

# Detailed Implementation Plan

## Little and Middle Spokane River Basins, Water Resource Inventory Area 55/57

---



Prepared by the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Implementation Team  
with the assistance of Sound Resolutions and Cascadia Consulting Group

Approved on February 20, 2008

Project funding provided by the  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
Watershed Planning Grant # G0700149

## List of Watershed Implementation Team Members

Avista Corporation	Tim Vore
City of Deer Park	Roger Krieger
Department of Ecology	Sara Hunt
Diamond Lake resident	Tom Wimpy
Eloika Lake resident	Greg Sweeney
Friends of the Little Spokane Valley	Tom Hargreaves
Horseshoe Lake resident	Howard Rowley
Lands Council	Brian Walker
City of Liberty Lake	Mary Wren-Wilson
City of Millwood Water Department	Cleve McCoul
Pend Oreille Conservation District	Brian Bolles
Pend Oreille County	Mike Lithgow
	Jim Marthaller
Sacheen Lake	Jeff Storms
Spokane Aquifer Joint Board	Ty Wick
Spokane County	Reanette Boese
	Robert Lindsay
Spokane County Conservation District	Walt Edelen
	Rick Noll
Spokane County Planning Commission	Dave Jones
Spokane County Water Conservancy Board	Doug Rider
City of Spokane	Lloyd Brewer
City of Spokane Valley	Scott Kuhta
	Tavis Schmidt
Stevens County	Clay White
Stevens Public Utility District	Dick Price
Vera Water and Power	Todd Henry
	Steve Skipworth
Watershed resident	Stan Miller
Whitworth Water District	Susan McGeorge

## Acknowledgements

The Middle and Lower Spokane River (WRIA 55/57) Detailed Implementation Plan was funded by the Washington State Department of Ecology under Watershed Planning Grant #G0700149, as authorized in the Watershed Planning Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW). The plan was written by Sound Resolutions and Cascadia Consulting Group. Spokane County gratefully acknowledges the dedication and hard work of the Planning Unit/Watershed Implementation Team members noted above. These individuals have put forth outstanding efforts and untold hours to develop this Detailed Implementation Plan and to collaboratively address issues in the watershed.

Special thanks are given to Claudia Crawford and Susan McGeorge of Whitworth Water District for helping with meeting support, and to the Spokane County Conservation District and the Spokane County Fire District #4 for providing meeting space. Thanks are also due to the water purveyors who took the time and effort to complete and return the water rights surveys.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part 1: 2008-2009 Workplan</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Part 2: Implementation Plan for Each Recommendation</b>	<b>31</b>
I. Water Conservation, Reclamation and Reuse	31
II. Instream Flow Needs for the Middle Spokane River	48
III. Instream Flow Needs for the Little Spokane River	56
IV. Domestic Exempt Wells	71
V. Water Rights and Claims	82
VI. Strategies for Base Flow Augmentation	89
VII. Strategies for Ground Water Recharge Augmentation	106
VIII. Approaches to Plan Implementation	117
<b>Part 3: Implementation Matrices</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>Part 4: Municipal Inchoate Water Rights Inventory</b>	<b>140</b>
<b>Part 5: Strategies to Provide Water for Specific Purposes</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Benefits and Practicality Ratings</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Sample Water Rights Survey Form and Responses</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Appendix 3: West Branch Little Spokane River Committee Recommendations</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Avista Comments on the Draft DIP</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Phase IV Memorandum of Agreement</b>	<b>174</b>

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AF/YR – Acre Feet per Year	SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board
APA – Aquifer Protection Area	SCCD – Spokane County Conservation District
cfs – cubic feet per second	SVRP – Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie
DIP – Detailed Implementation Plan	TMDL – Total Maximum Daily Load <sup>2</sup>
DOH – Washington Department of Health	USGS – United States Geological Survey
Ecology – Washington Department of Ecology	WB LSR – West Branch Little Spokane River
gpm – gallons per minute	WDFW – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
IDF&G – Idaho Fish and Game	WDNR – Washington Department of Natural Resources
NOAA – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	WRIA – Water Resource Inventory Area
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service	WSU – Washington State University
POCD – Pend Oreille Conservation District	WIT – Watershed Implementation Team
RCW – Revised Code of Washington	
RWCC – Regional Water Conservation Collaboration <sup>1</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> The RWCC is an informal group facilitated by the Department of Ecology. RWCC is an unofficial term used to describe this group in the DIP.

<sup>2</sup> The term “Total Maximum Daily Load”, or TMDL, refers to plans to clean up water quality in order to comply with standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Ecology.

## Executive Summary

This Detailed Implementation Plan is a blueprint for coordinating and implementing the recommendations outlined in the Watershed Management Plan for the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins. These 107 recommendations address central issues to water resource management in the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins: water conservation, reclamation, and reuse; instream flow needs for the Middle and Little Spokane Rivers; domestic exempt wells; water rights and claims; and strategies for river baseflow and ground water recharge augmentation, as well as approaches to plan implementation.

This plan was developed by the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Implementation Team (WIT), formed of community members and agency staff. The WIT has encouraged public comment and participation throughout the planning process, and came to its decisions by consensus. Many of the proposed actions depend upon the cooperation of local residents, businesses, governments, and other entities. The WIT and WIT members are committed to continuing to work with the community towards successful implementation of the actions detailed in this plan. General recommendations include the following:

### 1. WATER CONSERVATION, RECLAMATION, AND REUSE

These strategies focus on combining complementary existing water conservation strategies and filling gaps where needed. Specific implementation actions include reducing indoor water use by developing public education programs and water saving incentives, reducing outdoor water use through encouraging xeriscaping and efficient irrigation methods, educating the public on water conservation and use, and supporting actions that increase use of reclaimed and reused water, such as evaluating regulatory incentives and researching specific opportunities for water reclamation and reuse.

### 2. INSTREAM FLOW NEEDS FOR THE MIDDLE SPOKANE RIVER

While the Department of Ecology (Ecology) is responsible for developing and adopting the instream flow rules for the Middle Spokane River, WIT members can take specific actions to address issues regarding minimum instream flows. Specific implementation actions include steps to assure that instream flows for the river address the needs of rainbow trout and associated aquatic biota, flow management to provide for aesthetic and recreational use as well as power generation, and flow management to maintain water quality adequate for identified beneficial uses.

### 3. INSTREAM FLOW NEEDS FOR THE LITTLE SPOKANE RIVER

Specific actions regarding minimum instream flows in the Little Spokane River include steps to assure that instream flows for the river address the needs of rainbow trout, mountain whitefish, and associated aquatic biota; water management to maintain beneficial uses other than aquatic biota; and integration of flow recommendations for aquatic biota, recreation, aesthetics, water quality, etc. into an overall recommendation for a minimum instream flow regime.

### 4. DOMESTIC EXEMPT WELLS

Recommendations to address the impacts of domestic exempt wells on overall water availability include developing approaches to land use management that limit the impacts of withdrawals from domestic exempt wells, such as managing when domestic exempt wells may be installed, determining ways to limit maximum daily withdrawals, and reducing summertime water use from these wells during low-flow years. Additional recommended actions include collecting additional data to better define the impact of domestic exempt wells

on water use and model calibration, and developing a clear, consistent policy for assigning water rights quantities when water systems take over domestic exempt wells.

## 5. WATER RIGHTS AND CLAIMS

These strategies speak to a need for better management of water rights in the basin, including increased enforcement and compliance. Recommendations include improving the understanding of water rights, acquiring water rights to increase instream flows, and reducing summertime water use to increase river flow during low-flow years.

## 6. STRATEGIES FOR BASE FLOW AUGMENTATION

Water resource management approaches are recommended that would augment water supply in the Little Spokane River Basin and the Middle Spokane River Basin during the summer high water use period. These include land management methods that slow the release of winter snowmelt and runoff into streams, storage approaches that slow winter snowmelt and runoff, and investigations into the possibility of moving water supply well pumping away from the Spokane River during the summer low-flow season.

## 7. STRATEGIES FOR GROUND WATER RECHARGE AUGMENTATION

These recommendations are designed to augment ground water recharge. Specific recommendations include using stormwater management approaches that foster the maintenance or enhancement of natural ground water recharge rates due to direct precipitation, particularly using stormwater runoff from development to enhance recharge. Additional recommendations include using reclaimed and reused water for aquifer storage and recovery to support water supply and/or river baseflow needs, and using Spokane River water diversions to recharge groundwater during high flow periods in order to mitigate municipal water supply pumping and enhance the river's baseflow.

## 8. APPROACHES TO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

This set of recommendations and actions is directed towards effective implementation of the plan. Specific recommendations that have not yet been fully implemented include continuing education and evaluation to fill data gaps that might limit the scope or implementation of the plan, utilizing existing systems to forecast water availability in the Middle Spokane and Little Spokane watersheds, and promoting funding of projects included in the Watershed Plan. Additional recommendations outline strategies for the plan to be responsive to changing needs and new information within the watersheds.

## PLAN ORGANIZATION

**Part 1** of the plan contains a workplan of immediate actions to be conducted in 2008-2009, which includes timelines for implementation. The body of the plan, **Part 2**, provides further details on each recommendation. The matrix in **Part 3** summarizes actions by implementer, and notes timelines and identified funding sources.

**Part 4** summarizes an inventory of inchoate municipal water rights in the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins, as required under RCW 90.82.048. **Part 5** provides a brief overview of the specific recommendations which address strategies to provide water for production agriculture, instream flows, and/or commercial, residential, and industrial use, as required under RCW 90.82.043.

## Introduction

### *Landscape, land use, and environmental attributes of WRIA 55/57*

WRIA 55, the Little Spokane River Basin, and WRIA 57, the Middle Spokane River Basin, are located in northeastern Washington near the Idaho border. These watersheds are part of the Columbia River drainage system, and lie at the intersection of the Northern Rocky Mountains and the Columbia Plateau. Within this 960-square-mile area, topographic elevations range from 1,640 feet to 5,878 feet above mean sea level, climates range from high plains desert to temperate, and precipitation ranges from less than 20 inches to over 40 inches annually.

Precipitation in both basins is particularly low in the summer months. Water in WRIA 55 is mostly recharged by precipitation within the WRIA boundaries, while WRIA 57 water stores are largely recharged by precipitation in the Rocky Mountains of north Idaho and western Montana. Both basins rely on spring snowmelt from the upland areas and groundwater discharge to the rivers to maintain stream flows during the drier months.

Water is becoming increasingly scarce in the WRIA 55/57 basins. An assessment of the WRIA 55 basin in 1995 concluded that between 1970 and 1991, water flows in the Little Spokane River and its tributaries did not meet the 1978 instream flow requirements an average of 53 days per year. This assessment also noted increased non-point source pollution, growing demand for water due to increased development and population growth, and declines in stream flows and groundwater levels. Past studies of WRIA 57 have largely focused on the Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie (SVRP) Aquifer, which was designated a “Sole Source Aquifer” by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in 1978. The aquifer is the drinking water source for over 400,000 people living in Spokane County as well as in Kootenai County, Idaho. Interactions between this aquifer and the Spokane River are important both seasonally and spatially to maintain flows in the river.

### *History of watershed management planning in WRIA 55/57*

Watershed planning in Washington State is conducted under the 1998 Watershed Planning Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW). This Act was designed to allow people who live, work and recreate within a watershed to collaborate on how water is managed for the future. The law is administered by Ecology in the form of a sequence of grants, which allow the initiating governments to undergo watershed planning according to four major phases. Planning occurs within the existing structure of Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) although, in cases such as this one, multiple WRIAs are combined for planning purposes.

Phase I provides funding for the convening of a planning unit formed of representatives of local government, interest groups and citizens. In Phase II, planning units may apply for funding to conduct watershed assessments, which may range from a compilation of existing data on water resources to new studies of specific watershed attributes. Phase III provides for development of a watershed management plan, which must be approved by consensus and approved by county legislative bodies. Phase IV funding allows planning units to develop detailed implementation plans to coordinate and oversee the actual implementation of the alternatives and recommendations of their watershed management plan.

Watershed-related work has been conducted for many years in WRIA 55/57. Joint watershed planning in the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins under Chapter 90.82 RCW was initiated by the City of Spokane, Spokane County, Stevens County, Pend Oreille County, Whitworth Water District, and Vera Water and Power. With Spokane County as the lead entity, these initiating governments and representatives of roughly fifteen other interests began watershed planning efforts under Chapter 90.82 RCW in 1998. The group

elected to focus on water quantity issues (required under Chapter 90.82 RCW) and instream flows (optional under Chapter 90.82 RCW).

The WRIA 55/57 Planning Unit oversaw several technical assessments under Phase II funding. A preliminary assessment of existing information for WRIA 55/57 was completed in June 2003, and a more detailed watershed simulation model was completed in February 2004. Instream flow studies were completed in December 2003 for the Little Spokane River and in June 2004 for parts of the Spokane River. Additionally, a multi-purpose storage assessment was completed in December 2004.

The WRIA 55/57 Planning Unit approved the Watershed Management Plan on July 6, 2005. The Plan was adopted by the Commissioners of Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties on January 31, 2006.

## **Process used to develop this plan**

Following the adoption of the Watershed Management Plan, the Planning Unit agreed by consensus to move to Phase IV of watershed planning. Participating local governments and other stakeholders signed a Memorandum of Agreement for plan implementation and to form a new decision making body, called the Watershed Implementation Team (WIT) (Appendix 5). This body, with similar membership and statutory authority as that of the Planning Unit, has been responsible for moving through the process of developing the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP).

Spokane County, designated as the Lead Agency, submitted and administered the Phase IV grant application to Ecology. Following receipt of that funding, the WIT selected and hired Susan Gulick of Sound Resolutions to facilitate and develop the DIP, with the assistance of Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc.

The WIT has held bimonthly meetings to develop the DIP. Members of the public have been welcome at all meetings. Decisions made in the process of developing this plan were reached by consensus.

This plan also incorporates many actions recommended separately by the West Branch Little Spokane River (WB LSR) Committee. Throughout the document, notations in parentheses beginning with 'WB' indicate that an action is also included in the recommendations from the WB LSR Committee. These notations cross-reference the list of recommendations from the WB LSR Committee, which is found in Appendix 3.

## **Potential Funding Sources**

Implementation of the plan requires funding and staff resources. The majority of the recommendations in this plan will be implemented through staff time donated by WIT members and member agencies, including Spokane County, the Spokane County Conservation District (SCCD), the Pend Oreille Conservation District (POCD), Ecology, the City of Spokane, Pend Oreille County, Stevens County, water districts, and other local governments. Major funding sources are Ecology grants, including Phase IV Implementation grants, the Terry Husseman account, the Centennial Clean Water Fund, and the Flood Control Assistance Account Program; Spokane County Aquifer Protection Area (APA) fees; and SCCD assessment funds. Additional potential funding sources for specific projects are identified in the DIP. Identified City of Spokane funding is, in most cases, contingent on the participation of other implementing members in providing funding.

