

**FINAL**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed**  
**March 26, 2008**

**Location:** Lakeside High School Library, Ninemile Falls, WA.

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

Mike Hermanson, Spokane County	Sara Hunt, WA State Dept. of Ecology
Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane	Larry Isaak, Stevens County PUD #1
Albert Tripp, City of Airway Heights	Hank Nelson, Avista Corporation
Stan Miller, Citizen	Charlie Peterson, Spokane County Conservation District
Lauri Clift, Citizen	Craig Volosing, Landowner and Palisades Neighborhood
Ben Brattebo, Spokane County	Larry Guenther, Citizen
Rob Plotnikoff, TetraTech	Cynthia Carlstad, TetraTech
Bryony Stasney, Golder Associates Inc.	
Wes McCart, Stevens County Farm Bureau and Stevens County Water Conservancy Board	
Jeanne Barnes, Spokane Association of Realtors and Lake Spokane Park Homeowners Association	

**Call to Order**

Bryony opened the meeting at 6:00 pm. Attendees introduced themselves. Bryony requested that each attendee complete the sign-in sheet.

**Review and Approve February 2008 Meeting Summary**

The Planning Unit reviewed the draft February 27, 2007 WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting summary. Those present approved the summary without any changes. The final summary will be posted on Spokane County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

**Public Comment**

Sara noted that the following draft reports will be released for public comment at the beginning of April:

- Dissolved Oxygen TMDL for the Spokane River
- 401 Spokane River Certification
- NPDES permits for the Spokane River dischargers

**Presentation on Water Conservation by Ben Brattebo, P.E. of Spokane County**

Ben is a Water Resources Specialist with Spokane County Utilities. A copy of Ben's presentation will be posted on Spokane County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

The general components of water use are: indoor use (all year round); landscape irrigation (April through September); and agricultural irrigation (April through September). This presentation will focus on indoor water use and the opportunities for indoor water conservation. Spokane County provides sewer and is therefore interested in reducing the amount of indoor water that enters into the sewer system.

***Presentation Outline***

- Background on Indoor Water Conservation
- Spokane County Program
- Water Rates

***Average Residential Water Use with Conservation***

Without conservation, per capita indoor water use (based on average figures available from EPA) is about 65 gallons per day. With good indoor water conservation, water use could be reduced to about 47 gallons per day. The most opportunity for conservation comes from toilets, clothes washers and showers.

### ***Costs vs Benefits***

Positives (cost avoidance, increased growth capacity, environmental protection)

Negatives (demand hardening during droughts, increased wastewater strength)

**Conservation = a new water supply**

### ***Implementation Measures***

- Residential Hardware upgrades (rebates or give-aways)
  - Water saving kits
  - Showerheads – 2.5 gpm vs 1.5 gpm
  - Faucet aerators – 5 gpm vs 2 gpm
  - Toilet leak detection kits
  - Toilet replacements
    - Ultra low flush toilet (ULFT) - 3.5 gpf vs 1.6 gpf
    - High Efficiency toilet (HET) - 3.5 gpf vs 1.3 gpf
  - Washing machine upgrades - 40 gpl vs 25 gpl
- Industrial/Commercial/Institutional (ICI)
  - Facility specific review
  - Cost sharing or rebates
    - Showerheads, toilets, washing machines
    - Cooling equipment upgrades
      - Ice machines – save 1000 gpd
      - X-ray – save 6000 gpd
      - Cooling towers
    - Food service upgrades
      - Food steamers – save 300 gpd
      - Pre-wash nozzles – save 70 gpd
- Education and outreach
  - Demonstration school
  - School/community education programs
  - Advertising
  - US EPA WaterSense program (like EnergyStar but for water)
- Code changes
  - Better-than-code fixtures (toilets, urinals, showerheads, single showerhead per shower)
  - Facility inspections (prior to sale)
- Water rates

