentions; objectives are precise.
- Goals are intangible; objectives are tangible.
- Goals are abstract; objectives are concrete.
- Goals can't be validated as is; objectives can be validated.

### ***Possible Solutions / Toolbox***

- Possible Solutions / Toolbox are the “long list” of management alternatives that could be considered by the Planning Unit to meet the objectives and address the issues.
- The intent is for the Planning Unit to brainstorm and identify the likely solutions.

### ***Recommended Actions***

- Include recommendations and obligations that the Planning Unit agrees to implement.
- Recommended actions will be selected by the Planning Unit based on an evaluation of each management alternative on the “long list”, considering the likelihood of the management alternative to meet the objective(s) and address the issues.
- Once the Watershed Plan is approved and adopted, the Planning Unit moves into Phase IV - implementation of the recommended actions.

### ***Implementation Plan***

- Phase IV implementation involves developing a detailed implementation plan (DIP) during the first year in accordance with Chapter 90.82 RCW.
- The DIP supports implementation of the recommended actions in the approved Watershed Plan.
- The DIP is essentially the list of recommended actions, who is responsible, when the action will be done and may include a list of potential funding sources.
- A **framework** for implementation will be included in the Phase III Watershed Plan.

### **Steering Committee**

Cynthia asked the group if they felt a need to have monthly steering committee meetings considering that the work groups will be meeting monthly as work groups in addition to the monthly Planning Unit meetings. After discussion, the group agreed to call steering committee meetings as needed. Rob requested that a regular agenda item be added to each Planning Unit meeting to address administrative issues and that Spokane County could pass out and review budget updates during this agenda item. Those present agreed.

### **Lessons Learned**

Cynthia asked the group to identify lessons learned based on experience from previous planning efforts. Bryony wrote the information on large white paper, adding to the list developed at the August 2007 Planning Unit meeting. The list below compiles lessons learned from the August and September 2007 Planning Unit meetings:

#### **August 2007:**

- Keep the plan simple.
- Like the issue paper approach.
- Do not take on too many issues.
- Focus on specifics.
- Include an implementation schedule in the plan.
- Keep eyes on implementation (who is going to do what) during plan development.
- Consider reasonable limits and funding for plan recommendations and obligations.
- Plan recommendations should not be constrained by current agency policies and programs. Determine what needs to be done first and then let the implementing agencies determine if and how to implement.
- Law requires identification of obligations and recommendations in the watershed plan. A practical way to do this is to define all actions initially as recommendations and then work with entities to confirm recommendations that can be taken on by the entities as obligations.
- Think of the audience (community, political and personal) and eliminate “techno-speak” from the plan.

#### **September 2007:**

- Work to develop a plan that is grounded in reality (i.e., do what we can to ensure that those committing to take on actions have the support of their boards / superiors).

- Plan obligations legally bind counties and states.
- Trust and collaboration are important components of a successful Watershed Plan.
- Citizen involvement is also important to Plan implementation (in addition to commitments from implementing governments).
- Resources are limited. A sense of the priority / urgency for obligations and recommendations is important to help Ecology's watershed lead advocate for funding.

The discussion around lessons learned at the September 2007 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting involved:

- Craig asked how much implementing entities can agree to take on by consensus. And will those participating take the actions to their boards to agree to implement? Can we develop a realistic plan?
- Rob and Lloyd explained that, from Spokane County's and the City of Spokane's perspective, there is active involvement so that the County and City can be realistic about what obligations they can and cannot take on.
- Rob noted that Watershed Plan obligations legally bind Counties and States. Rob expressed concern since Spokane County is involved in five active watershed planning units. Rob said that he will be careful not to obligate the County to actions that the County cannot realistically implement considering available budgets. Rob said the Planning Unit will have to trust that if the County agrees to take on an obligation that this obligation is taken in good faith and considering fiscal realities.
- Lloyd Brewer that this is true of the City also. City water and wastewater utilities are obligated by law to be in compliance with adopted watershed plans. However, available resources will govern the degree to which the City can be involved in implementation.
- Rob reiterated that the Planning Unit members not let preconceived notions about whether or not we can pay for recommended actions influence the ideals that are developed.
- Wes noted that non-governmental entities can also play an important role in implementation.
- Sara noted that a sense of urgency / prioritization for actions will be helpful for the state watershed lead to advocate for funding.

### **Issue Paper Workshop**

Cynthia explained that the consultant team will draft "straw-man" issue papers based on input provided from the Planning Unit tonight and at the October Planning Unit meeting. The work groups will further develop the "straw-man" issue papers between October 2007 and May 2008. Either Cynthia or Bryony will facilitate the work groups. The work groups will report progress and obtain guidance for future work at each Planning Unit meeting. When the Planning Unit is content with the issue paper, the issue paper will be integrated into the draft Watershed Plan. The proposed work groups are:

- Water quality
- Water management
- Technical data
- Land use
- Education
- Instream flow (which may be combined with Spokane River instream flow work group)

Cynthia made sure that those present had copies of the issue paper templates. Those present divided into three groups. The task tonight is to give the work groups direction on the scope of the issue papers. The three groups worked on the water quality, water management and land use issue templates for about 20 minutes and then reported back to the group.

### **Water quality report:**

- Crossed off the water quality issues that have or are being addressed by other processes (e.g., surface water quality concerns with phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, PCBs that are being addressed by TMDLs and contaminant clean up projects with Ecology / EPA oversight such as the West Plains missile site and the Midnite Mine). These concerns should be recognized in the Plan but the group felt that getting

involved with the technical details of these issues would not be money well spent. Coordinating with implementation activities for these issues may be appropriate.