The Spokane Aquifer Joint Board (SAJB), POCD, SCCD, and Spokane County have applied for Watershed Planning and Implementation funds from Ecology to fund specific actions in this DIP. Projects for which support was requested included facilitation of development of the instream flow recommendation, a study to develop flow augmentation strategies for the Middle Spokane River, continued organization of a Regional Water Conservation Collaboration (RWCC), a surface water storage feasibility study, restoration of wetland

areas in Saltese Flats, operations and maintenance of stream gauges on the Little Spokane River, and a watershed-wide wetlands restoration feasibility study.

At the end of 2007, Ecology had granted funding for the instream flow recommendation facilitation, the stream gauging, restoration of wetland areas in Saltese Flats, and the wetlands restoration feasibility study.

In addition, the WIT has identified specific actions in this DIP to be funded in 2008 and 2009 by Phase IV grant funds from Ecology. While specific dollar amounts have not yet been allocated, the WIT has prioritized recommendations into three tiers, based on immediacy of need for funding. These are as follows; more details about each recommendation may be found in Part 2 of this DIP.

#### **TIER 1**

R.IV.A.01.e, Data gap analysis for areas of water availability concern  
R.VI.B.01.a, R.VI.B.01.b, R.VII.C.01.b, R.VII.C.02.a and .b, Feasibility studies on water storage and surface flow augmentation projects  
R.I.A.02.e, Irrigation efficiency classes  
R.VI.A.02.a, Feasibility studies on instream water storage projects

#### **TIER 2**

R.IV.A.03.a, Encouraging domestic exempt well owners to conserve water  
R.I.C.01.a, Water reclamation and reuse education/outreach programs

#### **TIER 3**

R.VI.A.02.a, Feasibility analysis of Eloika Lake water control structure  
R.I.C.01.a, Survey on citizen perceptions of water reuse and reclamation  
R.VI.C.01.a, Analysis on costs/benefits of moving pumping away from river during low flows  
R.V.A.01.b, Water use inventory

## **Organizational Structure**

Spokane County has implementation and administration responsibilities including administering implementation grant funds and keeping track of the Phase IV projects and budgets. The WIT provides overall direction for implementation of current and future projects, and develops and approves revisions to the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Management Plan as well as the DIP. Following the completion of Phase IV funding, the WIT will meet to determine an appropriate organizational structure to ensure continued plan implementation. Possible future structures include a Watershed Management Partnership, per RCW 39.34.200, or a non-profit organization.

## **Plan Organization**

This plan has five major sections, followed by three appendices.

**Part 1: 2008-2009 Workplan** describes the eight overarching strategies for implementation, with specific actions and timelines. These strategies address water conservation, reclamation and reuse; instream flow needs for the Middle and Little Spokane Rivers; domestic exempt wells; water rights and claims; strategies for river baseflow and ground water recharge augmentation, as well as approaches to plan implementation. Each strategy includes specific immediate actions to occur in 2008-2009, which are drawn from the 107 recommendations detailed in Part 2.

**Part 2: Implementation Details** describes how each of the WIT's 107 recommendations will be implemented. In this section, multiple aspects of each recommendation are addressed, including the



WIT's opinion on the recommendation's potential benefits and practicality; specific implementation actions grouped by timeline, implementation considerations, performance indicators, funding sources, permits or legislative action needed, and oversight responsibilities.

**Part 3: Implementation Matrices** summarizes the actions detailed in Part 2 and provides the reader with a quick look at who will do what, by when, and with what funding. These matrices are organized by implementer and include information on timelines and funding sources.

**Part 4: Municipal Inchoate Water Rights Inventory** documents existing inchoate water rights in the watershed.

**Part 5: Strategies to Provide Sufficient Water** describes the actions in the plan that address provision of water for production agriculture, instream flows and/or commercial, industrial, and residential use, as required under RCW 90.82.043.

**Appendix 1** contains a summary of the WIT's votes on the benefits of each recommendation to the watershed, as well as the practicality of implementing that recommendation.

**Appendix 2** contains the survey form sent to all holders of municipal water rights in the watershed, as well as summarized responses from returned forms.

**Appendix 3** contains the recommendations made by the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee.

**Appendix 4** contains the Memorandum of Agreement signed by participating local governments and other stakeholders for plan implementation, formation of the Watershed Implementation Team, and development of the Detailed Implementation Plan.

## Part 1: 2008-2009 Workplan

### I. WATER CONSERVATION, RECLAMATION AND REUSE

**Objective:** This strategy is intended to combine complimentary water conservation strategies and to avoid duplication of efforts. Efforts under this initiative will be largely funded by donated staff time, particularly from water purveyors and from local government staff; although the RWCC may seek funding for coordinating the regional education effort. Specific implementation actions include reducing indoor water use by developing public education programs and water saving incentives (R.I.A.01.a-d); reducing outdoor water use through encouraging xeriscaping and efficient irrigation approaches (R.I.A.02.a-g); educating the public on water conservation and use (R.I.B.01.a); and supporting actions that increase use of reclaimed and reused water, such as evaluating regulatory incentives and researching specific opportunities for water reclamation and reuse (R.I.C.01.a-d).

#### Tasks:

#### Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

##### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will encourage all water purveyors in the WRIA to conduct a survey of their users to determine public knowledge and attitudes about water conservation and outdoor water use. (R.I.A.02.a)
- The WIT and the Washington Department of Health (DOH) will encourage purveyors to consider rate incentives in conservation plans to encourage irrigation efficiency. (R.I.A.02.g)
- The WIT will send a letter encouraging the State to offer conservation incentives to irrigators on a state-wide or regional basis. Local legislators will be cc'd on the letter. (R.I.A.02.g)
- The WIT will support RWCC efforts to coordinate conservation education programs. (R.I.A.01.c)

##### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will meet with leaders of the Washington State University (WSU) landscape design program to discuss options for additional xeriscaping incentives and/or education. (R.I.A.02.c)
- The RWCC will provide education to retailers such as home-improvement stores or nurseries on water conservation. Topics will include products which will improve efficiency and conservation of outdoor water use, and plants which are recommended for xeriscaping. The RWCC should consider collaborating with the Interdisciplinary Design Institute of WSU Spokane. (R.I.B.01.a)

##### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will encourage purveyors, counties, and wastewater utilities to explore water reuse and reclamation opportunities via pilot projects. (R.I.C.01.d)

##### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- WIT members will each compile a summary of xeriscaping incentives, requirements, or other components from local comprehensive plans and development regulations (including permitting requirements) that address xeriscaping or other water conservation actions. The WIT will evaluate what is currently being done in response to these plans and regulations and identify areas where additional incentives for compliance could be useful. The WIT will also evaluate the effectiveness of incentives such as tiered rate structures for water usage, and bonus density or bonus heights in exchange for xeriscaping. (R.I.A.02.b, d)
- Based on the results of the internal feasibility assessment, the WIT will recommend incentives for consideration by local governments to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies. (R.I.C.01.b)

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- The WIT will develop a package of recommended incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation, with a particular focus on the initial landscape planning prior to development. (R.I.A.02.b)

#### *Ongoing*

- WIT member agencies will provide customers with water-saving incentives consistent with the Spokane River TMDL requirements. (R.I.A.01.b)
- The WIT will continue to seek funding for education and implementation of incentives for water conservation and xeriscaping. (R.I.A.02.b)

### **Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The RWCC will prepare a master list of water conservation actions in the region and recommend standardized methods to measure conservation from these activities. (R.I.A.01.b)
- The RWCC will take the lead on coordinating existing regional conservation education programs and reporting to the WIT on such programs. (R.I.A.01.c)
- Ecology will compile a list of possible tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies. (R.I.C.01.b)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- Water purveyors will initiate personal, one-to-one communications with the largest water users in their service area to develop specific water conservation strategies. (R.I.A.02.e)
- The RWCC should coordinate education activities for xeriscaping to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency and effectiveness of various city and county efforts. (R.I.A.02.b)
- The SCCD, WSU Extension, and local homeowners' associations will coordinate the development of a targeted education program on outdoor landscaping. (R.I.A.02.b)
- The SCCD will develop a descriptive inventory of xeriscaping and water conservation demonstration sites. (R.I.A.02.c, .d)
- ★<sup>3</sup> The Cities of Spokane and Liberty Lake and Spokane County will develop and implement golf course water conservation strategies for the golf courses which they own or manage. The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County will develop and implement a water conservation strategy for public parks. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions. (R.I.A.02.g) **Potential Funding Sources:** Water purveyors (through water bills), the City of Spokane, or APA-funded County staff time.
- The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County will evaluate the internal feasibility of proposed tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions. (R.I.C.01.b)

#### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The RWCC will explore how and where to gather and present per capita water usage data. (R.I.B.01.a)

#### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane County will collect and report data on pilot water conservation and irrigation efficiency projects. (R.I.A.02.f)
- Spokane County, in cooperation with cities, other counties, and conservation districts, will develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits and cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and

---

<sup>3</sup> ★ Denotes actions that need a dedicated funding source. If no funding is provided, action will be delayed.

for builders; both will include sample landscape designs. The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley will distribute these materials. (R.I.A.02.b)

- The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC and Spokane County WSU Extension, will continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers. (R.I.A.02.c)

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- Water purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency, and share this information with relevant customers. (R.I.A.02.f)
- Water purveyors will evaluate data on weather trends to determine temperature impacts on water use. Average monthly temperature and precipitation will be correlated with water use. The WIT will provide assistance in developing a consistent methodology. (R.I.A.02.f)
- Spokane County will implement an indoor conservation program targeting Spokane County sewer customers as part of their TMDL program. (R.I.A.01.a)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2009*

- ★ Ecology and DOH, in collaboration with the Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County, will develop water reclamation and reuse education/outreach programs that build on the public perception survey data and address specific regional concerns and goals. (R.I.C.01.a) **Potential Funding Sources:** SAJB, Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, the City of Spokane, or Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR.
- Water purveyors will consider providing customers in the watershed with graphs or other information depicting average monthly or bi-monthly consumption and seasonal consumption to encourage conservation. (R.I.A.01.a)
- ★ The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County and/or wastewater utilities will survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and will share survey data. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions. (R.I.C.01.a) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or the City of Spokane (contingent on contributions from other agencies).

#### *4th Quarter, 2009*

- The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC and WSU Extension, will continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners. (R.I.A.02.c, .d)
- Water purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency. (R.I.A.02.f)

#### *Ongoing*

- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, the SAJB, and water purveyors will continue education efforts as appropriate and will coordinate among themselves. (R.I.A.01.a, .c, R.I.B.01.a) (WB.ED1-4<sup>4</sup>)
- ★ The City of Spokane, Spokane County, the SCCD, and Ecology will continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes, as needed. (R.I.A.02.e) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, the City of Spokane, or APA-funded County staff time.
- The City of Spokane will compile data for its existing pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse. (R.I.C.01.c)

---

<sup>4</sup> Notations in parentheses beginning with 'WB' refer to actions recommended by the WB LSR Committee.

## II. INSTREAM FLOW NEEDS FOR THE MIDDLE SPOKANE RIVER

**Objective:** While the Department of Ecology is responsible for developing and adopting the instream flow rule for the Middle Spokane, WIT members can take specific actions to address issues regarding minimum instream flows. These efforts will be funded through donated time from the relevant staff, as well as specific targeted funding. Specific implementation actions include steps to assure that instream flows for the river meet the needs of rainbow trout and associated aquatic biota (R.II.A.01.a - R.II.A.02.b); flow management to provide for aesthetic and recreational use (R.II.B.01.a - R.II.B.02.c); and flow management to maintain water quality adequate for identified beneficial uses (R.II.C.01.a - R.II.E.01.a).

### Tasks:

#### Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

##### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- WIT members, including state, local, and private entities, will form an Instream Flow work group to look at relevant studies, including TMDL work and instream studies, and will consider water conservation and habitat issues as part of the instream flow regime. (R.II.E.01.a)
- Avista, in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey (USGS), will continue to fund the Post Falls gauge as a real-time gauge. (R.II.A.02.a)

##### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will identify funding sources to continue operation of the gauge at Barker Road. (R.II.A.01.d)

##### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The Instream Flow work group will provide recommendations to the WRIA 55/57 and WRIA 54 planning units on flow regimes for the Middle Spokane River. (R.II.E.01.a)

##### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- Ecology will initiate rule-making to adopt instream flows for the Middle Spokane River. (R.II.A.01.a, R.II.E.01.a)

#### Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

##### *Ongoing*

- Avista, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and IDF&G will continue to implement a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation, and emergence for rainbow trout. (R.II.A.01.c)
- Spokane County, in coordination with the Instream Flow work group, will continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, and will update the WIT periodically. (R.II.A.01.d)

## III. INSTREAM FLOW NEEDS FOR THE LITTLE SPOKANE RIVER

**Objective:** While the Department of Ecology is responsible for developing and adopting the instream flow rule for the Little Spokane River, WIT members can take specific actions to address issues that may arise regarding the minimum instream flows. These strategies will be largely funded through time donated by relevant staff. Specific implementation actions include steps to assure that instream flows for the river meet the needs of rainbow trout, mountain whitefish, and associated aquatic biota (RIII.A.01.a - .f); water management to maintain beneficial uses other than aquatic biota (RIII.B.01.a – RIII.B.05.a); and integration of flow recommendations for aquatic biota, recreation, aesthetics, water quality, etc. into an overall recommendation for a minimum instream flow regime (RIII.C.01.a-b).

