

## Meeting Summary

### WRIA 54 - Lower Spokane River Watershed Planning Unit Meeting January 27, 2010

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

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

Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe  
Bill Rickard, City of Spokane Water Department  
Bryan St. Clair, City of Airway Heights  
Rusty Post, Washington State Department of Ecology  
David Luders, Fairchild Air Force Base and Indian Village Estates Water Association  
Dick Price, Stevens County PUD  
Kristin Nester, Fairchild AFB Environmental Management  
Charlie Peterson, Spokane County Conservation District  
Bob Derkey, Retired Geologist  
Jeanne Barnes, Association of Realtors & Lake Spokane Homeowners Association  
Lloyd Brewer, City of Spokane  
Mike Hermanson, Spokane County  
Rob Lindsay, Spokane County  
Charlie Kessler, Stevens County Conservation District  
Rick Noll, Spokane County Conservation District  
Meghan Lunney, Avista Utilities  
Craig Volosing, Palisades Neighborhood  
Cynthia Carlstad, Tetra Tech

#### Call to Order

Cynthia Carlstad opened the meeting at 9:08 am. Attendees introduced themselves. The sign-in sheet was passed around the room for everyone's signature.

#### Review of December 22, 2009 Meeting Summary

Cynthia provide opportunity for corrections, going page by page through the summary.

Page 1: Brian Crossley corrected the summary that the Spokane Tribe did not actually model higher flows.

The correction was made and the final summary posted to the Spokane County Water Resources website.

#### Public Comments

No comments.

#### Watershed Plan Recommendation/Obligation Prioritization

Cynthia introduced the prioritization process envisioned for today's meeting:

1. At the December Planning Unit meeting, the group decided to do a second round of recommendation ranking within each technical issue category as homework (they had previously done this following the November meeting.) The reason for doing a second round was that in light of the dire watershed planning state budget situation, it is likely that recommendation implementation will be done by

- individual entities rather than the Planning Unit as a whole. This may change some people's priorities, hence a second round of ranking was requested.
2. Along with the recommendation ranking within each technical issue category, Planning Unit members also selected their top 5 projects across technical issue categories. Some, not all members ranked their top 5 project selections.
  3. Response from the test detailed rating exercise done as homework after the November meeting indicated that a detailed rating such as that was too time consuming, and did not increase the quality of the prioritization. At the December Planning Unit meeting the group decided not to conduct a detailed rating of each recommendation.
  4. Cynthia compiled the rankings and "top 5 projects" she received from each member and distributed the results to the Planning Unit distribution list on Monday, January 25. She noted that she did not receive rankings from three individuals that had ranked on the first round: Larry Guenther, Brian Crossley, and Linda McCollum. For these instances, she used the previous ranking submitted by those individuals from round 1. It was also noted that these individuals did not submit their top 5 project selections.
  5. Cynthia explained that as requested at the last meeting, the process today would be to present the compiled rankings, then provide opportunity for members to propose adjustments to the numerical ranking for projects they feel warrant a higher ranking. If, after discussion, the group agrees with the proposal to adjust the ranking, it will be done. Along with this, the group will decide on high/medium priority classifications.

Cynthia presented the first technical issue category – Water Rights Administration – and oriented the meeting attendees to the format. The format was the same as the compiled results – in a table, but with an additional column for the high/medium classification and a place for comments under each recommendation.

For this first group of recommendations, Dick Price commented that he feels that Recommendation *WRA-6 – Planning Unit will review, discuss and recommend improvements to the relinquishment law* is very important and should be ranked higher. Many agricultural water right holders are unfamiliar with the current "use it or lose it" law which makes a water right subject to possible relinquishment after a five year period of non-use. There have been several unsuccessful past attempts in the legislature to extend the allowable water right non-use period to ten or fifteen years. This is an opportunity send a message to the legislature about the importance of changing the law. No one disagreed with this. Rusty Post pointed out that there are numerous exceptions to the relinquishment law, and these exceptions may mitigate the problems with the "use it or lose it" provision in the current law. The group discussed possibilities for more effectively advancing this action, for example through support of an agricultural lobby organization that shares the belief for the need for change with this law. Jeanne Barnes volunteered to bring it up with the Realtor's Association as they are reviewing active legislation for this legislative session.