### ***Western Water Conservation Programs***

- Seattle
- Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, Thurston Co. (LOTT)
- Everett
- California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)
- Energy Companies (e.g. Avista) since energy conservation = water conservation

### ***Spokane County Indoor Water Conservation Plan***

Spokane County currently provides sewer to Spokane Valley and a portion of north Spokane. Currently this waste water goes to the City of Spokane's wastewater treatment plant. Spokane County is constructing a Regional Water Reclamation Facility in Spokane Valley at the stockyards (near the County Fair Grounds) to treat wastewater collected in the Spokane County sewer system. As a component of the *Foundational Concepts for the Spokane River TMDL Managed Implementation Plan*, conservation is a required action: Public NPDES permit holders... will as soon as possible develop...“LOTT-style” indoor conservation efforts

- 20% water conservation per household in older urban areas (built 1992 or earlier)
- 10% per household (built 1993 or later)

The goal for Spokane County is to conserve 1.6 million gallons per day (MGD). Currently, Spokane County sewer basins produce about 8 MGD.

Spokane County has dedicated \$4 million in funding from rate payers for water conservation and plans to spend about \$1 million for the next 4 years (2008 to 2011). Spokane County plans to focus on mechanical, quantifiable conservation: 1) Residential hardware upgrades; 2) Education and outreach; and 3) Industrial, Commercial, Institutional (ICI) hardware upgrades.

Spokane County plans to use a cost effectiveness threshold of \$15.00 for an average flow reduction of one gallon per day (based on the cost of the new facility of \$120M / 8 MGD = \$15.00 per gallon). For toilets and washing machines, the life cycle is expected to be 15 years or more. Lower cost items (showerheads) will not meet this life cycle threshold but are inexpensive so this is acceptable. Goal tracking will include:

- Rebates and give-aways: estimate old water use and new water use
- Sample area: work with several water purveyors and track winter time water use
- Individual facilities: large upgrades for multi-family or ICI will be quantified

Planning for 2008:

- High efficiency toilet (HET) rebate - \$100
- Energy Star washing machine rebate - \$100
- Home indoor water conservation kits – give-away
- Voluntary commercial water survey
- Demonstration school

Cost Effectiveness:

- Toilet rebate (\$100) = 27 gallons per day and \$3.64 per gallon
- Washing machine rebate (\$100) = 15 gallons per day and \$6.67 per gallon
- Water conservation kit (\$20) = 37 gallons per day and \$0.31 per gallon

Implementation starting in 2008:

- Residential indoor water conservation kits
- Clothes washing machine rebates
- HET rebates
- Voluntary ICI water survey program
- Demonstration School (replace inefficient water fixtures in a school)
- Education and outreach will involve: media and bill inserts, vendor information and collaboration as a promotional partner with USEPA WaterSense
- Example:
  - 10% of 36,000 older residential units (toilet replacement, washing machine upgrade, conservation kit)
  - 0.39 MGD saved for \$792K (\$2.03 per gallon and 24% of the 1.6 MGD goal)

**Q:** Has Spokane County implemented water conservation measures at its facilities?

**A:** Not sure. The new utilities building was built after code required low flow toilets. Other buildings may not meet current water conservation codes. For this project, Spokane County is focusing on its sewer basin to reduce flow to the new wastewater treatment plant.

**Q:** Do you have plans for the old toilets?

**A:** If we are able to replace all the old toilets we are anticipating 36,000 toilets will be replaced. We have talked to regional solid waste and there are not many opportunities to reuse old toilets. We are researching this.

**Q:** Is there a problem for treatment plants if the waste stream becomes more concentrated.

**A:** This depends on the treatment process. For the Spokane County Plant we are not anticipating a problem.

**Q:** If the City of Spokane adopted a similar program, would this be a problem for the City's treatment facility?

**A:** Lloyd Brewer noted that the effects would be more concentrated sewage and it is anticipated that the treatment facility could handle this. There may be increased odor issues at the manholes in the vicinity of the major interceptors.