## Tasks:

### Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

#### 2nd Quarter, 2008

- The WIT will hold a meeting to solicit input from user groups on needs and options for creating future parks or access points. (R.III.B.04.c)

#### 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2008

- The WIT will write a letter to the Legislature supporting additional funding for WDFW to conduct studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences. (R.III.A.01.c, .d) *This will be coordinated with R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, and R.V.A.02.a.*

#### 1st Quarter, 2009

- The WIT will consider seeking funding and cooperation with interested parties on the gauge(s) at Chattaroy/Elk, depending on the utility of the data for Ecology's water rights regulation. (R.III.B.03.a)
- The WIT will consider whether additional gauges should be installed on tributaries to the West Branch, depending on funding and data needs, based on the stream gauging strategy prepared by the SCCD. (R.III.B.05.a)

#### 2nd Quarter, 2009

- The WIT will evaluate funding needs to conduct a PHABSIM (or other habitat model) analysis of habitat needs on the Little Spokane River. (R.III.A.01.f)

#### Ongoing

- The WIT will keep abreast of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences, and determine whether to conduct flow studies on the tributaries. (R.III.A.01.c, .d)
- The WIT, working with Pend Oreille County, Ecology, Spokane Community College, the SCCD, and others, will continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements. (R.III.B.03.b)
- The WIT will continue to discuss options such as seasonal storage that would be used throughout the watershed to enhance recreation. (R.III.B.04.a, .b)
- WIT members will continue to participate in the TMDL process. (R.III.C.01.a)
- As necessary, prior to each legislative session, the WIT will communicate to the Legislature its support for WDFW funding needs for studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences. (R.III.A.01.c, .d) *This will be coordinated with R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, and R.V.A.02.a.*

### Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

#### 1st Quarter, 2008

- Whitworth Water District, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane will take the lead in developing an outline on how to proceed on monitoring the effects of exporting water, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology, cost, etc. (R.III.B.01.a)
- If the gauges at Chattaroy and/or Elk are reactivated, Ecology will evaluate data to assess whether minimum instream flows are being met. (R.III.B.03.a)
- ★ The SCCD will contract with the USGS to maintain the Elk stream gauge on the mainstem of the Little Spokane River with current real-time data available via satellite on the USGS web page. (R.III.B.03.a)  
**Funding Source:** The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation and Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

#### 4th Quarter, 2008

- The SCCD, in cooperation with the POCD, will prepare and implement a comprehensive gauging strategy for streams and lakes in the West Branch of the Little Spokane River. The strategy will be based on an

assessment of existing gauge data, and will prioritize recommended gauge locations, identify the types of gauges needed, identify the agencies that will maintain gauges and analyze the data, and discuss options to maximize the benefit of volunteer monitoring efforts. (R.III.B.05.a) (WB.SW2-2)

- The POCD, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will assess the impact of beaver dams on water levels in Diamond Lake. (R.III.B.05.a)

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- The SCCD will seek willing landowners for the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program for creating future parks or access points. (R.III.B.04.c)

#### *Ongoing*

- The SCCD will seek funding to continue operations and maintenance of its current gauges. (R.III.B.05.a)
- The WB LSR Committee members will take notes and/or pictures to document unexplained flow surges on Horseshoe, Eloika, Trout, and Sacheen Lakes. (R.III.B.05.a) (WB.SW2-5)
- Ecology will meet with the WIT to develop strategies to enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff in the Little Spokane Watershed for exempt wells that have junior water rights. (R.III.B.02.a) *This will be coordinated with R.IV.A.03.a and R.V.B.01.a.*
- Spokane and Pend Oreille Counties will support SCCD efforts to obtain funding and collect data. (R.III.B.03.a)

## IV. DOMESTIC EXEMPT WELLS

**Objective:** These recommendations are intended to address the impacts of domestic exempt wells on overall water availability. Specific recommendations include developing approaches to land use management that limit the impacts of withdrawals from domestic exempt wells, including managing when domestic exempt wells are installed, limiting maximum daily withdrawals, and reducing summertime water use from these wells during low-flow years (R.IV.A.01.a – R.IV.A.03.a). Recommendations also include collecting additional data to better define the impact of domestic exempt wells on water use and model calibration (R.IV.B.01.a-R.IV.B.02.a), and developing a clear, consistent policy for assigning water rights quantities when water systems take over domestic exempt wells (R.IV.C.01.a).

### **Tasks:**

#### **Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole**

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT, along with Spokane County, will make a formal request to Spokane Regional Health District and the NE Tri-County Health District to evaluate the required production rate, and minimum duration of production at that rate, for domestic exempt wells required for issuance of a building permit, and will recommend that the quantity be increased. (R.IV.A.01.c) (WB.G&LU1-2)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will develop recommendations for criteria for demonstrating water availability before building new development, and send them to counties and other land use regulators. (R.IV.A.01.d, .e)
- The WIT will develop and propose comprehensive plan amendments to the planning commission to address water availability issues, working closely with county staff. (R.IV.A.01.f)
- The WIT will develop a list of procedures for better coordination and communication about water availability between water purveyors and county planning departments and begin, with appropriate county staff, to adopt and implement these. (R.IV.A.01.e)
- WIT members will assist in updating an existing database of domestic exempt well owners for the West Branch of the Little Spokane River. (R.IV.A.03.a, R.V.B.01.a)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2009*

- The WIT will host a summit with purveyors on identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern. (R.IV.A.01.e)

#### *4th Quarter, 2009*

- The WIT will provide oral or written briefings to county commissions, planning commissions, or other policy bodies on the need to better ensure sufficient water availability prior to construction. (R.IV.A.01.d)

#### *Ongoing*

- ★ The WIT, with Spokane County as lead, and support from other counties, cities, water purveyors, and others, will identify owners of domestic exempt wells and issue a press release or send them a letter in mid-summer (when National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) stream flow predictions fall below minimum instream flows) requesting that they voluntarily conserve water. (R.IV.A.03.a) *This will be coordinated with R.V.B.01.a. **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or the SAJB.*
- WIT members will support each county's efforts to establish low residential densities and other land use polices that support the recommendations, by sending letters, providing public testimony, etc. (R.IV.A.01.a)

### **Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane County will coordinate with water purveyors to establish water supply consultation requirements for new developments. (R.IV.A.01.b)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of domestic exempt well owners in the Little Spokane Watershed. (R.IV.A.03.a)
- Ecology will brief the WIT on Policy 1230, "Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals." Following the briefing, the WIT may ask Ecology to clarify the policy to facilitate its consistent implementation. (R.IV.C.01.a)

#### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane and Stevens Counties will develop ordinance language on water availability required for land development and present it to the WIT. In determining water availability, the ordinances will also consider impacts of new developments on streamflows and lake levels. (R.IV.A.01.d) (WB.G&LU1-1, 1-2)

#### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane and Stevens Counties will bring proposed water availability ordinances to the relevant planning committees and work towards adoption with the WIT's support. (R.IV.A.01.d)

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- Ecology will brief the WIT on laws regarding exempt wells, focusing particularly on rights, limitations, and what options WITs or local governments have to restrict or regulate use from exempt wells. (R.IV.A.02.a)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2009*

- Spokane County, in coordination with water purveyors, DOH and Ecology, will identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA. (R.IV.A.01.f)

#### *3rd Quarter, 2009*

- ★ Using purveyors' input from the summit on water availability, Spokane County will conduct a data gap analysis to examine well logs, purveyor information, and the DOH complaint data base to identify areas of



water availability concern. (R.IV.A.01.e) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants.

*Ongoing*

- Spokane County will inform the WIT when rural density changes are proposed. (R.IV.A.01.a)
- Spokane County will provide a summary to the WIT of upcoming policy changes or clarifications with respect to residential densities that affect water supplies. (R.IV.A.01.a)

## V. WATER RIGHTS AND CLAIMS

**Objective:** These recommendations address water management strategies to ensure water is available in the future for all beneficial uses. Specific recommendations include improving the understanding of water rights (R.V.A.01.a – R.V.A.01.d), acquiring water rights to increase instream flows (R.V.A.02.a), and reducing summertime water use to increase river flow during low-flow years (R.V.B.01.a – R.IV.B.01.b).

**Tasks:**

**Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole**

*1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will request that Ecology hire a Water Master to oversee data gathering, evaluation, and enforcement, and to have direct contact with landowners. (R.V.A.01.a, .b)

*3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will meet to discuss the content of the funding request letter to be sent to the Legislature. (R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.02.a) *This will be coordinated with R.III.A.01.c and .d.*

*4th Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will write a letter to the Legislature which addresses additional funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights and increased funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program. Spokane County will coordinate with other lead agencies of WRIAs in Eastern Washington on this action. (R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, R.V.A.02.a) *This will be coordinated with R.III.A.01.c and .d.*
- The WIT will ask DOH to compile and present water use data and options for tracking water use in the watershed. (R.V.A.01.b)

*1st Quarter, 2009*

- The WIT will look at Municipal Reserves in other watersheds and obtain more information from Ecology as to the nature of a Municipal Reserve, and how it can be used in WRIA 55/57 for future water rights for municipal water suppliers. (R.V.A.01.c)

*Ongoing*

- When the low streamflow trigger level is reached, the WIT will issue a notice regarding the low water year, and issue Public Safety Announcements and requests for voluntary water conservation measures. (R.V.B.01.b)
- If necessary, the WIT will continue to meet in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of each year to discuss the content of the funding request letter to be sent to the Legislature, and will write and send that letter in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of each year. (R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, R.V.A.02.a) *This will be coordinated with R.III.A.01.c and .d.*

**Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

*1st Quarter, 2008*

- Ecology will meet with the WIT to discuss enforcement issues and options, and identify actions to increase compliance, with educational efforts as the primary approach. (R.V.A.01.a) *This will be coordinated with R.V.B.01.a.*

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- ★ Ecology, DOH, and Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of all water rights holders in the watershed. This database would integrate current property ownership information from the assessor's office and planning or building departments. (R.V.B.01.a) **Potential Funding Sources:** Legislative appropriations.

#### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- Ecology will provide the WIT with a water rights enforcement strategy and regularly report on enforcement actions. (R.V.A.01.a)

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- Ecology will brief the WIT on its findings from the pre-adjudication work and seek input on public education and outreach efforts. (R.V.A.01.d)
- ★ Spokane County will design a water use inventory for WRIA 55/57 either by hiring a consultant or doing it in-house. (R.V.A.01.b) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or APA-funded County staff time.

#### *Ongoing*

- Ecology will send a letter ordering curtailment to all junior water rights holders subject to adopted instream flow rules in mid-summer when stream flows drop below the established minimum flow. (R.V.B.01.a) *This will be coordinated with R.IV.A.03.a and R.III.B.02.a.*
- ★ Ecology and DOH will work together to either merge or make compatible their water rights databases. The WIT will support additional state-wide funding for this effort. (R.V.A.01.b) **Potential Funding Sources:** Legislative appropriations.

### **WIT Support for Actions by Others**

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The RWCC, in cooperation with NOAA and Avista, will gather and compile relevant hydrologic data to note when low-flow years are anticipated in order to initiate media activities to encourage additional water conservation measures. (R.V.B.01.b)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The RWCC will determine a low streamflow trigger level, which will likely be the same as that for R.IV.A.03.a and R.V.B.01.a. (R.V.B.01.b)

#### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The RWCC will develop media partners, such as the Spokane Weather Channel, who could publish information on projected stream flows similar to air quality indices. (R.V.B.01.b)

## **VI. STRATEGIES FOR BASE FLOW AUGMENTATION**

**Objective:** Specific recommendations include supporting water resource management approaches that augment water supply in the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins during the summer high-water-use period. These include land management methods that slow the release of winter snowmelt and runoff into streams (R.VI.A.01.a – R.VI.A.01.f), storage approaches that slow winter snowmelt and runoff (R.VI.A.02.a-R.VI.A.02.d, R.VI.B.01.a-R.VI.B.01.d), and possibly moving water supply well pumping away from the Spokane River during the summer low-flow season (R.VI.C.01.a).

## Tasks:

### Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will send a letter to the Governor supporting the purchase of the Rustler's Gulch property by the State of Washington. (R.VI.A.01.f) (WB.G&LU3-7)
- The WIT will encourage Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties to retain or hire a wetlands biologist who makes site visits as part of the permitting and compliance processes, as well as a full-time development code enforcement officer, and will support and assist counties in obtaining grants or other funding for these hires. (R.VI.A.01.a, .d) (WB.G&LU3-2, 3-3)
- The WIT will encourage Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties and the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) to require loggers to post a sign bearing their name for five years following logging in order to encourage an improvement in forest practices. (R.VI.A.01.c)

#### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will meet with fire districts to collaborate on education efforts to discourage slope denuding. (R.VI.A.01.c)

#### *4th Quarter, 2009*

- A sub-committee of the WIT will conduct briefings to the boards of county commissioners, planning commissions, etc. to inform them of the merits of land use policies or regulations that adequately preserve vegetation in natural drainages. (R.VI.A.01.f)

#### *Ongoing*

- The WIT will support increased funding to conservation districts for programs that address runoff and infiltration. (R.VI.A.01.e)

### Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane and Stevens Counties will identify wetlands within the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) and associated maps, and develop a strategy to preserve wetlands. (R.VI.A.01.a, .d)
- Spokane County and the City of Spokane will consider using wetlands as a part of the stormwater management system. (R.VI.A.01.a)
- The SCCD will look at the Conservations Futures program for potential wetlands areas to purchase. (R.VI.A.01.a)
- The SCCD will apply for grants to conduct custom direct seeding in order to obtain farmer buy-in. (R.VI.A.01.e)
- The POCD will take the lead in collaboration with other counties and state agencies, particularly WDFW, in determining a narrowly focused beaver dam education strategy. (R.VI.A.02.d)
- ★ Spokane County will review wetlands in WRIA 55 and 57 based on the US Fish and Wildlife National Wetland Inventory and the Spokane County Critical Areas standard, compare existing wetlands with historical wetlands, and develop a list of historical wetland areas in WRIA 55 and 57 not currently functioning as wetlands. (R.VI.A.01.a) **Funding Source:** Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology.

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The SCCD will seek additional funding to enhance their current efforts to create new wetlands and the POCD will initiate similar actions. WIT members will support conservation districts' efforts to obtain additional funds. (R.VI.A.01.b)
- ★ The POCD and Pend Oreille County, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will identify and coordinate public/private purchase of important wetlands in the WB LSR watershed for conservation by

working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts. (R.VI.A.01.d) (WB.G&LU2-2) **Potential Funding Sources:** The Conservation Futures Program in Spokane County or Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR Committee in Pend Oreille County.

- The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will assess the culvert at the outlet of Eloika Lake and determine if the culvert elevation contributes to lowered lake levels. (R.VI.A.02.a) (WB.SW4-1)
- ★ The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will conduct a feasibility analysis of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake to maintain the lake's elevation and serve, if needed, to augment baseflows in downstream reaches of the Little Spokane River. (R.VI.A.02.a) (WB.SW4-2) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR Committee, or the City of Spokane.
- ★ WDFW will investigate and address illegal beaver dam removal at the southern end of Eloika Lake. (R.VI.A.02.d) (WB.SW4-3) **Potential Funding Sources:** Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR Committee, or other Legislative appropriations.
- ★ Spokane County will hire consultants to do two feasibility analyses of the use of surface runoff storage in 1) existing lakes (R.VI.B.01.a) and 2) new reservoirs, manmade ponds, or wetlands (R.VI.B.01.b) as a means of augmenting base flow in the Middle Spokane Watershed. The feasibility analyses will include:
  - An engineering analysis of the feasibility of surface water flow augmentation at one or more sites.
  - A wetlands delineation and assessment.
  - An explanation of the legal issues, including water rights, and identification of all needed permits.**Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or the City of Spokane.

#### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- Spokane and Stevens Counties will consider adopting forest management and development requirements that a minimum number of existing trees be retained, particularly on slopes. (R.VI.A.01.c)
- ★ Spokane County will present the categorized wetland opportunities list to the WIT for decision on several wetlands for further study, and will develop in-depth reports for chosen wetland opportunities. (R.VI.A.01.a) **Funding Source:** Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology.

#### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- ★ The POCD will conduct site identification and feasibility studies for instream water storage projects throughout the WB LSR Watershed, both to augment summer flows downstream and to alleviate flooding. (R.VI.A.02.a) (WB.SW2-1) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR Committee, or the City of Spokane.
- ★ Spokane County, in close coordination with the City of Spokane and other appropriate water purveyors, will take the lead in designing and conducting an analysis of the benefits and costs of moving pumping away from wells near the river during the summer low-flow season. The analysis (which may be done in-house or by hiring a consultant) will:
  - Identify locations to do trials
  - Identify measuring points.
  - Evaluate the impacts of exercising full inchoate water rights.
  - Evaluate the costs of moving pumping away from the river.
  - Use the Bi-State Aquifer model to evaluate the benefits of moving pumping away from the river. (R.VI.C.01.a) **Potential Funding Sources:** Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, City of Spokane, or APA-funded County staff time.

#### *2nd Quarter, 2009*

- ★ Spokane County will present the in-depth wetland study report to the WIT for their decision on the most likely opportunities for implementation, and will develop cost estimates. (R.VI.A.01.a) **Funding Source:** Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology.

#### *Ongoing*

- The WIT will encourage counties to better enforce current land use codes for wetlands restoration and preservation. (R.VI.A.01.a, .d)
- The SCCD and POCD will involve the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in wetland activities if necessary. (R.VI.A.01.b)
- ★ Spokane County will conduct an on-site investigation, and develop restoration designs, for restoration of functioning wetlands in the Saltese Flats. (R.VI.A.01.a) **Funding Source:** Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology

#### **WIT Support for Actions by Others**

- The consultant hired to conduct a storage feasibility study for existing lakes in the Little Spokane watershed will also conduct site identification and feasibility analysis of storage in artificial lakes or ponds if funding is sufficient. (R.VI.A.02.b)
- The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, and Spokane will develop and adopt urban forestry regulations throughout the WRIA. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions. (R.VI.A.01.c)

## **VII. STRATEGIES FOR GROUND WATER RECHARGE AUGMENTATION**

**Objective:** These recommendations are designed to augment ground water recharge. Specific recommendations include using stormwater management approaches that foster the maintenance or enhancement of natural ground water recharge rates due to direct precipitation, particularly using stormwater runoff from development to enhance recharge (R.VII.A.01.a – R.VII.A.01.c); using reclaimed and reused water for aquifer storage and recovery to support water supply and/or river base flow needs (R.VII.B.01.a-R.VII.B.01.c); and using Spokane River water diversions to recharge groundwater during high flow periods in order to mitigate municipal water supply pumping and enhance the River's base flow (R.VII.C.01.a-R.VII.C.03.a).

#### **Tasks:**

#### **Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole**

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will create a sub-committee to examine current stormwater plans, and take recommendations to cities and counties during the public involvement period on: (R.VII.A.01.b)
  - What new policies and/or plan amendments need to be made
  - Potential incentives, such as bonus densities, that could be included.
  - Public involvement opportunities during the development or amendment of stormwater plans – particularly in the Cities of Spokane and Spokane Valley, and Spokane County.

#### *4th Quarter, 2008*

- The stormwater sub-committee of the WIT will develop specific policy recommendations that support infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps. The WIT will finalize and forward the recommendations to the counties, and will work with the counties to adopt the recommendations. (R.VII.A.01.c)

#### *Ongoing*

- The WIT will track regulatory proposals to amend stormwater regulations and comment as appropriate. (R.VII.A.01.a)

- The WIT will discourage regulations that allow stormwater to be piped into the river, unless there are no other options available. (R.VII.A.01.a)
- WIT members will bring information regarding federal, private, or other funding opportunities to the attention of the WIT to fund storage feasibility assessments. (R.VII.C.01.a)
- Spokane County will actively participate in the mitigation subcommittee and make suggestions for local criteria. (R.VII.C.01.d)

#### **Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

##### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT, with Spokane County as the lead, will identify grant opportunities and apply for funding to conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge. (R.VII.C.01.a)

##### *1st Quarter, 2009*

- ★ Spokane County, with support from the WIT, will issue an RFP and hire a consultant to identify potential infiltration areas to augment the Spokane River's summer baseflow. The consultant will evaluate and rank the feasibility of specific sites and processes. The assessment will include a water quality component to ensure that infiltrating water does not violate anti-degradation regulations. (R.VII.C.01.b, R.VII.C.02.a and .b)  
**Potential Funding Sources:** The City of Spokane, Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, Spokane County's Wetland Restoration Feasibility Study grant from Ecology, or other Ecology grants.

##### *4th Quarter, 2009*

- ★ Spokane County, in coordination with Ecology, will incorporate the new license agreement for Avista into the Bi-State Aquifer model once that agreement is finalized. (R.VII.C.03.a) **Potential Funding Sources:** The City of Spokane or APA-funded County staff time.

##### *Ongoing*

- During the stormwater planning process, Spokane County and the Cities of Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley will address channeling stormwater infiltration through natural sumps. (R.VII.A.01.c)
- Ecology will continue to work with a subcommittee to begin a state-wide discussion of mitigation credits. Issues to be discussed include whether specific conservation and augmentation actions count as mitigation, and how mitigation would affect the issuance of new water rights. Following this process, Ecology will issue a policy guidance document on mitigation. (R.VII.C.01.d, R.VII.C.02.d)

#### **WIT Support for Actions by Others**

- Wastewater treatment plants are encouraged to hire consultants to evaluate the feasibility of indirectly recharging aquifers with reclaimed water. The City of Spokane, Spokane County and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District should collaborate in this effort. (R.VII.B.01.a, .b, .c)

## **VIII. APPROACHES TO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

**Objective:** This set of recommendations and actions are directed towards effective implementation of the plan. Specific recommendations which have not yet been fully implemented include continuing education and evaluation to fill data gaps which might limit the scope or implementation of the plan (R.VIII.B.01.a-.c), utilizing existing systems to forecast water availability in the Spokane and Little Spokane watersheds (R.VIII.C.01.a-.b), and promoting funding of projects included in the Watershed Plan (R.VIII.D.01.a-.b), as well as recommendations that the plan be responsive to changing needs and new information within the watersheds (R.VIII.E.01.a-.c). Recommendations to address the structure and membership of the Planning Unit as it moves into the implementation phase (R.VIII.A.01.a-.c) have already been implemented.

## Tasks:

### Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

#### *1st Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will encourage the National Weather Service, the NRCS and the USGS to publicize their forecasts. (R.VIII.C.01.a)

#### *2nd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will work with the NRCS to translate their forecast information to the public and begin to publicize these data. (R.VIII.C.01.a)

#### *3rd Quarter, 2008*

- The WIT will hold a meeting to discuss possible uses of forecasting data. Issues to be considered include the forecasting by the Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima, which predicts water levels in reservoirs based on stream flows and snow pack. These forecasts are used by all water users to prepare for water shortages. (R.VIII.C.01.a)
- A WIT subcommittee will address how to appropriately convey forecasting information to the media, and appropriate formats for presenting information to the public. (R.VIII.C.01.b)

#### *Ongoing*

- The WIT will continue to pursue grant funds to fill data gaps in the watershed plan. (R.VIII.B.01.a)
- The WIT will ensure that evaluations are written into all scopes-of-work that implement recommendations of the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Plan. (R.VIII.B.01.b)
- WIT members will continue to improve projects as funding and information becomes available. (R.VIII.B.01.c)
- The WIT will continue to pursue Ecology grant funding for projects. After the DIP is completed, the WIT will identify other grants or funding sources (e.g. federal, private, other agencies). (R.VIII.D.01.b)
- WIT members will share notice of funding opportunities with the entire WIT. (R.VIII.D.01.b)
- The WIT may consider and approve amendments to the Watershed Plan as needed. Once the amendments are approved by the WIT they must also be adopted by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties. (R.VIII.E.01.a)
- The WIT will review and revise the DIP as funding allows on an ongoing basis. (R.VIII.E.01.a)

## IMPLEMENTATION MATRICES

The following matrices group by quarter all actions to be undertaken in 2008-2009. Actions to be implemented by the WIT are listed first in each quarter, followed by actions to be implemented by other WIT members or actions supported by the WIT. Recommendation numbers are noted in the left-hand column. Identified funding sources are noted in the right-hand column; a key to abbreviations is found on at the bottom of each page.

1st Quarter, 2008		Funding Sources
R.I.A.01.c	The WIT will support RWCC efforts to coordinate conservation education programs.	D
R.I.A.02.a	The WIT will encourage all water purveyors in the WRIA to conduct a survey of their users to determine public knowledge and attitudes about water conservation and outdoor water use.	D
R.I.A.02.g	The WIT and WDOH will encourage purveyors to consider rate incentives in conservation plans to encourage irrigation efficiency.	D
R.I.A.02.g	The WIT will send a letter encouraging the State to offer conservation incentives to irrigators on a state-wide or regional basis. Local legislators will be cc'd on the letter.	D
R.II.E.01.a	WIT members, including state, local, and private entities, will form an Instream Flow work group to look at relevant studies, including TMDL work and instream studies, and will consider water conservation and habitat issues as part of the instream flow regime.	D
R.IV.A.01.c, WB.G&LU1-2	The WIT, along with Spokane County, will make a formal request to Spokane Regional Health District and the NE Tri-County Health District to evaluate the required production rate, and minimum duration of production at that rate, for domestic exempt wells required for issuance of a building permit, and will recommend that the quantity be increased.	D
R.V.A.01.a, .b	The WIT will request that Ecology hire a Water Master to oversee data gathering, evaluation, and enforcement, and to have direct contact with landowners.	D
R.VI.A.01.a, .d, WB.G&LU3-2, 3-3	The WIT will encourage Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties to retain or hire a wetlands biologist who makes site visits as part of the permitting and compliance processes, as well as a full-time development code enforcement officer, and will support and assist counties in obtaining grants or other funding for these hires.	D
R.VI.A.01.c	The WIT will encourage Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties and WDNR to require loggers to post a sign bearing their name for five years following logging in order to encourage an improvement in forest practices.	D
R.VI.A.01.f, WB.G&LU3-7	The WIT will send a letter to the Governor supporting the purchase of the Rustler's Gulch property by the State of Washington.	D
R.VII.A.01.b	The WIT will create a sub-committee to examine current stormwater plans, and take specific recommendations to cities and counties during the public involvement period.	D
R.VIII.C.01.a	The WIT will encourage the National Weather Service, the NRCS, and the USGS to publicize their forecasts.	D
R.I.A.01.b	The RWCC will prepare a master list of water conservation actions in the region and recommend standardized methods to measure conservation from these activities.	D
R.I.A.01.c	The RWCC will take the lead on coordinating existing regional conservation education programs and reporting to the WIT on such programs.	D
R.I.C.01.b	Ecology will compile a list of possible tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies.	D
R.II.A.02.a	Avista, in cooperation with the USGS, will continue to fund the Post Falls gauge as a real-time gauge.	D
R.III.B.01.a	Whitworth Water District, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane will take the lead in developing an outline on how to proceed on monitoring the effects of exporting water, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology, cost, etc.	D
R.III.B.03.a	If the gauges at Chattaroy and/or Elk are reactivated, Ecology will evaluate data to assess whether minimum instream flows are being met.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.



R.III.B.03.c	The SCCD will contract with the USGS to maintain the Elk stream gauge on the mainstem of the Little Spokane River with current real-time data available via satellite on the USGS web page.	SGOM
R.IV.A.01.b	Spokane County will coordinate with water purveyors to establish water supply consultation requirements for new developments.	D
R.V.A.01.a	Ecology will meet with the WIT to discuss enforcement issues and options, and identify actions to increase compliance, with educational efforts as the primary approach.	D
R.V.B.01.b	The RWCC, in cooperation with NOAA and Avista, will gather and compile relevant hydrologic data to note when low-flow years are anticipated in order to initiate media activities to encourage additional water conservation measures.	D
R.VI.A.01.a, .d	Spokane and Stevens Counties will identify wetlands within the CAO and associated maps, and develop a strategy to preserve wetlands.	D
R.VI.A.01.a	Spokane County and the City of Spokane will consider using wetlands as a part of the stormwater management system.	D
R.VI.A.01.a	The SCCD will look at the Conservations Futures program for potential wetlands areas to purchase.	D
R.VI.A.01.a	Spokane County will review wetlands in WRIA 55/57, compare existing wetlands with historical wetlands, and develop a list of historical wetland areas in WRIA 55 and 57 not currently functioning as wetlands.	WRFS
R.VI.A.01.e	The SCCD will apply for grants to conduct custom direct seeding in order to obtain farmer buy-in.	D
R.VI.A.02.d	The POCD will take the lead in collaboration with other counties and state agencies, particularly WDFW, in determining a narrowly focused beaver dam education strategy.	D
R.VII.C.01.a	The WIT, with Spokane County as the lead, will identify grant opportunities and apply for funding to conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.	D

2nd Quarter, 2008		Funding Sources
R.I.A.02.c	The WIT will meet with leaders of the WSU landscape design program to discuss options for additional xeriscaping incentives and/or education.	D
R.II.A.01.d	The WIT will identify funding sources to continue operation of the gauge at Barker Road.	D
R.III.B.04.c	The WIT will hold a meeting to solicit input from user groups on needs and options for creating future parks or access points.	D
R.IV.A.01.d, .e	The WIT will develop recommendations for criteria for demonstrating water availability before building new development, and send them to counties and other land use regulators.	D
R.IV.A.01.e	The WIT will develop a list of procedures for better coordination and communication about water availability between water purveyors and county planning departments and begin, with appropriate county staff, to adopt and implement these.	D
R.IV.A.01.f	The WIT will develop and propose comprehensive plan amendments to the planning commission to address water availability issues, working closely with county staff.	D
R.IV.A.03.a, R.V.B.01.a	WIT members will assist in updating an existing database of domestic exempt well owners for the West Branch Little Spokane River.	D
R.VIII.C.01.a	The WIT will work with the NRCS to translate their forecast information to the public and begin to publicize these data.	D
R.I.A.02.b	The RWCC should coordinate education activities for xeriscaping to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency and effectiveness of various city and county efforts.	D
R.I.A.02.b	The SCCD, WSU Extension, and local homeowners' associations will coordinate the development of a targeted education program on outdoor landscaping.	D
R.I.A.02.c, .d	The SCCD will develop a descriptive inventory of xeriscaping and water conservation demonstration sites.	D
R.I.A.02.e	Water purveyors will initiate personal, one-to-one communications with the largest water users in their service area to develop specific water conservation strategies.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