There was also discussion that *WRA-5 – Recommend that the Spokane Tribe develop a water code for the Spokane tribe and Reservation, including fee lands* was an example of a recommendation that was of high priority to the Spokane Tribe. The group was supportive of the tribe doing this work, but it may not have ranked as high because its applicability is limited to the tribe, and therefore it is not perceived as such an urgent need to members from outside the reservation.

Confronting these two specific situations caused the participants to consider additional options for completing the ranking, including:

- Peeling off recommendations that are big projects that take a lot of time and money from ones that are discussion and decision topics for the group.
- Establishing numerical thresholds for high/medium or high/medium/low classifications in each technical issue category
- Eliminating the numerical ranking
- Sticking to just the numerical ranking, and not completing the high/medium classifications
- Using the "Top 5 Projects" list to identify the collective highest priority projects of the group.

It was observed that some of the recommendations that may have ranked low are really not in the sense of low priority, but rather an indication of what the group feels should be worked on first at this point in time. If the presentation of this exercise documents that sentiment, it may eliminate difficulties associated with the potential future situation where a low ranked project is chosen to implement before one ranked higher. This could happen because of evolving needs, individual priorities, and funding source constraints. This sentiment was echoed by others, and Craig Volosing commented “I really want us to have a solid proviso that we really are not, in a sense, defining these L’s as necessarily low. Even the M’s as necessarily medium. That this terminology is just inside working – these are all opportunities for acquiring and helping in WRIA 54 and beyond and at this point in time we are just using it as a management tool. We are not applying these necessarily as low or medium, but we really just set them aside for ranking in terms of what we are undertaking first.”

The decision of the Planning Unit, based on the discussion above, was to present the rankings within each technical issue category simply as the compiled numerical ranking averages for the purposes of the Watershed Plan Appendix.

Meeting participants then turned their attention to the last idea, using the “top 5 projects” list to identify the collective highest priority projects of the group. Cynthia oriented the group to how she had presented the compiled results:

- Projects with the most occurrences are presented first, with rankings from high to low.
- Where more than one project had the same number of occurrences (i.e. three people submitted it in their top 5), the projects are presented with the highest known rankings first.
- In cases where a Planning Unit member did not rank their top 5, the table simply states “not ranked”. This does not connote a high or low ranking within the top 5 since the individual did not list priorities for any of their selections.

Meeting participants discussed how to use the top 5 project compilation. There was generalized agitation about the list and what it really means about the Planning Unit’s priorities. Mike Hermanson commented that these results showed areas of common ground among a very diverse Planning Unit. In total, eighteen projects were submitted as “top 5” by Planning Unit members, with the following number of occurrences:

- Four occurrences:
  - **RECOMMENDATION WFN 1:** Consider a regional management and coordination organization for water supply on the West Plains. The West Plains bridges WRIAs 54, 43, 56 and 34, Spokane and Lincoln Counties, and several cities, making a planning/management area specific to the West Plains necessary. This organization should encourage improvement of connectivity between water systems, as allowed by cost and water right constraints.
  - **RECOMMENDATION WUE-2—** Recommend that local governments work toward improved water use efficiency in landscaping and other outdoor water uses
- Three occurrences:
  - **RECOMMENDATION WRA 4:** Conservancy Boards in Stevens, Spokane, and Lincoln Counties should develop and maintain a public database of willing water rights buyers and sellers within their respective Counties. The Conservancy Boards will need to make statements that the extent and validity of water rights in order of application date, but can do so within a sub basin or watershed.
  - **RECOMMENDATION WQ-1—**Implement the monitoring described in the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the Nine Mile Area Non-Point Source Monitoring Study (Tetra Tech, 2009) and proceed with a study to monitor and assess non-point sources from the surface water and groundwater that drain directly to Lake Spokane. LU-12, Spokane County adding the conditions for the approval of final plats related to water supply.