**Q:** Are you including tablets for toilet leak detection?

**A:** The tablets could be included in the give-away kits.

**Q:** Instead of replacing toilets, have you considered suggesting bricks / bags in toilets.

**A:** The challenge is tracking this. Also, the older toilets may not work properly with lower flushes. Spokane County is considering this type of thing for the conservation kit give-aways.

**Q:** Is there an opportunity to require code enforcement during remodels (similar to the requirement to upgrade electrical wiring)?

**A:** You can't buy an older, low efficiency toilet any more – so this happens when an older toilet is replaced.

### ***Water Rates***

Spokane County does not sell water. This presentation discusses local and regional residential water rates. Residential water rates include: Block Rates (price per gallon), Base Rates, Total Monthly Bill and Total Price per Gallon. This presentation includes comparison of the following local water rates: City of Spokane, Cheney, Medical Lake, Airway Heights and Whitworth Water District #2. This presentation includes comparison of the following regional water rates: Tacoma, Phoenix, Austin and Tucson.

Graphs illustrating the presentation are available at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

In summary:

- Water billing with conservation is difficult to predict
- Base rates impact price points (base rates can be set low to reduce the cost for low water users)
- Inclined blocks can be designed to meet specific goals (block rates can be placed at predicted usage)

**Q:** Have there been studies on the effects of these rates on conservation?

**A:** There are studies and in general people use less water when the rate structures are more aggressive.

**Q:** Has there been any effort to educate people on water rates?

**A:** No, I have not worked on this. Also, this can be difficult since, depending where you are located, meters are not read monthly and bills may be provided through tax assessments. Also, there is a need to coordinate between water purveyors. This would be a worthwhile effort.

### **Watershed Plan Outline and SEPA Approach**

Cynthia handed out a preliminary table of contents for the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan. The preliminary table of contents for the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan is similar to the structure described at the beginning of the planning process and may change slightly as the Plan components are written and as the Plan evolves. The first three chapters provide an introduction to the Plan, document other relevant plans and processes, describe the watershed characteristics and summarize the technical studies developed during watershed planning in WRIA 54. The fourth chapter will include the Watershed Plan Technical Modules (Water Management, Land Use, Water Quality, Technical Information, Instream Flow and Education). Each module will be 10 – 15 pages long. The final chapter will be the implementation approach (including Plan adoption process, role of the Planning Unit during implementation, inter WRIA coordination and implementation framework matrix). Inter WRIA coordination could be included as a technical module. SEPA will follow along with the Appendices.

**Q:** It would be nice to include relevant documents such as the Chamokane Watershed Plan and the WRIA 54 technical reports as appendices. However, I realize that the Plan will be too large. It will be important to

provide links to relevant electronic documents.

**A:** Links will be provided in the introduction section and in the appendices on other plans and processes. Some Watershed Planning Units also keep a library.

**Q:** Can you include tables of recommendations and obligations per entity?

**A:** Yes. This can be easily done if the original framework matrix is developed as an Excel spreadsheet.

**Q:** Does the Spokane Tribe need to approve the Plan?

**A:** Yes. The Spokane Tribe, the State and the Spokane, Stevens and Lincoln County Governments.

The Planning Unit agreed by consensus that they could use the preliminary table of contents as a starting point for structuring the Watershed Plan.

Cynthia handed out an example State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) approach handout (taken from the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Plan). SEPA is required to assess the impact of any state project, including a planning project. Ecology has developed a statewide programmatic impact statement for Watershed Planning. The easiest option to comply with SEPA is to go through the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan and see how the actions compare to those assessed in the statewide programmatic impact statement. This process is illustrated in the handout for the WRIA 55/57 Plan. For any actions that are not covered by the statewide programmatic impact statement, the Planning Unit could assess the impacts as an addendum. The Planning Unit agreed to use this approach for the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan.