R.I.A.02.g	The Cities of Spokane and Liberty Lake and Spokane County will develop and implement golf course water conservation strategies for the golf courses which they own or manage.	APA, C, W
R.I.A.02.g	The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County will develop and implement a water conservation strategy for public parks.	APA, C, W
R.I.C.01.b	The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County will evaluate the internal feasibility of proposed tax incentives, permitting and/or regulatory credits to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies.	D
R.IV.A.03.a	Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of domestic exempt well owners in the Little Spokane Watershed.	D
R.IV.C.01.a	Ecology will brief the WIT on Policy 1230, "Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals." Following the briefing, the WIT may ask Ecology to clarify the policy to facilitate its consistent implementation.	D
R.V.B.01.a	Ecology, DOH, and Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of all water rights holders in the watershed.	LA
R.V.B.01.b	The RWCC will determine a low streamflow trigger level, which will likely be the same as that for R.IV.A.03.a and R.V.B.01.a.	D
R.VI.A.01.b	The SCCD will seek additional funding to enhance their current efforts to create new wetlands and the POCD will initiate similar actions. WIT members will support conservation districts' efforts to obtain additional funds.	D
R.VI.A.01.d, WB.G&LU2-2	The POCD and Pend Oreille County, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will identify and coordinate public/private purchase of important wetlands in the WB LSR watershed for conservation by working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts.	CF, WB
R.VI.A.02.a, WB.SW4-1	The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will assess the culvert at the outlet of Eloika Lake and determine if the culvert elevation contributes to lowered lake levels.	D
R.VI.A.02.a, WB.SW4-2	The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will conduct a feasibility analysis of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake to maintain the lake's elevation and serve, if needed, to augment baseflows in downstream reaches of the Little Spokane River.	C, E, WB
R.VI.B.01.a, R.VI.B.01.b	Spokane County will hire consultants to do two feasibility analyses of the use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes and new reservoirs, manmade ponds, or wetlands as a means of augmenting base flow in the Middle Spokane Watershed. See workplan or recommendations for more details.	C, E
R.I.B.01.a	The RWCC will provide education to retailers such as home-improvement stores or nurseries on water conservation. Topics will include products which will improve efficiency and conservation of outdoor water use, and plants which are recommended for xeriscaping. The RWCC should consider collaborating with the Interdisciplinary Design Institute of WSU Spokane.	D

3rd Quarter, 2008		Funding Sources
R.I.C.01.d	The WIT will encourage purveyors, counties, and wastewater utilities to explore water reuse and reclamation opportunities via pilot projects.	D
R.II.E.01.a	The Instream Flow work group will provide recommendations to the WRIA 55/57 and WRIA 54 planning units on flow regimes for the Middle Spokane River.	D
R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.02.a	The WIT will meet to discuss the content of the funding request letter to be sent to the Legislature.	D
R.VIII.C.01.a	The WIT will hold a meeting to discuss possible uses of forecasting data. Issues to be considered include the forecasting by the Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima, which predicts water levels in reservoirs based on stream flows and snow pack. These forecasts are used by all water users to prepare for water shortages.	D
R.VIII.C.01.b	A WIT subcommittee will address how to appropriately convey forecasting information to the media, and appropriate formats for presenting information to the public.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

R.I.B.01.a	The RWCC will explore how and where to gather and present per capita water usage data.	D
R.IV.A.01.d, WB.G&LU1- 1, 1-2	Spokane and Stevens Counties will develop ordinance language on water availability required for land development and present it to the WIT. In determining water availability, the ordinances will also consider impacts of new developments on streamflows and lake levels.	D
R.V.B.01.b	The RWCC will develop media partners, such as the Spokane Weather Channel, who could publish information on projected stream flows similar to air quality indices.	D
R.VI.A.01.a	Spokane County will present the categorized wetland opportunities list to the WIT for decision on several wetlands for further study, and will develop in-depth reports for chosen wetland opportunities.	WRFS
R.VI.A.01.c	Spokane and Stevens Counties will consider adopting forest management and development requirements that a minimum number of existing trees be retained, particularly on slopes.	D

4th Quarter, 2008		Funding Sources
R.I.A.02.b, d	WIT members will each compile a summary of xeriscaping incentives, requirements, or other components from local comprehensive plans and development regulations (including permitting requirements) that address xeriscaping or other water conservation actions. The WIT will evaluate what is currently being done in response to these plans and regulations and identify areas where additional incentives for compliance could be useful. The WIT will also evaluate the effectiveness of incentives such as tiered rate structures for water usage, and bonus density or bonus heights in exchange for xeriscaping.	D
R.I.C.01.b	Based on the results of the internal feasibility assessment, the WIT will recommend incentives for consideration by local governments to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies.	D
R.III.A.01.c,d	The WIT will write a letter to the Legislature supporting additional funding for WDFW to conduct studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences.	D
R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, R.V.A.02.a	The WIT will write a letter to the Legislature which addresses additional funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights and increased funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program. Spokane County will coordinate with other lead agencies of WRAs in Eastern Washington on this action.	D
R.V.A.01.b	The WIT will ask DOH to compile and present water use data and options for tracking water use in the watershed.	D
R.VI.A.01.c	The WIT will meet with fire districts to collaborate on education efforts to discourage slope denuding.	D
R.VII.A.01.c	The stormwater sub-committee of the WIT will develop specific policy recommendations that support infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps. The WIT will finalize and forward the recommendations to the counties, and will work with the counties to adopt the recommendations.	D
R.I.A.02.b	Spokane County, in cooperation with cities, other counties, and conservation districts, will develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits and cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and for builders; both will include sample landscape designs. The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley will distribute these materials.	D
R.I.A.02.c	The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC, will continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers.	D
R.I.A.02.f	Spokane County will collect and report data on pilot water conservation and irrigation efficiency projects.	D
R.II.A.01.a, R.II.E.01.a	Ecology will initiate rule-making to adopt instream flows for the Middle Spokane River.	D
R.III.B.05.a, WB.SW2-2	The SCCD, in cooperation with the POCD, will prepare and implement a comprehensive gauging strategy for streams and lakes in the West Branch of the Little Spokane River. The strategy will be based on an assessment of existing gauge data, and will prioritize recommended gauge locations, identify the types of gauges needed, identify the agencies that will maintain gauges and analyze the data, and discuss options to maximize the benefit of volunteer monitoring efforts.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

R.III.B.05.a	The POCD, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will assess the impact of beaver dams on water levels in Diamond Lake.	D
R.IV.A.01.d	Spokane and Stevens Counties will bring proposed water availability ordinances to the relevant planning committees and work towards adoption with the WIT's support.	D
R.V.A.01.a	Ecology will provide the WIT with a water rights enforcement strategy and regularly report on enforcement actions.	D

1st Quarter, 2009		Funding Sources
R.I.A.02.b	The WIT will develop a package of recommended incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation, with a particular focus on the initial landscape planning prior to development.	D
R.III.B.03.a	The WIT will consider seeking funding and cooperation with interested parties on the gauge(s) at Chattaroy/Elk, depending on the utility of the data for Ecology's water rights regulation.	D
R.III.B.05.a	The WIT will consider whether additional gauges should be installed on tributaries to the West Branch, depending on funding and data needs, based on the stream gauging strategy prepared by the SCCD.	D
R.V.A.01.c	The WIT will look at Municipal Reserves in other watersheds and obtain more information from Ecology as to the nature of a Municipal Reserve, and how it can be used in WRIA 55/57 for future water rights for municipal water suppliers.	D
R.I.A.01.a	Spokane County will implement an indoor conservation program targeting sewer customers as part of the TMDL program.	D
R.I.A.02.f	Water purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency, and share this information with relevant customers.	D
R.I.A.02.f	Water purveyors will evaluate data on weather trends to determine temperature impacts on water use. Average monthly temperature and precipitation will be correlated with water use. The WIT will provide assistance in developing a consistent methodology.	D
R.I.C.01.a	The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley, Spokane County, and/or wastewater utilities will survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and will share survey data.	C, E
R.III.B.04.c	The SCCD will seek willing landowners for the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program for creating future parks or access points.	D
R.IV.A.02.a	Ecology will brief the WIT on laws regarding exempt wells, focusing particularly on rights, limitations, and what options WITs or local governments have to restrict or regulate use from exempt wells.	D
R.V.A.01.d	Ecology will brief the WIT on its findings from the pre-adjudication work and seek input on public education and outreach efforts.	D
R.V.A.01.b	Spokane County will design a water use inventory for WRIA 55/57 either by hiring a consultant or doing it in-house.	E, APA
R.VI.A.02.a, WB.SW2-1	The POCD will conduct site identification and feasibility studies for instream water storage projects throughout the WB LSR Watershed, both to augment summer flows downstream and to alleviate flooding.	E, C, WB,
R.VI.C.01.a	Spokane County, in close coordination with the City of Spokane and other appropriate water purveyors, will take the lead in designing and conducting an analysis of the benefits and costs of moving pumping away from wells near the river during the summer low-flow season. See workplan or recommendation for more details of the analysis.	C, E, APA
R.VII.C.01.b, R.VII.C.02.a and .b	Spokane County, with support from the WIT, will issue an RFP and hire a consultant to identify potential infiltration areas to augment the Spokane River's summer baseflow. The consultant will evaluate and rank the feasibility of specific sites and processes. The assessment will include a water quality component to ensure that infiltrating water does not violate anti-degradation regulations.	C, E

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

2nd Quarter, 2009		Funding Sources
R.III.A.01.f	The WIT will evaluate funding needs to conduct a PHABSIM (or other habitat model) analysis.	D
R.IV.A.01.e	The WIT will host a summit with purveyors on identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.	D
R.I.A.01.a	Water purveyors will consider providing customers in the watershed with graphs or other information depicting average monthly or bi-monthly consumption and seasonal consumption to encourage conservation.	D
R.I.C.01.a	Ecology and DOH, in collaboration with the Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County, will develop water reclamation and reuse education/outreach programs that build on the public perception survey data and address specific regional concerns and goals.	E, C, SAJB, SW, WB
R.IV.A.01.f	Spokane County, in coordination with water purveyors, DOH and Ecology, will identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA.	D
R.VI.A.01.a	Spokane County will present the in-depth wetland study report to the WIT for their decision on the most likely opportunities for implementation, and will develop cost estimates.	WRFS

3rd Quarter, 2009		Funding Sources
R.IV.A.01.e	Using purveyors' input from the summit on water availability, Spokane County will conduct a data gap analysis to examine well logs, purveyor information, and the DOH complaint data base to identify areas of water availability concern.	E

4th Quarter, 2009		Funding Sources
R.IV.A.01.d	The WIT will provide oral or written briefings to county commissions, planning commissions, or other policy bodies on the need to better ensure sufficient water availability prior to construction.	D
R.VI.A.01.f	A sub-committee of the WIT will conduct briefings to the boards of county commissioners, planning commissions, etc. to inform them of the merits of land use policies or regulations that adequately preserve vegetation in natural drainages.	D
R.I.A.02.c, .d	The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC, will continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.	D
R.I.A.02.f	Water purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency.	D
R.VII.C.03.a	Spokane County, in coordination with Ecology, will incorporate the new license agreement for Avista into the Bi-State Aquifer model once that agreement is finalized.	C, APA

Ongoing		Funding Sources
R.I.A.01.b	WIT member agencies will provide customers with water-saving incentives consistent with the Spokane River TMDL requirements.	D
R.I.A.02.b	The WIT will continue to seek funding for education and implementation of incentives for water conservation and xeriscaping.	D
R.III.A.01.c, .d	The WIT will keep abreast of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences, and determine whether to conduct flow studies on the tributaries.	D
R.III.A.01.c, .d	As necessary, prior to each legislative session, the WIT will communicate to the Legislature its support for WDFW funding needs to conduct studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences.	D
R.III.B.03.a	Spokane and Pend Oreille Counties will support SCCD efforts to obtain funding and collect data.	
R.III.B.03.b	The WIT, working with Pend Oreille County, Ecology, Spokane Community College, the SCCD, and others, will continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements.	D
R.III.B.04.a, .b	The WIT will continue to discuss options such as seasonal storage that would be used throughout the watershed to enhance recreation.	D
R.III.C.01.a	WIT members will continue to participate in the TMDL process.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

R.IV.A.01.a	WIT members will support each county's efforts to establish low residential densities and other land use polices that support the recommendations, by sending letters, providing public testimony, etc.	D
R.IV.A.03.a	The WIT, with Spokane County as lead, and support from other counties, cities, water purveyors, and others, will identify owners of domestic exempt wells and issue a press release or send them a letter in mid-summer (when NOAA stream flow predictions fall below minimum instream flows) requesting that they voluntarily conserve water.	E, SAJB
R.V.A.01.a, R.V.A.01.d, R.V.A.02.a	If necessary, the WIT will continue to meet in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter of each year to discuss the content of the funding request letter to be sent to the Legislature, and will write and send that letter in the 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter of each year.	D
R.V.B.01.b	When the low streamflow trigger level is reached, the WIT will issue a notice regarding the low water year, and issue Public Safety Announcements and requests for voluntary water conservation.	D
R.VI.A.01.e	The WIT will support increased funding to conservation districts for programs that address runoff and infiltration.	D
R.VII.A.01.a	The WIT will track regulatory proposals to amend stormwater regulations and comment as appropriate.	D
R.VII.A.01.a	The WIT will discourage regulations that allow stormwater to be piped into the river, unless there are no other options available.	D
R.VII.C.01.a	WIT members will bring information regarding federal, private or other funding opportunities to the attention of the WIT to fund storage feasibility assessments.	D
R.VIII.B.01.a	The WIT will continue to pursue grant funds to fill data gaps in the watershed plan.	D
R.VIII.B.01.b	The WIT will ensure that evaluations are written into all scopes-of-work that implement recommendations of the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Plan.	D
R.VIII.B.01.c	WIT members will continue to improve projects as funding and information becomes available.	D
R.VIII.D.01.b	The WIT will continue to pursue Ecology grant funding for projects. After the DIP is completed, the WIT will identify other grants or funding sources (e.g. federal, private, other agencies).	D
R.VIII.D.01.b	WIT members will share notice of funding opportunities with the entire WIT.	D
R.VIII.E.01.a	The WIT may consider and approve amendments to the Watershed Plan as needed. Once the amendments are approved by the WIT they must also be adopted by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties.	D
R.VIII.E.01.a	The WIT will review and revise the DIP as funding allows on an ongoing basis.	D
R.I.A.01.a, c, R.I.B.01.a, WB.ED1-4	The City of Spokane, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties, the SAJB, and water purveyors will continue education efforts as appropriate and will coordinate among themselves.	D
R.I.A.02.e	The City of Spokane, Spokane County, the SCCD, and Ecology will continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes, as needed.	E, C, APA
R.I.C.01.c	The City of Spokane will compile data for its existing pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	D
R.II.A.01.c	Avista, WDFW, and IDF&G will continue to implement a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation, and emergence for rainbow trout.	D
R.II.A.01.d	Spokane County, in coordination with the Instream Flow work group, will continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, and will update the WIT periodically.	D
R.III.B.02.a	Ecology will meet with the WIT to develop strategies to enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff in the Little Spokane Watershed for exempt wells that have junior water rights.	D
R.III.B.05.a	The SCCD will seek funding to continue operations and maintenance of its current gauges.	D
R.III.B.05.a, WB.SW2-5	The WB LSR Committee members will take notes and/or pictures to document unexplained flow surges on Horseshoe, Eloika, Trout, and Sacheen Lakes.	D
R.IV.A.01.a	Spokane County will inform the WIT when rural density changes are proposed.	D
R.IV.A.01.a	Spokane County will provide a summary to the WIT of upcoming policy changes or clarifications with respect to residential densities that affect water supplies.	D
R.V.B.01.a	Ecology will send a letter ordering curtailment to all junior water rights holders subject to adopted instream flow rules in mid-summer when stream flows drop below the established minimum flow.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