- **RECOMMENDATION LU-12**—Recommend Spokane County add the following condition for the approval of a final plat: “Prior to filing the final plat, the applicant will demonstrate provision of adequate potable water supply by providing one of the following:
  - A letter from a water purveyor stating they will serve the proposed subdivision. If a plat is not developed for a specified amount of time, this commitment may need to be reconfirmed.
  - A copy of a water right permit from the Department of Ecology with adequate quantity to serve the proposed subdivision;
  - A plan to supply the proposed subdivision within the groundwater exemption specified in RCW 90.54.050 that complies with the 1997 Attorney General Opinion, Washington State Supreme Court Decision Department of Ecology vs. Campbell and Gwinn, LLC and Washington State Department of Health guidelines for residential water use.”
- **RECOMMENDATION WFN-5**—Establish a program to collect data and evaluate where permit-exempt wells are a concern. Develop management options for problem areas. Affected local governments and Ecology should provide technical support and funding; counties, purveyors, Ecology and Regional Health District should coordinate. Program components could include:
  - Conduct buildout analysis for subbasins and study areas according to current zoning and projected water needs.
  - Develop water supply and demand forecasts for subbasins and study areas, including extending water service into these areas from existing water purveyors.
  - Consider protecting areas of strained water resources through critical areas ordinance or water supply overlay zones if alternate water supply is not feasible.
- *The following three recommendations ranked as a group:*
  - **RECOMMENDATION LU-6**—Recommend that counties, purveyors and Ecology collaborate to develop flexible local guidelines for demonstration of water supply availability and sustainability. Methods may include but are not limited to hydrogeologic investigation and characterization reports.
  - **RECOMMENDATION LU-7**—Recommend that Ecology provide technical assistance and funding for ongoing support in the implementation of guidelines developed in Recommendation LU-6 to demonstrate sufficient water availability and sustainability for proposed and existing uses for comprehensive plan amendments and associated zoning changes.
  - **RECOMMENDATION LU-8**—Recommend that Spokane County require applicants to demonstrate sufficient water availability and sustainability for proposed and existing uses for comprehensive plan amendments and associated zoning changes.
- **RECOMMENDATION WRA-3** Recommend that the Planning Unit consider prioritizing hydrologic sub-basins for Ecology to process water rights applications.
- Two occurrences:
  - **RECOMMENDATION LU-11**—The Planning Unit recommends an evaluation of methodologies and the review process used to determine water availability for proposed development projects, in order to better determine that permitted projects have a viable water supply.
  - **RECOMMENDATION TI-1**—Basalt Aquifer Groundwater Study—The Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG) aquifers that underlie the West Plains area are used for water supply. Groundwater levels have declined in some areas, indicating the groundwater resource is potentially strained. These aquifers (there are at least three distinct aquifers within this) are not well understood. Elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest, basalt aquifers are used extensively for water supply, indicating that a better understanding of the CRBG aquifers in the West Plains area would be beneficial to understand how this resource can be used in a sustainable way.