- Feel that the WRIA 54 Plan should focus on issues such as:
  - Understanding groundwater quality in palaeochannels considering the potential use of the palaeochannels for reclaimed water and stormwater infiltration.
  - Localized areas of groundwater quality degradation that are not being addressed by other processes.
- Need input from Brian Crossley to understand the tribes monitoring program and needs across the western portion of the watershed.
- Lloyd noted that there may be opportunities for the Watershed Planning process to connect with the TMDL processes for the benefit of Watershed Planning and TMDLs.
- Rob noted that Watershed Planning groups may assist TMDLs by working on tributaries and non-point source issues (e.g., education, septic, stream bank restoration, stormwater management).

#### Water management report:

- Worked on developing goals for the water management issue paper.
  - Achieve a balance between water needs for instream and out of stream uses.
  - Ensure water will be available in the future to protect quality of life (domestic, municipal, industrial water needs) and to maintain a healthy economy, healthy agricultural community and a healthy environment.
  - Coordinate areas where growth / development are expected to occur with water availability.

#### Land use report:

- Grouped review the land use issues:
  - Water availability unknowns and development.
  - Soils and water treatment capacity in particular as this relates to the West Plains.
  - Water importing from the SVRP aquifer to the West Plains.
  - Stevens County's growth issues should be recognized equally with Spokane's issues. There should be proof of water availability prior to preliminary sub-division platting.
  - Lincoln County is a non GMA County. This should be described in the plan.

Cynthia made updates to the water quality, water management and land use issue paper templates to incorporate the input from the three groups. Cynthia reminded those present to sign-up sheets for the issue paper workgroups on the sign-up sheets at the front of the room.

#### **Instream Flow, Storage and Water Quality Updates**

Mike Hermanson updated the group on the Spokane River Instream Flow work group:

- There was an instream flow workshop on Tuesday September 25. About 15 people attended.
- Next meeting is scheduled for October 23 at the WDFW office at Mirabeau Park in Spokane Valley. The meeting will focus on where to set control points, what geographic extent the instream rule should apply to and what the flow should be.

Wes asked that the group consider a meeting location that is closer to Spokane that would be able to accommodate the work group (up to 30 people). Wes said that downtown Spokane would be a better location.

Sara said the issue of whether or not a WRIA 54 instream flow work group would be needed to address the WRIA 54 tributaries was not confirmed at the September 25 meeting. The priority of the workgroup is the Spokane River regime.

Rob noted that the Spokane River Instream Flow work group will be providing a memorandum with recommendations to the WRIA 54 Planning Unit for their consideration. It will be up to the WRIA 54 Planning

Unit to form a WRIA 54 instream flow work group and/or evaluate the memorandum within Planning Unit meetings. Lloyd noted discussion during the Instream Flow work group meeting which indicated that there most likely will be insufficient funding for the ongoing Spokane River Instream Flow workgroup to review the technical data, discuss instream flow rule options and complete recommendations for the Spokane River and for WRIA 54.

Cynthia updated the group on the WRIA 54 storage project:

- The consultant team produced the draft report in May 2007.
- Comments were received after the September 2007 Planning Unit meeting. These were incorporated into the comment response table and were circulated to the Planning Unit about a week ago.
- The consultant team is now finalizing the storage report. Final hard copy reports will be available at the October 2007 Planning Unit meeting.

Cynthia updated the group on the WRIA 54 water quality project:

- TetraTech presented the water quality assessment at the August 2007 Planning Unit meeting and will be providing the assessment in hard copy in the next couple of weeks.
- The water quality work group will use the assessment to prioritize water quality monitoring projects at the October water quality work group.
- It is expected that the water quality work group for Phase III will be the same group that worked on scoping the Phase II water quality supplemental project.

### **Public Comment**

- Wes noted that the Stevens County Water Conservancy Board will be overseeing a public database of willing water rights buyers and sellers throughout Stevens County (as allowed by statute). This task was completed over the last two years by the Stevens PUD #1 in WRIA 59. This action could be included as an early action in the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan.
- Rob asked if the Spokane County Water Conservancy Board is doing this. Wes said he did not know.
- Cynthia noted that TetraTech developed a GIS coverage of water rights in WRIA 54 for the Phase II technical assessment that may be useful to the Stevens County Water Conservancy Board.

### **General Schedule Announcements**

The following meetings are scheduled and open to everyone:

- Rob Lindsay, Mike Hermanson and Reanette Boese will be presenting on Watershed Planning to the Spokane County Planning Commission, September 27, 2007 at 9 am.
- There is a Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie aquifer meeting with representatives from WA and ID on September 27, 2007 at 1 pm at the Grayhound Park in Post Falls.
- October 3, 2007 public hearing for the phosphorus TMDL, 6 pm at Spokane Falls Community College.
- October 10, 2007 public hearing for the NPDES permits for the Spokane River dischargers, 6 pm at Spokane Falls Community College.
- Ecology's pre-adjudication staff will be giving a 30 minute presentation on water rights mapping and analysis at the October 24, 2007 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting.
- October 15, 2007 WRIA 54 water quality work group meeting at 1:30 pm at the Spokane County Public Works Building, conference room 4A or 4C, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA.
- The December 2007 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting may be cancelled or rescheduled to December 19. The work group meetings will occur in December.

### **Next Meeting Date and Adjourn**

The next WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting is scheduled for **October 24, 2007, 9:30 am – noon** at the Airway Heights Community Center. Bryony adjourned the meeting at 8:40 pm.