R.V.A.01.b	Ecology and DOH will work together to either merge or make compatible their water rights databases. The WIT will support additional state-wide funding for this effort.	LA
R.VI.A.01.a	Spokane County will conduct an on-site investigation, and develop restoration designs, for restoration of functioning wetlands in the Saltese Flats.	WRFS
R.VI.A.01.a, .d	The WIT will encourage counties to better enforce current land use codes for wetlands restoration and preservation.	D
R.VI.A.01.b	The SCCD and POCD will involve the NRCS in wetland activities if necessary.	D
R.VI.A.01.c	The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, and Spokane will develop and adopt urban forestry regulations throughout the WRIAs.	D
R.VI.A.02.b	The consultant hired to conduct a storage feasibility study for existing lakes in the Little Spokane watershed will also conduct site identification and feasibility analysis of storage in artificial lakes or ponds if funding is sufficient.	D
R.VI.A.02.d, WB.SW4-3	WDFW will investigate and address illegal beaver dam removal at the southern end of Eloika Lake.	D
R.VII.A.01.c	During the stormwater planning process, Spokane County and the Cities of Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley will address channeling stormwater infiltration through natural sumps.	D
R.VII.C.01.d, R.VII.C.02.d	Ecology will continue to work with a subcommittee to begin a state-wide discussion of mitigation credits. Issues to be discussed include whether specific conservation and augmentation actions count as mitigation, and how mitigation would affect the issuance of new water rights. Following this process, Ecology will issue a policy guidance document on mitigation.	D
R.VII.B.01.a, .b, .c	Wastewater treatment plants are encouraged to hire consultants to evaluate the feasibility of indirectly recharging aquifers with reclaimed water. The City of Spokane, Spokane County and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District should collaborate in this effort.	D
R.VII.C.01.d	Spokane County will actively participate in the mitigation subcommittee and make suggestions for local criteria.	D

FUNDING SOURCES: **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County staff time, **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gauge Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

## Part 2: Implementation Plan for Each Recommendation

This section includes specific implementation details for each of the recommendations, excepting those which have already been implemented. Specific responsibilities for implementing each recommendation are assigned to WIT members. Where applicable, obligations made in the Watershed Management Plan are noted. Potential funding sources are noted for actions which will require dedicated funding; other actions are expected to be implemented by WIT member staff, as funding and staff resources allow.

### I. Water Conservation, Reclamation and Reuse

#### Issue I.A.01: What actions can be taken to reduce indoor water use?

##### Recommendation I.A.01.a

***Determine indoor conservation issues (approaches) on which the public needs to be educated (i.e. habits, indoor low-flow devices such as showerheads, faucets, toilets and appliances).***

*(Obligation to Spokane County)*

##### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

##### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The City of Spokane and Spokane County, as well as other large water purveyors, have been implementing this recommendation with ongoing education efforts.

##### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will implement an indoor conservation program targeting Spokane County sewer customers as part of their Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL<sup>2</sup>) program.
- Water purveyors in the watershed will consider providing customers with graphs or other information depicting average monthly or bi-monthly consumption and seasonal water consumption in the watershed to encourage conservation.
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and water purveyors will continue education efforts as staff and funding allows.

##### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

##### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

##### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Conservation information supplied to consumers could also include statistics on how much water is wasted during common tasks (e.g. leaving the water running while brushing teeth or washing dishes).



- The City of Tucson has a good model conservation program.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Indoor conservation programs for Spokane County sewer customers.
- Graphs and other information on water consumption for customers of water purveyors.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Staff at water purveyors, city and county governments will continue to donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$8,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.
- Spokane County staff will oversee and administer their indoor water conservation program as part of their TMDL program.

## **Recommendation I.A.01.b**

***Local authorities / wastewater utilities should evaluate customer indoor water saving incentives as a means to save on new facility costs. If cost effective, incentives should be included in facility and comprehensive planning processes and implemented through local regulation.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Many water purveyors have completed this evaluation.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- WIT member agencies will provide water saving incentives consistent with the Spokane River TMDL requirements.
- The RWCC will prepare a master list of water conservation actions by waste water utilities and water purveyors in the region and recommend standardized methods to measure conservation from these activities.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Water purveyors will continue to measure water savings and re-evaluate cost-effectiveness of incentives on an annual basis.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Water purveyors will continue to measure water savings and re-evaluate cost-effectiveness of incentives on an annual basis.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The TMDL process requires that public NPDES permit holders develop individual and regional programs that reduce flows by funding indoor conservation efforts. Many local agencies are in the process of implementing the requirements in the TMDL.
- The Lacey/Olympia/Tumwater/Thurston County (LOTT) model has been identified as a good model for this area. Spokane County is patterning their indoor water conservation program after the LOTT model.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Implementation of TMDL requirements, as determined by the TMDL oversight committee.
- Completion of a master list of water conservation actions in the region with recommended measurement strategies.
- Incorporation of incentives into facility and comprehensive plans, as well as local regulations.
- Reduced water usage in participating service areas.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Wastewater utility, city and county staff will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Spokane County will provide up to \$1,000,000 per year for four years to implement an indoor water conservation program for Spokane County sewer customers as part of their TMDL program.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Local regulations may be adopted to ensure implementation of the water saving measures.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- This will be implemented through the TMDL requirements. Coordination will be provided by the TMDL oversight committee

## **Recommendation I.A.01.c**

***City and county governments will develop and implement a regional education and awareness program to promote wise and efficient use of the water supply with voluntary participation by water suppliers. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation is currently being implemented by the SAJB and Spokane County in school education programs, and by the City of Spokane and water purveyors, as detailed in their water system plans.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The City of Spokane, counties and the SAJB will continue their current public education programs and expand as appropriate. (WB.ED1-4)
- The RWCC will take the lead on coordinating existing regional conservation education.

- The RWCC will report back to the WIT on conservation education programs.
- The WIT will support RWCC efforts to coordinate conservation education programs.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Consideration should be given as to whether the SAJB and RWCC will work together or have separate roles in conservation efforts.
- The Waterways curriculum from the late 1990s potentially could be revived.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- RWCC report on regional conservation education efforts.
- Implementation of new education efforts in areas not already served.
- Reduced water usage in areas served by participating governments and water suppliers.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The RWCC will seek collaborative funding for regional efforts.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$30,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Spokane County includes water conservation as a component of their education program funded by the regional APA fee program.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- RWCC and TMDL Oversight Committee

## **Recommendation I.A.01.d**

***Municipal water suppliers will develop water conservation programs independently and cooperatively in accordance with Washington State Department of Health regulations and other water suppliers are encouraged to develop their own water conservation programs.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Water purveyors are implementing this recommendation. Details of their efforts are included in their water system plans. (WB.G&LU1-3).

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Underway. No implementation actions needed.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Continued water conservation programming from municipal water suppliers.

**Issue I.A.02: What steps can be taken to reduce domestic, municipal and public outdoor water use?**

## *Recommendation I.A.02.a*

***Determine the outdoor conservation issues (approaches) on which the public needs to be educated (i.e., soil development, plant root development, native/drought-resistant vegetation, xeriscaping).*** (Obligation to Spokane County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Whitworth Water District has provided educational materials and ideas on outdoor conservation issues to its customers on an ongoing basis since 1990.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage all water purveyors in the WRIA to conduct a survey of their users to determine public knowledge and attitudes about water conservation and outdoor water use.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Greater emphasis should be placed on water use because it offers the greatest opportunity for quantity reductions during periods of low stream flows.
- Ecology conducted a focus group survey on this issue.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Surveys of water users conducted by water purveyors.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Water purveyor staff will donate time.

- The City of Spokane has committed \$35,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- The regional APA fee program provides funding to Spokane County’s water conservation education program.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.b**

*Counties/cities consider developing incentives for xeriscaping and use of native and/or drought-resistant vegetation through existing and future planning processes.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County WSU Extension and the SCCD currently promote drought tolerant landscaping.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- WIT members will each compile a summary of xeriscaping incentives, requirements or other components from local comprehensive plans and development regulations that address xeriscaping or other water conservation actions.
- The WIT will also evaluate the effectiveness of incentives such as tiered rate structures for water usage, and bonus density or bonus heights in exchange for xeriscaping.
- The RWCC will compile WIT members’ xeriscaping information and identify areas where additional xeriscaping incentives or requirements could be useful.
- The WIT will develop a package of recommended incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation, with a particular focus on the initial landscape planning prior to development.
- The WIT will coordinate presentations to boards of county commissioners, city councils, city and county planning commissions, and other appropriate policy bodies to request that specific incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation be implemented.
- The WIT will continue to seek funding for education and implementation of incentives for water conservation and xeriscaping.
- The RWCC should coordinate education activities for xeriscaping to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency and effectiveness of various city and county efforts.
- Spokane County, in cooperation with cities, other counties, and conservation districts, will develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits as well as cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and for builders; both will include sample landscape designs.
- The SCCD and POCD will continue the development of a targeted education program on outdoor landscaping and will provide technical assistance to developers in designing xeriscaped developments.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The SCCD or other entities will seek funding to develop new water conservation or xeriscaping demonstration sites, as needed.
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Funding is needed for production and distribution of educational materials.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Xeriscaping materials distributed to all applicants for land use permits.
- Targeted education program on outdoor landscaping offered to homeowners' associations.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- City and county staff will donate time, as available, to develop xeriscaping information.
- SCCD staff will donate time to develop the education program.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.c**

***Include options for xeriscaping in landscape requirements for commercial and industrial developments.*** (Obligation to Spokane County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Xeriscaping options already exist in the City of Spokane but are infrequently implemented.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC and Spokane County WSU Extension, will continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers.
- The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC, will continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.
- The SCCD will develop a descriptive inventory of xeriscaping and water conservation demonstration sites.

- The WIT will meet with leaders of the WSU landscape design program to discuss options for additional xeriscaping incentives and/or education.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The SCCD or other entities will seek funding to develop new water conservation or xeriscaping demonstration sites, as needed.
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Xeriscaping policies could be incorporated in local comprehensive plans.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Options for xeriscaping included in landscape requirements for commercial and industrial developments.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- City and county staff will donate time, as available.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.d**

***Encourage the xeriscaping option for urban open space in planned developments.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Xeriscaping options already exist in the City of Spokane but are infrequently implemented.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD and POCD, in cooperation with the RWCC and WSU Extension, will continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.
- The SCCD will develop a descriptive inventory of xeriscaping and water conservation demonstration sites.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The SCCD or other entities will seek funding to develop new water conservation or xeriscaping demonstration sites, as needed.
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Options for xeriscaping are included in landscape requirements for urban open spaces.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- City/county staff will donate time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.e**

***County/city/water purveyors encourage implementation of water conservation in watering of public properties such as parks, school lawn areas, athletic fields, boulevards, and highway green areas.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The City of Spokane has had trial irrigation demonstration projects at Parks Department facilities. A reuse demonstration project is currently operating at Downriver Golf Course.
- Spokane County is currently evaluating options for use of reclaimed water for irrigation of County-owned parks as part of their Wastewater Facilities planning efforts.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- All water purveyors will initiate personal, one-to-one communications with the largest water users in their service area to develop specific water conservations strategies.
- ★ The City of Spokane, Spokane County, SCCD and Ecology will continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes, as staff funding allows.



## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The number of water conservation strategies developed and implemented by large water users.
- The number of irrigation efficiency classes conducted.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$40,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other funding sources may include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or APA-funded County staff time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.
- Spokane County will oversee and administer their Wastewater Facilities planning efforts.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.f**

***Evaluate the benefits of retrofitting irrigation systems with automatic controllers and other high efficiency components for schools, golf courses, parks, cemeteries, and other large-scale public irrigation projects. (Obligation to Spokane County.)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Pilot projects have been conducted. Water savings at these pilot sites will be measured over the years 2007-2009.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will collect and report data on pilot irrigation efficiency projects.
- Purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency, and share this information with relevant customers.