- **RECOMMENDATION TI-2**—Identification of Areas of Strained Water Resources—  
Identifying potential and existing areas of strained water resources, where water supply is not currently available to meet growing water demand for out-of-stream water needs, is a major data need for WRIA 54. Stevens, Lincoln and Spokane Counties all have begun developing more proactive methodologies to identifying these areas within their jurisdictions, and enacting programs to address the challenges associated with these areas. The Planning Unit supports development of methodologies to accurately identify areas of strained water resources, and development of tools to manage land use needs associated with these areas. Elements of this work may include the following:
  - Conduct buildout analysis for subbasins and study areas according to current zoning and projected water needs. Note that Ecology guidance suggests using 20-year projections from the state Office of Financial Management (OFM) for setting instream flows and allocating water for future out-of-stream uses.
  - Develop water supply and demand forecasts for subbasins and study areas.
  - Compile well information, including number, location, construction specifications, and use.
  - Develop estimates for actual water use
  - Hydrogeologic study to understand the available water resources
  - Compile complaint database information
  - Work with area residents to understand their needs so practical solutions can be found.
- **RECOMMENDATION WS-3** - Promote and support water storage projects initiated by individual entities throughout the watershed to meet instream flows and to provide water for residents, business and projected growth in Spokane, Lincoln and Stevens Counties and the Spokane Indian Reservation.
- One occurrence:
  - **RECOMMENDATION WRA-6**—Planning Unit will review, discuss, and recommend improvements to the relinquishment law.
  - **RECOMMENDATION WFN-4**—Local governments, the Spokane Tribe, and water purveyors should assess subarea water supply needs, identify appropriate measures from a range of options, and facilitate options that are economically viable and provide long-term sustainability.
  - **RECOMMENDATION WFN-7**—The state Legislature should amend current law to allow water banking throughout the state.
  - **RECOMMENDATION TI-3**—Develop Water Supply and Demand Forecast for Prioritized Areas
    - Utilize growth projections, zoning, building/permit activity
    - Relate to parcel data, water service areas
    - Identify existing water sources and capacity
    - Determine unit water needs and conservation/infrastructure assumptions
  - **RECOMMENDATION EDU-2**—Conduct a water resources education needs assessment in WRIA 54.
  - **RECOMMENDATION WUE-3** Recommend that counties, cities and water purveyors develop and implement indoor and outdoor water conservation incentives.

The group discussed the pros and cons of paring the list down to ten or fewer, presenting the entire list in a rank order, or just presenting the list “as-is” as “high priority projects.” Some participants were uncomfortable with having a large list, as this may dilute the focus of the list. A counter point to this is that a longer list provides a larger range of project types, providing more choices that may fit a broader range of funding options and individual priorities. Several participants who are regularly involved in preparing grant applications or reviewing them indicated that it is valuable to have a project recommended by a regional watershed plan, but the exact rank is not typically considered. Cynthia offered that in her five years working with the Planning Unit, they had never had a difficult time agreeing on what project to do when funding was available as long as a

strong project lead has volunteered, and a good scope of work has been developed.

The outcome of this discussion was that the “Prioritization” appendix for the Watershed Plan will include the following:

- Compiled numerical results of the “recommendation ranking within each technical issue category” as reviewed earlier in the meeting
- Compiled “top 5 projects” list will be called “high priority projects” and will include the following:
  - The eighteen projects originally submitted
  - Recommendation WRA-5 – Spokane Tribe develop a water code. Addition of this was requested by Brian Crossley as his input to the “top 5 projects”
  - Cynthia will contact individuals who submitted a top five, but did not rank them 1 to 5 to see if they want to add a ranking. If yes, that ranking will be integrated into the compilation.
  - Presentation will include the number of occurrences and ranking data.
- A brief narrative describing the prioritization process and intent of the Planning Unit for its use.

The question of attaching an implementation timeline was asked, and Mike Hermanson responded that if the additional \$30,000 that the Planning Unit is eligible for becomes available during the next biennium, the Planning Unit can complete the DIP and pick right back up. The recommendations will already be prioritized and the group can put all the remaining details such as timeline and interim steps.

### **Consider project proposals for \$4,000 unallocated WRIA 54 funds**

This agenda topic was a follow-up to the December meeting discussion about reallocating WRIA 54 Phase IV Year One funds in light of the severe state budget reductions and uncertainty of future watershed planning grant funding.