### **Water Management Work Group Update**

Bryony presented a summary of the March 21, 2008 WMWG meeting. A copy of the presentation will be available at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

#### ***Presentation Outline***

- Water Management Goals
- **Conservation, Reclamation, Reuse**
  - Information
  - Issues
  - Alternative Solutions

***Purpose – present work & gather feedback***

#### ***Goals***

- Balance needs of instream and out of stream uses.
- Strive for water availability in the future to protect quality of life, healthy economy, and a healthy environment.
- Promote sustainable use of water resources.
- Strive for adequate laws and regulations that are dictated by reality and that support sustainable management of water resources.
- Coordinate water availability and areas of development.
- ***Encourage, perform and coordinate ongoing studies to better understand water resources – identified at the 032108 meeting.***

#### ***WRIA 54 Water Conservation, Reclamation and Reuse Information***

- Municipal water providers are required to develop water use efficiency and conservation measures.
- WA is developing rules for safe reclaimed water use (i.e. treated wastewater that can be reused in various ways depending on level of treatment, such as street cleaning, irrigation, aquifer recharge).
- Reclamation and reuse projects in WRIA 54 include:
  - Medical Lake (only active permit in WRIA 54)
  - Airway Heights planning, studies and construction

- City of Spokane pilot project for reuse on golf courses and the City of Spokane's 2007 irrigation district feasibility study (that considers the feasibility of using reclaimed water to establish an irrigation district).
- Nova Fuel (seeking permit to reuse FAFB wastewater)
- Spokane County Water Reclamation planning covers the Spokane County sewer basin (including areas of North Spokane and Spokane Valley) and does not extend into WRIA 54.

### ***WRIA 54 Water Conservation, Reclamation and Reuse Issues***

The WMWG has identified the following issues (i.e., concerns) with water conservation, reclamation and reuse in WRIA 54:

- There is a need for improvements in water use efficiency and conservation.
- There is a need for water reclamation and reuse to play a larger role in water management for all water uses.

### ***Possible Solutions for Water Allocation Issues***

The following lists the potential solutions identified by the WMWG under various categories. These potential solutions will be evaluated and ranked by the Planning Unit.

#### **WATER CONSERVATION**

1. Encourage Airway Heights and Medical Lake to join Ecology's regional water conservation collaboration and encourage outreach to Airway Heights and Medical Lake from current participants.

Albert Tripp noted that Airway Heights is involved with Ecology's regional water conservation collaboration.

*WMWG plans to complete identification of water conservation strategies in April.*

#### **CLEAN-UP DATA**

1. Ecology present pre-adjudication work.
2. Ecology "Clean-up" WRATs database.
3. Ecology to evaluate overlap between claims and permit-exempt water rights.

#### **WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE**

1. Conduct education and outreach on the risks / benefits of reclaimed water use for the public and technical community.
2. Coordinate with surrounding WRIsAs.
3. Encourage reclaimed water to be used in lieu of groundwater / surface water and also to support new agricultural opportunities and landscape irrigation.
4. Encourage Ecology's water rights impairment subgroup to develop clear recommendations related to reclamation and reuse in a timely manner.
5. Consider possible water quality impacts related to water reclamation projects.

Albert Tripp said that he had attended a reclaimed water group in Lacey. Albert noted that the regulatory environment is unclear with respect to impairment. For the Airway Heights 1 MGD facility, an impairment analysis was a part of the design and even after this analysis it is not clear if the City of Airway Heights would be allowed to reuse all the treated water. Albert noted that ownership of reclaimed water if the water passes through a number of entities is also an issue that needs to be resolved. Albert said that Bruce Rawls (Spokane County Utilities) is a good resource on water reclamation and reuse.

**Q:** Did the reclaimed water group in Lacey talk about consumptive use of reclaimed water?

**A:** Yes. There was concern that the working group may not be able to come to resolution by the December 2008 deadline and that a wholesale change in the framework for developing reclaimed water rules may be needed.

### **Land Use Work Group Update**

Bryony presented a summary of the March 21, 2008 LUWG meeting. A copy of the presentation will be available at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>.