- Water purveyors will evaluate data on weather trends to determine temperature impacts on water use, correlating average monthly temperature and precipitation with water use.
- The WIT will provide assistance in developing a consistent methodology to determine temperature impacts on water use.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Water purveyors will evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Irrigation efficiency is an important focus for the WIT.
- Documenting weather trends is important because of weather variability and its effects on summer outdoor water use.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The number of new pilot projects to improve irrigation efficiency.
- The number of water purveyors who analyze the impacts of weather on water use.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Water purveyor staff will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$40,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.A.02.g**

***Encourage and evaluate incentives for irrigators (e.g. agricultural and golf course) to implement all feasible irrigation efficiencies.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County Water District # 3 has raised rates for irrigation, as planned, from \$0.23/100 cubic feet to \$0.55/100 cubic feet (gradually increased over time), which should provide some efficiency incentives.
- Whitworth Water District implemented a conservation rate structure in 1999, which has greatly reduced per-connection water use.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- ★ The Cities of Spokane and Liberty Lake and Spokane County will develop and implement golf course water conservation strategies.
- ★ The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley, and Spokane County will develop and implement a water conservation strategy for public parks. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions.
- The WIT will send a letter encouraging the State to offer conservation incentives to irrigators on a state-wide or regional basis. Local legislators will be copied on the letter.
- The WIT and DOH will encourage water purveyors to consider rate incentives in conservation plans to encourage irrigation efficiency.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Spokane County will evaluate implemented irrigation incentives and changes in irrigation efficiencies, as staff and funding allows.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Irrigation conservation is a high priority for the State.
- Irrigators using water from private wells will be harder to target through incentives. Other options include targeted outreach/education conducted by the county, Ecology, or DOH. Quantifying the numbers of such irrigators would be useful.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The number of golf courses that have improved irrigation efficiency.
- Letter to the State and State legislators advocating for state-wide incentives for irrigation efficiency.
- The number of water purveyors who offer rate incentives to encourage irrigation efficiency.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and DOH staff will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$10,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other funding sources may include water purveyors (through water bills) and APA-funded County staff time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## Recommendation I.B.01.a

*Encourage the use of several educational methods to reach all segments of the population (e.g. schools, government, and businesses).*

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SAJB is using TV, radio, internet, comic books and other handouts; wastewater utilities are looking at similar tools.
- Spokane County currently conducts an education program regarding preservation, protection, and enhancement of the SVRP as part of their APA program.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SAJB and water purveyors will continue to their current educational efforts and coordinate these efforts among themselves.
- The RWCC will explore how and where to gather and present per capita water usage data.
- The RWCC will provide education to retailers such as home-improvement stores or nurseries on water conservation. Topics will include products which will improve efficiency and conservation of outdoor water use, and plants which are recommended for xeriscaping. The RWCC should consider collaborating with the Interdisciplinary Design Institute of WSU Spokane.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The focus of this effort should be regional, i.e. beyond the WRIA 55/57 boundaries.
- The Spokane Forum, if established, may be another venue for public education and outreach.
- The goal is to compare per capita usage data to previous years; however, this may be difficult given that meter usage may not all be in the same time frame. As a result, it may be easier to use production volume than usage.
- Some data may be obtained on a monthly basis from cities.
- Overall, this effort represents an opportunity to raise awareness.
- Entities, including Ecology, can work cooperatively in these efforts as they have on other issues.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Meaningful and comparable per capita water usage data collected across the region.
- Water usage data presented in a manner that encourages citizens to consider their own water use and to reduce what they use.

- Educational programs in place in each major population segment (schools, businesses, etc.).

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Water purveyor and RWCC staff will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$30,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Spokane County staff will donate resources as funding allows.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue I.C.01: What economic, political, legal and resource incentives can be implemented to encourage municipalities, utilities and businesses to reclaim and reuse water?**

## *Recommendation I.C.01.a*

***Evaluate the public perception of water reclamation and reuse and determine how to educate the public to increase their understanding of the benefits and risks. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Implementation of this recommendation has been partially completed by Ecology.
- The City of Spokane has a reuse demonstration project at Downriver Golf Course, and will initiate a similar project at Qualchan Golf Course in 2008.
- The Aquifer Protection Council plans to discuss water reuse at its November 2007 meeting, where agencies are expected to discuss technical issues involved, including risks and benefits.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley, Spokane County, and/or wastewater utilities will survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and will share survey data. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar actions.
- ★ Ecology and DOH, in collaboration with the Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley and Spokane County, will develop water reclamation and reuse education and outreach programs that build on the public perception survey data and address specific regional concerns and goals.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- All parties must be involved in discussion on benefits and risks.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Summary of survey results of public opinion of water reclamation and reuse.
- The number of education/outreach programs initiated that addresses water reclamation/reuse.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Local governments and/or wastewater utilities staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$15,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other potential funding sources include the SAJB, Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, and Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.C.01.b**

***Evaluate the potential for tax incentives, permitting and/or regulatory credits that can be used by corporations that want to implement water reuse strategies. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will compile a list of possible tax incentives, permitting and/or regulatory credits for corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies.
- The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Spokane, and Spokane Valley, and Spokane County will evaluate the internal feasibility of proposed tax incentives, permitting and/or regulatory credits to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies. The WIT will encourage other local governments which are not WIT members to consider similar evaluations.
- Based on the results of the internal feasibility assessment, the WIT will recommend incentives for consideration by local governments to be used by corporations and other entities to implement water reuse strategies.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Each local government will consider proposed changes in tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- It would be best to make these changes on a regional basis.
- Implementation of this recommendation depends on involvement from the Association of Washington Business and chambers of commerce.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Summary of issues, concerns and support for potential tax incentives, permits and/or regulatory credits.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Water purveyors, city, county, and Ecology staff will donate time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.C.01.c**

***Evaluate development of cost-effective options for reclamation and reuse in small-scale and decentralized settings. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County already conducted such an evaluation and determined it wasn't feasible.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The City of Spokane will compile data for its existing pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Cities, counties or water purveyors will expand to new pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Small plants, not just large wastewater utilities, should do small-scale projects.
- The City of Spokane plans to do reuse trials at golf courses.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Evaluation of existing pilot projects and recommendations for additional actions.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- City, county and purveyor staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$10,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation I.C.01.d**

***Research possible water reuse and reclamation opportunities.*** (Obligation to Spokane County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The City of Spokane has completed an irrigation feasibility study.
- Whitworth Water District completed a water reuse and reclamation study relating to possible sites within its service area.
- Spokane County is currently evaluating options for use of reclaimed water as part of their Wastewater Facilities planning efforts.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage water purveyors, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties, and wastewater utilities to explore water reuse and reclamation opportunities via pilot projects.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Water purveyors, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Stevens Counties, and wastewater utilities will present conclusions from their initial pilot projects on water reuse and reclamation.
- Water purveyors, counties, and wastewater utilities will conduct additional pilot studies or research on water reuse and reclamation as necessary.



## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The number of pilot projects for water reuse and reclamation.
- Comprehensive presentation of results from all regional pilot studies on water reuse and reclamation.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and water purveyor, city, county and wastewater utility staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## II. Instream Flow Needs for the Middle Spokane River

Issue II.A.01: Does the information on rainbow trout from the Hardin Davis Instream Flow and Habitat Study establish the basis for setting instream flows on the Middle Spokane River?

### *Recommendation II.A.01.a*

***Establish a minimum instream flow for the Spokane River at the Barker Road transect (USGS Gauge 12420500) of 500 cfs to provide significant weighted useable area for juvenile and adult rainbow trout. (Obligation to Spokane County and State of Washington)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will initiate rule-making to adopt instream flows for the Middle Spokane River.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Ecology will look at all new data in setting the flows, including recommendations from other WRIAs and other studies on establishing instream flows.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Minimum instream flow of 500 cubic feet per second (cfs) established on the Spokane River at Barker Road.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Instream flow rule made for the Middle Spokane River.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation II.A.01.b**

***Avista's 2007 operating license for the Spokane River Hydroelectric Development should require a minimum discharge to provide habitat for juvenile and adult rainbow trout that would be protected through a minimum instream flow for the Spokane River at the Barker Road transect (USGS gauge 12420500) of 500 cfs.***

This recommendation will be completed once the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license is granted. No implementation actions are needed.

## **Recommendation II.A.01.c**

***Flow in the Middle Spokane River should be managed to optimize spring spawning, incubation and emergence for rainbow trout. A protocol should be established between the WDFW, IDF&G and Avista to accomplish this task. Specific flow levels and timing would be established as early as possible each year and based on snow pack and expected runoff conditions for that year.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Avista, WDFW, and IDF&G are implementing a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation, and emergence for rainbow trout.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Avista, WDFW, and IDF&G will continue to implement a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation, and emergence for rainbow trout.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Avista, WDFW, and IDF&G will evaluate the rainbow trout spawning, incubation, and emergence protocol, revise if necessary, and continue with implementation.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Optimized spring spawning, incubation and emergence for rainbow trout.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Avista, WDFW, and IDF&G staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- FERC license obtained by Avista.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- FERC has jurisdiction over the implementation of this recommendation. The WIT will comment when appropriate.

## **Recommendation II.A.01.d**

***Continue operation of the Greenacres gauge<sup>5</sup> and study the correlation between the Barker Road and Post Falls flows. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County is currently cooperating with USGS to fund this gauge.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will identify funding sources to continue operation of the gauge at Barker Road.

---

<sup>5</sup> At Barker Road

- Spokane County, in coordination with the Instream Flow work group, will continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, and will update the WIT periodically.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Spokane County, in coordination with the Instream Flow work group, will continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, and will update the WIT periodically.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Spokane County may look for help to continue funding the gauge.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Continued operation of the gauge.
- Observations made about correlations between Greenacres (Barker Road) and Post Falls flows.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Potential sources may include Ecology or a cost share between Spokane County and the USGS.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$10,000, which would support gauge operation at a rate of roughly \$2,000/year for five years.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue II.A.02: Would using Post Falls gauge (USGS gauge 12419000) and/or the Greenacres gauge (12420500) provide better protection for aquatic biota in the Spokane River between the Post Falls HED and Sullivan Road than using the Spokane at Spokane gauge (USGS gauge 12422500) below the Maple Street Bridge?**

## **Recommendation II.A.02.a**

***The flow regime in critical habitat areas for aquatic biota identified in the Spokane River between the Post Falls HED and Sullivan Road are more closely related to flow at the Spokane River near Post Falls gauge (USGS 12419000) and/or the Greenacres gauge (12420500) than at the Spokane River at Spokane gauge (USGS 12422500). To improve flow management in this reach, take steps to upgrade the Post Falls gauge to that of a “real time” gauge. (Obligation complete)***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Avista, in cooperation with the USGS, upgraded the Post Falls gauge to a real-time gauge.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Avista, in cooperation with the USGS, will continue to fund the Post Falls gauge as a real-time gauge.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Post Falls gauge upgraded to a real-time gauge.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Avista, as required by FERC.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000/year for five years for a total of \$10,000.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation II.A.02.b**

***Instream flow for the Lower Spokane River could be managed using USGS Gauge 12422500, the Spokane River at Spokane. Conduct fish habitat studies focusing on juvenile and adult rearing on at least 3 sites in the Lower Spokane River between the Monroe Street HED and the Nine-Mile HED pool. This work could be conducted as part of the WRIA 54, Lower Spokane River Watershed Plan and/or as an Avista relicensing PM&E. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

**Issue II.B.01: What flow provides an aesthetic experience in the “north channel” of the Spokane River in Riverfront Park?**

## **Recommendation II.B.01.a**

***Support a consensus-based agreement within the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group of at least 300 cfs in the north channel of the Spokane River through Riverfront Park as the basis for aesthetic flows.***

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

Issue II.B.02 What flow conditions are needed to provide recreation experience on the Middle Spokane River during the low-flow period?

### **Recommendation II.B.02.a**

*Use the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group findings as the basis for recreation flows in the Middle Spokane River.*

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

### **Recommendation II.B.02.b**

*Evaluate the use of periodic increases in flow during low-flow periods for recreational use in the Middle Spokane River while taking into account effects on aquatic biota, water quality, and safety.*

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

### **Recommendation II.B.02.c**

*Evaluate the impact on aquatic biota, water quality, and safety of managing the declining spring runoff and fall drawdown with releases from the Post Falls HED to optimize recreational use of the Spokane River according to the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group.*

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

Issue II.C.01 How do different flow regimes in the Spokane River affect temperature and dissolved oxygen and what are their consequences for aquatic biota?

### **Recommendation II.C.01.a**

*Encourage the Department of Ecology to use the CEQUALW2 model (with necessary changes) to consider different flow regimes as part of the Spokane River / Lake Spokane TMDL process.*

#### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

#### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- Underway.

#### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- Underway. No implementation actions are needed.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Ecology will not re-run the model until 2012.

**Issue II.D.01 How can spring high flows be managed to meet the needs of fish spawning and incubation and still allow for the diversion of flow for groundwater recharge?**

### *Recommendation II.D.01.a*

***Evaluate how river diversions can be accomplished without impairing spawning and incubation of rainbow trout. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

#### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

#### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- None (not an immediate priority).

#### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- None (not an immediate priority).

#### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT will seek funding for a study of how river diversions can be accomplished without impairing spawning and incubation of rainbow trout, including a cost/benefit analysis, at some point in the future.

#### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The study should build on the Golder Associates storage assessment.<sup>6</sup>

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- Suggestions of river diversions that would not impair fish life cycles.

#### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$15,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

#### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

#### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

---

<sup>6</sup> Golder Associates, December 2004, Final Storage Assessment Little and Middle Spokane Watersheds, Prepared for WRIA 55 and 57 Planning Unit

## Recommendation II.E.01.a

***After the Avista HED license application is filed, the Spokane River / Lake Spokane Dissolved Oxygen TMDL data gathering phase, and instream studies on rearing below Monroe Street HED are completed, integrate all of the recommended instream flows into one regime for the whole watershed. The flow regime will be submitted to the Department of Ecology for instream flow rule making. (Obligation to Spokane County and State of Washington)***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- WIT members, including state, local and private entities, formed an Instream Flow work group to look at relevant studies, including TMDL work and instream studies, and to consider water conservation and habitat issues as part of the instream flow regime.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- WIT members, including state, local and private entities, will form an Instream Flow work group to look at relevant studies, including TMDL work and instream studies, and to consider water conservation and habitat issues as part of the instream flow regime. This activity is ongoing.
- The Instream Flow work group will provide recommendations to the WRIA 55/57 and WRIA 54 planning units on flow regimes for the Middle Spokane River. Recommendations are anticipated in early 2008.
- The WIT will recommend flow regimes to Ecology for instream flow rule-making based on the flow regime analysis prepared by the Instream Flow work group.
- Ecology will proceed with rule-making.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Instream flow rule made.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology staff will donate time.
- Instream Flow Workgroup process is currently funded by Ecology grants and administered by County staff.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.



## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Ecology will be asked to make instream flow rules.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

# III. Instream Flow Needs for the Little Spokane River

Issue III.A.01 Does the information on rainbow trout and mountain whitefish from the Golder study support changing the minimum instream flows on the Little Spokane River?

### Recommendation III.A.01.a

***Recommend no changes in the minimum instream flows for the reaches controlled by the “At Dartford” gauge, the Chattaroy gauge, and the Elk Park gauge in WAC 173-555 at this time. As new data become available the minimum instream flows should be evaluated.***

This recommendation is ongoing. No implementation actions are needed.

### Recommendation III.A.01.b

***Additional studies on instream flow needs for the mainstem and tributaries should be conducted if problems arise with the existing conditions.***

This recommendation is ongoing. No implementation actions are needed.