At the December meeting, the group talked about projects and implementation projects that would fulfill the Phase IV Year One grant requirements as well as initiate some of the implementation work that is in the plan. A decision was made to redirect a major portion of the Phase IV remaining budget to the water demand forecast project that has recently been kicked off. This project was previously ranked as a high priority project including WRIA 55/57, 56, and 54. Spokane County is the lead on that project. That decision left approximately \$4,000-\$5,000 grant monies that could be used for a small project. Bob Derkey had expressed interest in proposing a geologic mapping project that could make use of the remaining funding.

Cynthia referred the Planning Unit to the posted flip chart from the December Planning Unit that documented the follow-up actions related to the grant monies:

- Clarify legal/financial requirement with Ecology grants and lead agency administration – no issues had been identified
- Revise grant agreement - Mike Hermanson reported that the grant amendment was complete
- Check Tetra Tech contract to determine whether it would be possible to subcontract to entities not originally listed in the Phase IV statement of qualifications. – Cynthia reported that Tetra Tech’s contract with Spokane County would allow for this as long as the County was in agreement.
- Figure out what to do with the remaining \$5,000 of WRIA 54 grant monies – the Planning Unit had discussed the possibility of funding geologic map database work proposed by Bob Derkey at the last meeting. Bob provided a proposal which Cynthia had forwarded to the Planning Unit. The Spokane County Conservation District also provided a proposal for work that could make use of the remaining \$5,000; this information had also been distributed via email to Planning Unit with the meeting agenda.
- Regular Planning Unit meeting in January – December meeting participants had discussed the possibility of holding a special meeting in early January to discuss and decide on project proposals. This suggestion had been abandoned when the meeting participants decided to use most of remaining WRIA 54 monies to fund the water demand forecast project.

Mike Hermanson updated meeting attendees to further developments on the funding topic. Following the December meeting, the Spokane County Conservation District came forward with a project proposal that would require more than the remaining \$5,000 of WRIA 54 monies. Spokane County met with the Spokane Conservation District and suggested that the district use the \$8,000 that WRIA 56 was contributing toward the water demand project, reducing the budget for the water demand project by \$8,000 and reallocating that money toward the district’s groundwater monitoring project. Rob Lindsay commented that Spokane County had initiated this as a gesture of support for the Spokane County Conservation District’s hydrogeology project. That agreement was reached, leaving the water demand project budget reduced by \$8,000. The impact to the project will be reduction of one advisory committee meeting and a cutback in data collection and analysis effort. Mike proposed to the meeting participants that the remaining \$4,000 of WRIA 54 money be used to restore half of that budget reduction for the water demand project.

Cynthia listed the three project candidates on a flip chart:

PROJECT	DELIVERABLE/MECHANICS	\$ REQUESTED
Compile geologic map data into GIS map coverage for West Plains	Geologic Map in GIS layer	\$5,000
Restore \$4,000 of the \$8,000 cut to water demand forecast project		\$4,000
Groundwater Sampling – geochemical and isotopes		\$7,600

Clarification on available dollars was requested. Mike Hermanson reported that \$4,000 was available. The \$5,000 reported at the last meeting was an estimate.

Bob Derkey’s Proposal

Bob Derkey presented his proposed project. Bob worked for about 15 years with the Department of Natural Resources mapping the geology of the Spokane area, including the West Plains. Separate from Bob’s efforts, Linda McCollum, professor at EWU and Mike McCollum, retired geologist have completed additional geologic mapping and have also completed an extensive well inventory, including precise locations using global position system (GPS). Most of Bob’s mapping has been published as 7 1/2 minute quadrangles (1:24,000 scale).

Bob proposes to bring together the two sets of geologic data into a single data set that can be used for any future investigation relating to aquifers and water supply in the West Plains area. This effort would include limited field work, geochemical analysis of basalt samples to assist with identifying geologic formation, and preparation of detailed basalt-flow stratigraphic columns and cross sections. The major deliverable product would be a geologic map of the area as a digital GIS shapefile; other products include geochemistry results, GIS database of GPS-located water wells, GIS database of wells with established basalt stratigraphy, and detailed cross sections of areas based on best available geologic information.