#### ***Presentation Outline***

- Goals
- Issues
- Information
- Alternative Solutions

***Purpose – present work & gather feedback***

#### ***Land Use Goals***

- Strive for consistency and coordination between the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan and local land use plans and development regulations.
- Strive for sustainable land use development.
- Coordinate water availability and areas of development.
- Support property owners' rights, including legal access to water.
- ***Support public access to water for recreation – identified at the 032108 meeting.***

#### ***Land Use Issues***

- There is a need for better connection between land use regulations and water availability.
- There is a need for better connection between land use planning and water supply planning.
- There is a need to consider the impacts of land development (e.g., shoreline development, timber harvest, vegetation removal for land development, impact to wetlands and to and from stormwater / wastewater systems) on water quantity, water quality and habitat.
- There is a need to protect rural land uses.
- There is a need to maintain and enhance sustainable agriculture through growth management and land use planning.
- There is a need to provide public access to important water related recreation areas.
- There is a need to evaluate beaver activities and associated land use impacts ***and water storage opportunities – modified at the 032108 meeting.***

#### ***Land Use Information***

- Ecology and WDOH have an MOA to review water system plans and updates.
- Ecology is responsible for: review of water rights, expansion of service areas and determination of whether or not the plan is “not inconsistent” with adopted Watershed Plans.
- WDOH confirmed likely some WRIA 54 water systems that are late in submitting water system plans / plan updates.

#### ***Possible Solutions for Land Use Issues***

The following lists the potential solutions identified by the WMWG at the 032108 meeting. These potential solutions will be evaluated and ranked by the Planning Unit.

### **LAND USE PLANNING**

1. Review landscaping regulations for water efficiency and make recommendations to improve.
2. Recommend development and implementation of development regulations / guidelines related to water efficiency.
3. Recommend Cities and Counties develop incentives for xeriscaping and use of native / drought tolerant vegetation.
4. Encourage use of NRCS FOTOG / Eastern WA Stormwater Manual BMPs for land clearing.
5. Encourage low impact development.
6. Recommend Cities and Counties hire or retain wetlands biologists to review wetland delineations.
7. Support wetland restoration for water storage and water quality improvements where feasible.

8. Encourage land use policies that preserve vegetation in natural drainages.
9. Encourage agricultural practices that reduce runoff and increase infiltration.
10. Encourage clustering and agronomically viable land.
11. Discourage purchase of agricultural water rights to support development and for water rights mitigation.  
*Sara will discuss with Ecology. Consider rewording recommendation not to actively advocate purchase of agricultural water rights to support development and for water rights mitigation*
12. Support City, County, State and National efforts to acquire or improve public access to water for recreation.

**Q:** Why is it important to discourage purchase of agricultural water rights to support development and for water rights mitigation.

**A:** Water rights are important to maintain viable agriculture in this area.

**Q:** What if an agricultural area becomes rural and then urban over time? In this case it seems like it would be appropriate to convert the agricultural water rights to other uses?

**A:** It is OK if this occurs on the free market. I am uncomfortable with Ecology and others advocating the purchase of agricultural water rights to support development and for water rights mitigation.

**Q:** Could you also protect agricultural land through land use planning?

**A:** To a certain extent this is what the Growth Management Act has tried to do.

**Q:** Is new legislation proposing a moratorium on inter-basin water rights transfers addressing this?

**A:** This bill did not pass. A study to assess impacts of inter-basin water rights transfers is in the appropriations bill.

#### WATER SYSTEM PLANNING

1. Establish WRIA 54 subcommittee to develop checklist and review water system plans/updates to ensure “not inconsistent” with Watershed Plan.
2. Purveyors provide copies of new water system plans / updates to Planning Unit for review.
3. Obligate WDOH to enforce water systems that are out of compliance to be compliant.
4. Encourage water purveyors to keep their water system plans current with WDOH.