Bob emphasized that his experience and familiarity with the basalt stratigraphy in the region is a big asset to this project. It would be very difficult for someone else to complete the work as efficiently. An important outcome of this work will be a better understanding about the location of West Plains aquifers. This relates to possible artificial recharge and storage on the West Plains in that you need to understand where that water is going. For example, if you start putting the water out there and 6 months later it is in the Spokane River - that is worthless.

Meeting participants asked Bob for clarification:

- Cost for the work – the proposal provided to the Planning Unit stated the project cost at \$10,262. Bob clarified that he would complete the work for a lump sum of \$5,000. Rusty Post alerted Bob that Ecology would need a specifically-define scope for the money received – i.e. what is going to cut from the \$10,262 project scope to make a \$5,000 project?
- What is the role of Eastern Washington University? They own the ArcGIS software needed for the map production.
- Contract mechanism – would there be a contract between Spokane County and EWU, between Tetra Tech and EWU, or some other arrangement? This is undetermined at this time.

### Spokane County Conservation District Proposal

Charlie Peterson and Rick Noll from the Spokane County Conservation District presented the district's proposal to the Planning Unit. Charlie introduced the proposal, indicating that he did not realize there was only \$4,000 to \$5,000 available WRIA 54 money at the conclusion of the December meeting, which is why the district put forward a project with a larger budget. He asked that Planning Unit members consider the proposal, both for immediate and future funding.

Rick Noll presented more details about the project. The project consists of groundwater sampling, with the purpose of determining the age and isotope signature of groundwater in the basalt aquifers. This information would aid in understanding groundwater flow paths and recharge characteristics that are not apparent from standard geologic or water level data. For example, if your sampling results indicate 20,000 year old water, you know the recharge is far away, and/or groundwater movement through the aquifer is slow. Ultimately this work will contribute to a better ability to sustainably manage use of groundwater from the basalts. While the work is targeted for WRIA 56, it is likely that the results would benefit WRIA 54, and if funded, the district could seek to locate one or two wells in WRIA 54.

Understanding that the Planning Unit does not have enough available money to fund both Bob Derkey's proposal and this one, Rick indicated the Planning Unit could consider doing the sampling in the future. In part, the district wants to educate folks that these sampling techniques exist so that people consider integrating them into future projects and analysis. He stressed that this approach is an economical way to learn a lot about the groundwater that will help plan for how much water is available to use in the future.

### Questions for Rick and Charlie:

- Have the well sites been identified? This is ongoing right now in WRIA 56 in conjunction with our other projects.
- What is the risk of sampling from a contaminated well? You have to make sure you have a good well. An open well that was drilled through 200 feet of basalt that maybe draws groundwater from several different zones would not be an ideal candidate. Ideally you have good knowledge about what zone the well is drawing water from and do not get cross flow from any of the other zones.
- Does the requested budget fund drilling new monitoring wells? No, this \$7,600 doesn't include drilling any wells, it is just sampling. We have some money to do some drilling in WRIA 56. But in WRIA 54 we would ideally look for existing wells that we could sample.
- Bob Derkey commented that he would welcome a cooperative project with the Spokane County Conservation District. The two projects would be complementary and are both important. Better data about the age of groundwater in the basalt aquifers would definitely contribute to the ability to manage groundwater use sustainably, and not mine groundwater from the basalts. Bob also noted that he had recently attended a presentation by USGS in WRIA 53 about age dating of water in the Columbia Basin. The results were very interesting and indicated that the age of water in the basalt aquifers ranged from young to quite old. Further investigation would be necessary because there was some suggestion of cross contamination within the sampled wells (mixing of young and old water).



### Discussion and Decisions Regarding Project Funding

More general discussion surrounding the benefits and potential sequencing of projects occurred. Charlie and Rick indicated that the Conservation District is supportive of Bob Derkey's project. Charlie noted that all three projects were reinforcing of each other, and also commented that while the water demand forecast project was important, understanding the water supply constraints is at least equally important.

Brian Crossley expressed dissatisfaction that the Planning Unit had so little time to react, consider, and decide upon their input for how the remaining WRIA 54 monies would be spent. Although most people seemed to agree that the water demand forecast project sounded like a good project, he feels this should still be an open discussion topic. Also, it is awkward that the WRIA 54 facilitator, Cynthia, also is involved with the water demand forecast project. Mike Hermanson acknowledged that it was unfortunate that there was so little advance notice about the budget cuts, but that he had listened to the meeting recording and confirmed that the quorum of Planning Unit members at the meeting had made decision to reallocate WRIA 54 funds to the water demand forecast project. It's fine to revisit that decision as a group now, but the meeting summary was accurate per the meeting recording.

Rob Lindsay expressed concern about the possible perception that Spokane County came in and scooped up the funding for the water demand forecast project. He had to leave the December meeting early, and was surprised to learn later that the group was not going to reconvene in early January to discuss and decide on other project proposals as that would have been his preference. He stated that the value of the working relationships of the group are worth more to him than the water demand project, and if anyone in the room felt sour about that to please speak up as the grant amendments, etc could certainly be revised again. He also indicated support for the Spokane Conservation District's project and acknowledged Charlie and Rick for taking the time to present the opportunity to the Planning Unit.

Rusty Post added that the grant requirements under the law also create some constraints; the money is under Phase IV, which is a developing a detailed implementation plan. The water demand project meets those grant requirements – developing strategies to meet future water demand – which is why Ecology was able to approve the grant amendment. So part of the reason that Ecology said yes to the proposal to do that project rather than a detailed implementation plan itself is that the project does some of the stuff that is required in developing that detailed implementation plan. For example, the other two projects we are looking at right now, by themselves wouldn't meet the legal requirements under the grant. But either of these other two projects, coupled with the demand forecast, go together fine in terms of meeting the grant requirements.

Mike Hermanson elaborated that a big part of the funding amount relates to what it would take to bring the demand forecast to completion. Originally the project had been funded only to develop a study plan. The additional money discussed in December would allow completion of the forecast model and a baseline forecast. With more limited funding there may not be enough money to get a useful work product completed. That was part of the decision making.

Several Planning Unit members, including the Spokane County Conservation District, suggested the group make the decision to support Bob Derkey's proposal. No one disagreed, however unresolved issues regarding the additional \$1,000 needed to make up the difference between \$4,000 and \$5,000, contracting questions, and necessary grant amendments were raised. David Luders volunteered to contribute \$1,000 to the effort from Indian Village Estates Water Association; he wrote a check and delivered it to Mike Hermanson. This decision is contingent on working out the details regarding budget, scope, contracting and grant amendments.

Bob Derkey expressed appreciation and also asked that the WRIA 54 look into the possibility of funding and working with the Conservation District to get the groundwater sampling project off the ground. He emphasized that the scientific endeavor to understand the aquifers in the West Plains is absolutely essential to any future

groundwater use and management.

Question: Will the product be available to others to use? EWU isn't going to own the results of this, they just own the software essentially is that what you are saying? This isn't going to be data that will held by EWU. Rusty Post commented that any products developed with Ecology grant money would be part of the public record, available to anyone who requests them.

### **Public Comment**

Charlie Kessler announced that they had a signed grant agreement with Ecology for creation of the Chamokane Creek Watershed Council. The Stevens County Conservation District will be sending out information soon about meeting location and time to kick it off.

### **Admin & General Schedule Announcements**

Cynthia announced the next advisory committee meeting for the Water Demand Forecast project has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 24th, 9 a.m. to noon.

Rob Lindsay announced that the Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan for the SVRP aquifer in Idaho had recently begun, and had its first advisory committee meeting on Friday, January 29. No location or time was provided.

This will be the last WRIA 54 Planning Unit meeting until July, 2010

### **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.