#### STUDIES / MONITORING

1. Identify potential sites for public access to water for recreation that could be acquired or improved.
2. Consider relocation of beavers to willing landowners.
3. Consider beavers to improve upper watershed water storage.

#### FUNDING

1. Recommend legislature provide funding for WRIA 54 Planning Unit to develop checklist and review water system plans/updates to ensure “not inconsistent” with Watershed Plan.

#### EDUCATION

1. Recommend that Ecology and WDOH meet with City and County planning departments, council and commissioners to educate on water rights and water system planning and why this type of planning is important.

**Q:** Can you talk about the discussion related to water systems expanding their service areas.

**A:** This recommendation, developed at the February 2008 Land Use work group, was modified at the March 2008 Land Use work group meeting to allow consideration of wholesale water as well as water rights and aquifer capacity in expansion of service area. Albert said that this change is acceptable to allow purveyors more flexibility in obtaining funding to support studies such as studies to improve understanding of local aquifer capacity.



### **Technical Information Work Group Update**

Cynthia noted that the TIWG met on March 25. The Water Management, Water Quality, Land Use and Instream Flow Work Groups are independent and are developing issues / data needs / recommendations that may be inter-related. At the TIWG, we listed the data needs that have been identified through the Water Management, Water Quality, Land Use and Instream Flow Work Groups and acknowledged duplication. The following lists examples of data needs from the other working groups that will be addressed by the TIWG:

- Water Management – impact of permit exempt wells
- Water Quality – water quality in tributaries
- Land Use - areas of strained water resources
- Instream Flow – stream flow in tributaries

Cynthia noted that the WRIA 54 Instream Flow Work Group will start up next month.

### ***Vision/Goals/Objectives/Purpose***

Address data gaps that are critical to implementing watershed plan goals and recommendations

- Prioritization will reveal overlapping needs.
- Funding can be sought for prioritized projects.
- As issues/data gaps are prioritized, it could influence other entity's projects and focus areas.
- Prioritization is needed to manage workload.

### ***Tech Info – Next Steps***

1. Wait for draft water management, water quality, and land use issue papers.
2. Identify information needs for each recommendation.
3. Compile, synthesize, prioritize.
4. Develop technical info project concepts?
5. Plan to meet next in May, date TBD at the April Planning Unit meeting.

Mike noted that as an example of a project concept, areas of strained water resources could be identified by analysis of a complaints database that includes information on where purveyors have had to extent transmission lines, where dry wells have been drilled and where wells have been deepened. This information, compiled along with full build out, could help identify areas of strained water resources. Spokane County is currently developing this project concept for WRIA 55/57.

Cynthia noted that Stevens County has also been working on this concept using their parcel database.

Lloyd asked that Cynthia also request that participants / Planning Unit members bring up their project ideas at the TIWG meetings so that these can be documented in the Watershed Plan.

### **Water Quality Work Group Update**

Cynthia noted that the WQWG met on March 26. Staff from GeoEngineers (Jon Rudders) and TetraTech (Rob Plotnikoff) presented progress reports on the supplemental Water Quality project QAPPs. Jon Rudders is the lead on the palaeochannel monitoring plan and Rob Plotnikoff is the lead on the Ninemile monitoring plan. Copies of slide shows and preliminary recommendations will be posted on Spokane County's web site at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/wqmp/wria54.htm>, under the WQWG.

### ***QAPP Background Information and Monitoring Concepts Presented***

- Nine Mile Nonpoint Monitoring Plan
- Paleochannel Monitoring Plan

*Purpose for both: Plan containing specific sampling elements, sample sites, sample and lab procedures, data management, and project organization.*

***Future Implementation of Monitoring Programs***

- Sampling won't be implemented through this project, but will be "ready to go" when funding obtained.
- "A la carte" approach so that interested entities can implement individual components
- Will provide strong basis for obtaining grant funding and other support for implementation.

At the WQWG meeting, Craig noted that the palaeochannel in the vicinity of the airport is already likely being used by a couple of developments to infiltrate stormwater. There may be a project opportunity to assess the water quality of the stormwater that is being conveyed to the airport palaeochannel and to assess if the BMPs used at these infiltration sites are working.

Cynthia noted that the consultant team plans to write the water quality issue paper in April. The WQWG plans to meet again in May 2008. We plan to set a meeting date at the April Planning Unit meeting.

**Public Comment**

Wes said that he is concerned that the work groups have not focused sufficient time to identify and put some detail to water storage projects.

Wes said that he feels that WRIA 54 should also be considering a need to better track permit-exempt wells. Well logs often do not provide or provide inaccurate information (such as location, well depth, testing). Wes suggested communicating with Jaime Short (Ecology WRIA 59 Watershed Lead) for additional details on recommendations to address this concern.

Wes noted that in forested areas there seems to be a lack of emphasis in WRIA 54 on forest management as it relates to watershed science. For example, there are too many trees in some areas that reduce the amount of infiltration. If these stands are better managed (i.e., thinned for fire protection and stand management), there may be an opportunity to increase water infiltration.

Craig suggested that this Planning Unit work with the DNR on this issue – maybe as an addendum to their forest management manuals. Stan and Wes noted that federal and private forest lands should be addressed as well as state lands.

Bryony noted that this issue is included in a general sense within the WRIA 54 land use issues related to land development. Charlie said that the Planning Unit could support DNR's forest stewardship plans. Charlie Peterson said that he would contact DNR and see if a DNR representative could attend the next land use work group meeting (on April 18). Mike noted that most of the forest in WRIA 54 is located on the Spokane Reservation. Wes noted that the Spokane Tribe do a good job of managing their forest and that there may be an opportunity in the Watershed Plan to support the Spokane Tribe's forestry management also.

Cynthia suggested that the Planning Unit consider adding water storage as a stand-alone module. Those present agreed by consensus to include a stand-alone module on water storage, particularly since there is encouragement from the legislature to develop water storage projects in WA. Cynthia noted that the team will write up the storage issue paper and will then solicit input and details from Planning Unit members.

Sara noted that Ecology is starting to work on funding for the 2009-11 biennium. Since the WRIA 54 Watershed Plan is scheduled to be adopted by June 2009, this Planning Unit will likely be eligible for project funding.

**Administration and General Schedule Announcements**

Mike Hermanson said that he would provide an update on public outreach at the April Planning Unit meeting.

Bryony noted that:

- Ecology will be providing an update on the pre-adjudication work in April Planning Unit meeting.
- Andy Dunau will talk about the Spokane River Forum at the April Planning Unit meeting.
- Tentatively Hal Beecher and Brad Caldwell will talk about setting instream flows on small streams at the May Planning Unit meeting.

The following meetings are scheduled and open to everyone:

**APRIL 2008:**

- WRIA 54 Education Work Group, Thursday April 3, 1:30 – 4 pm, Conf. Rm. 4A, Spokane County Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA.
- WRIA 54 Water Management Work Group, Friday April 18, 9 am – noon, Conf. Rm. 4C, Spokane County Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA.
- WRIA 54 Land Use Work Group, Friday April 18, 1:30 – 4 pm, Conf. Rm. 4C, Spokane County Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA.
- WRIA 54 Instream Flow Work Group, Tuesday April 22, 1:30 – 3:30 pm, Conf. Rm. 4A, Spokane County Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway Ave, Spokane, WA.
- WRIA 54 Planning Unit, Wednesday April 23, 10 am – noon, Airway Heights Community Center, Airway Heights, WA.

**MAY 2008:**

- WRIA 54 Planning Unit, Wednesday May 28, 6 – 8:30 pm, Lakeside High School Library, Lakeside, WA.

**Next Meeting Date and Adjourn**

The next WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 23, 2008, 10 am – noon Airway Heights Community Center, Airway Heights, WA. Bryony adjourned the meeting at 8:35 pm.