### Recommendation III.A.01.c

***Studies should be conducted on the major tributaries to determine the extent of and areas where spawning occurs. When this information becomes available, flow studies on the tributaries should be conducted to determine flow needs for the tributaries.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will keep abreast of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences, and will consider whether to conduct flow studies on the tributaries depending on the status of those studies.
- The WIT will write a letter to the Legislature supporting additional funding for WDFW to conduct studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The POCD, in collaboration with the SCCD, Stevens County Conservation District, Ecology, and WDFW, will compile and document existing fisheries information, including an assessment of native fish populations, identify data gaps and collect additional information for the WB LSR watershed. The group may develop restoration and/or watershed enhancement actions as a result of its findings. (WB.H1-1)

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Letter or other communication to the Legislature in support of WDFW funding.
- A WIT decision on whether additional flow studies are needed.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.A.01.d**

***Recommend a study on the Little Spokane River tributaries on optimizing habitat for the target species and linking the preferred flows on the tributaries to flows at the control points.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT did not rate the benefits and practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will keep abreast of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences.
- The WIT will communicate to the Legislature that they support WDFW funding needs.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Depending on the status of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences, the WIT will consider whether to conduct studies on optimizing fish habitat.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The near-term actions will not occur until after gauging occurs and Recommendation III.A.01.c is implemented.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Letter or other communication to the Legislature in support of WDFW funding for these studies.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.A.01.e**

*Expanded study on the mainstem would require reapplication of PHABSIM using site-specific preference curves and multiple transect measurements.*

No further actions are necessary.

## **Recommendation III.A.01.f**

*Recommend a study of the fish habitat instream flow needs for the reach of the Little Spokane River below the “At Dartford” gauge to better determine the water available for future withdrawals.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will evaluate funding needs to conduct a PHABSIM (or other habitat model) analysis of habitat needs on the Little Spokane River.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will determine whether to conduct a study using a habitat model such as PHABSIM.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- If habitat modeling is conducted, the WIT will compare the results with the current instream flow rule.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Completion of a habitat model for the Little Spokane River or a WIT decision that the model is not financially feasible.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$12,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue III.B.01 How will pumping from the SVRP Aquifer Watershed to provide water service in the Little Spokane Watershed north of the Little Spokane River / Deadman Creek affect flows in the Little Spokane River?**

## **Recommendation III.B.01.a**

***Monitor the effects of exporting water from the SVRP Aquifer into the Little Spokane Watershed on the flow of the Little Spokane River. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Whitworth Water District, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane will take the lead in developing an outline for studying water export from the SVRP Aquifer to the Little Spokane Watershed, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology and cost.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- If funding is identified, the WIT will identify a lead agency that will issue an RFP and negotiate a contract to conduct the recommended study.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on results of immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Specific water purveyors would be key implementers of this recommendation.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Outline completed for a study of water export from the aquifer to the Little Spokane River.
- Funding identified.
- Lead agency identified and RFP issued.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Whitworth Water District, Spokane County, and City of Spokane staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$25,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Additional funding may be identified.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue III.B.02 What action should be taken toward domestic exempt wells when flows at the designated control point fall below the minimum instream flow?**

### **Recommendation III.B.02.a**

***The Department of Ecology should enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff of water rights junior to WAC 173-555 on irrigation from exempt wells in the Little Spokane Watershed where it does not cause additional fire danger.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will meet with the WIT to develop strategies to enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff in the Little Spokane Watershed for exempt wells that have junior water rights.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the near-term and immediate actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Enforcement actions by Ecology to shut off water rights to junior water rights holders, including irrigation from exempt wells, as necessary to comply with the instream flow rule.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue III.B.03 What effect will reactivating the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk have on water rights interruptions for upper basin water users?**

## **Recommendation III.B.03.a**

***Using existing data, study the effects of reactivating the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk for regulation of the upstream water users. (Obligation to Spokane County and Pend Oreille County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SCCD has applied for grant funding to reactivate the gauge.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- If gauge is reactivated, Ecology will evaluate data to assess whether minimum instream flows are being met.
- Spokane and Pend Oreille Counties will support SCCD efforts to obtain funding and collect data.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A summary memo or briefing to the WIT on whether instream flows are being met at the Chattaroy or Elk gauges.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The SCCD has obtained grant funding from Ecology to reactivate the gauge at Elk.
- Whitworth Water District will consider funding one or both of the gauges for a 5-year time frame.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.B.03.b**

*If further study is desired, the WIT should work with Pend Oreille County, the Department of Ecology, Spokane Community College and others to continue flow measurements as needed.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT, working with Pend Oreille County, Ecology, Spokane Community College, the SCCD, and others, will continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- A real-time gauge would be preferable, but if not possible at both Chattaroy and Elk, then both sites should be equipped with other types of gauges.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Stable funding secured for flow measurements.
- Additional flow measurements made.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- To be identified.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.B.03.c**

***If the benefits are sufficient to offset costs and legal constraints do not exist, beneficiaries of the operation of a Chattaroy and/or Elk control point, in cooperation with the Department of Ecology, should reactivate and fund the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk with real-time capabilities as needed for regulation.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will seek funding and cooperation with those who would benefit from the gauges.
- ★ The SCCD will contract with the USGS to maintain the Elk stream gauge on the mainstem of the Little Spokane River with current real-time data available via satellite on the USGS web page.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Depending on the results of immediate actions, interested parties may reactivate and fund the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk.



## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Ecology would use these data for water rights regulation.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Funding obtained for gauge operation.
- Fully operational gauges at Elk and Chattaroy.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The SCCD has obtained grant funding from Ecology to reactivate, operate, and maintain the gauge at Elk.
- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue III.B.04 What actions are needed to maintain or improve recreational opportunities on the Little Spokane River?**

## **Recommendation III.B.04.a**

***Promote management practices, when feasible, that maintain minimum flows of at least 90 cfs at the “At Dartford” gauge in the Lower Little Spokane River (Little Spokane River Natural Area) to support current and future recreational activities.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Ecology regulates water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will continue to discuss options such as seasonal storage that would be used throughout the watershed to enhance recreation.
- Ecology will regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Ecology will regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.
- Additional near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Ecology will regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.
- Additional long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- If the adopted minimum instream flow is met then recreational needs are met. The concern is when flows fall well below the minimum instream flow of 115 cfs.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Continued enforcement by Ecology of the 115 cfs minimum instream flow at the “At Dartford” gauge.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.B.04.b**

***Promote management practices, when feasible, that maintain minimum flows of at least 90 cfs at the “At Dartford” gauge for Pine River Park and 32 cfs at Elk Park to support existing and future recreational activities.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Ecology regulates water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs and when flows at Elk Park fall below 38 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will continue to discuss options such as seasonal storage that would be used throughout the watershed to enhance recreation.

- Ecology will regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs and when flows at Elk Park fall below 38 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2009-2012)

- Ecology will regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs and when flows at Elk Park fall below 38 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.
- Additional near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near term actions will be continued or amended as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The minimum instream flow during low-flow periods (summer/early fall) is 38 cfs at Elk Park and 115 cfs at the “At Dartford” gauge.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Continued enforcement by Ecology of the 115 cfs minimum instream flow at the “at Dartford” gauge and 38 cfs at the Elk Park gauge.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.B.04.c**

***Investigate and/or determine if future parks or access points are needed for recreational use of the Little Spokane River. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County acquired the Haynes property on the Little Spokane River in 2001, and plans to conduct restoration and trails improvement.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will hold a meeting to solicit input from recreational user groups on needs and options on the Little Spokane River.

- The SCCD will seek willing landowners for the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Spokane and Pend Oreille counties will consider including parks or access points in future updates of their Shoreline Master Programs and Parks Plans.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A WIT meeting with user groups to discuss needs and options for enhanced recreation on the Little Spokane River.
- Additional landowners participating in the Conservation Futures Program.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- None needed.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue III.B.05 Would a better understanding of flow in the West Branch of the Little Spokane River help water resource management in the watershed?**

## **Recommendation III.B.05.a**

***Determine the feasibility of installing a gauge(s) on the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.***  
*(Obligation to Spokane County)*

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SCCD currently maintains several gauges on the West Branch.
- The SCCD has conducted a seepage run which may indicate whether new data are needed.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will seek funding to continue operations and maintenance of its current gauges.

- The SCCD, in cooperation with the POCD, will prepare and implement a comprehensive gauging strategy for streams and lakes in the West Branch of the Little Spokane River. The strategy will be based on an assessment of existing gauge data, and will prioritize recommended gauge locations, identify the types of gauges needed, identify the agencies that will maintain gauges and analyze the data, evaluate the impact of beaver dams on Diamond Lake and discuss options to maximize the benefit of volunteer monitoring efforts. (WB.SW2-2, 2-3, 4-4, 5-1, 5-2, 6-1)
- The POCD, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will assess the impact of beaver dams on water levels in Diamond Lake.
- The WIT will consider whether additional gauges should be installed on tributaries to the West Branch, depending on funding and data needs, based on the stream gauging strategy prepared by the SCCD.
- The WB LSR Committee members will take notes and/or pictures to document unexplained flow surges on Horseshoe, Eloika, Trout, and Sacheen Lakes. (WB.SW2-5, 6-2)

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Funding for continued operation and maintenance of the existing gauges.
- Additional gauges installed on West Branch tributaries if necessary.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and SCCD staff will donate time.
- The SCCD will fund ongoing operation and maintenance of stream gauges with a grant from Ecology.
- Additional funding sources may include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.C.01.a**

***When the lower Little Spokane River aquatic biota study and the Water Quality Management Plan/TMDL process are completed, integrate all of the recommended instream flows into one regime to evaluate the need for revisiting the instream flow rule for the whole watershed taking wildlife habitat and other uses into account. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- None.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- WIT members will continue to participate in the TMDL process.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- The WIT will consider seeking funding for an aquatic biota study on the Little Spokane River.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- None.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- WIT member participation in the TMDL process.
- Funding for an aquatic biota study on the Little Spokane River, if necessary.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- WIT members will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- The WIT may identify additional funding sources.

### **PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED**

- None needed.

### **OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES**

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation III.C.01.b**

***Develop strategies for achieving the integrated flow regime. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- None.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- No actions can be taken until the instream flow regime is known.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- No actions can be taken until the instream flow regime is known.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- The WIT will consider strategies such as storage and conservation to meet the integrated flow regime.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- The Spokane River should be used as a model and example of lessons learned.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Completion of a written strategy to achieve the integrated flow regime on the Little Spokane River.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

### **PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED**

- None needed.

### **OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES**

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## IV. Domestic Exempt Wells

Issue IV.A.01 Should the counties adopt policies to manage the proliferation of domestic exempt wells?

### Recommendation IV.A.01.a

***Support low residential densities in areas of the counties designated as rural in order to protect water supplies.***

#### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

#### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will inform the WIT when rural density changes are proposed.
- WIT members will support each county's efforts to establish low residential densities (and other land use polices that support recommendations in the Watershed Plan) by sending letters, providing public testimony, and other actions.
- Spokane County will provide a summary to the WIT of upcoming policy changes or clarifications with respect to residential densities that affect water supplies.

#### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

#### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

#### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Definitions of "rural" need to be standardized between the counties and the WIT for effective communication.
- There are concerns about existing wells going dry after new homes are constructed in the vicinity.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Letters, testimony or other actions by WIT members supporting county land use polices that support the Watershed Plan.
- Summary of upcoming policy changes by counties.

#### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and county staff will donate time, as available.



## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation IV.A.01.b**

*The counties should implement a policy or procedure requiring a person who is developing property within a water service area to consult with the water purveyor about the potential for public water service before creating a development or single-family residence dependent on domestic exempt wells.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Spokane County's policy is that if there is no purveyor in the area, a builder should drill an exempt well.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will coordinate with water purveyors to establish water supply consultation requirements for new developments.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Such a requirement would protect people from building wells that may go dry over time.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Water supply consultation requirements for new developments.
- Increased proportion of new developments that receive public water service rather than using a domestic exempt well.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- County and water purveyor staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation IV.A.01.c**

***Request counties, cities, and/or the Regional Health Districts to evaluate the quantity of water necessary (currently 1 gallon per minute) from a domestic exempt well before issuing a building permit.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT, along with Spokane County, will make a formal request to Spokane Regional Health District and the NE Tri-County Health District to evaluate the required production rate, and minimum duration of production at that rate, for domestic exempt wells required for issuance of a building permit. The WIT will recommend that the quantity be increased. (WB.G&LU1-2)

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Formal request made to Health Districts for a production rate for domestic exempt wells which must be met before a building permit may be issued.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- City, county and/or Regional Health District staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Health Districts may change local regulations on required quantity of water from a domestic exempt well.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## Recommendation IV.A.01.d

***Local land use regulations should contain specific criteria by which applicants for land development such as subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, or certificates of exemption for the purpose of creating additional building sites must demonstrate sufficient water availability.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- In Pend Oreille County, land development applicants must provide well logs from surrounding properties. County staff reviews these to ensure there is evidence of sufficient water availability.
- In Spokane County, applicants need only demonstrate a 1 gallon per minute capacity to the Health District.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will develop recommendations for criteria for demonstrating water availability and send them to counties and other land use regulators.
- Spokane and Stevens Counties will develop ordinance language on water availability required for land development and present it to the WIT. In determining water availability, the ordinances will also consider impacts of new developments on streamflows and lake levels. (WB.G&LU1-1, 1-2, 1-6)
- Spokane and Stevens Counties will bring proposed ordinances on water availability required for land development to the relevant planning committees and work towards adoption with the WIT's support.
- The WIT will provide oral or written briefings to County Commissions, planning commissions, or other policy bodies on the need to better ensure sufficient water availability prior to construction.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- WIT recommendations to local Health Departments on criteria for demonstrating water availability.
- Proposed ordinances establishing criteria for water availability prior to land development.
- WIT oral or written briefings to County Commissions, planning commissions, or other policy bodies on the need to better ensure sufficient water availability prior to construction.
- Local land use regulations containing criteria for demonstrated sufficient water availability.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and county staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$1,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- New ordinance developed by counties with input from WIT.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation IV.A.01.e**

***Water purveyors are encouraged to participate with land use regulators and the Department of Health in identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will develop criteria for demonstrating water availability before development.
- The WIT will seek money to fund a data gap analysis to examine well logs, purveyor information, and the DOH complaint data base to identify areas of water availability concern.
- ★ Using purveyors' input from the summit on water availability, Spokane County will conduct a data gap analysis of areas of water availability concern.
- The WIT will host a summit with water purveyors on identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.
- The WIT will develop a list of procedures for better coordination and communication about water availability between water purveyors and county planning departments and begin, with appropriate county staff, to adopt and implement these.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Written criteria for water availability requirements, prior to development.
- Funding for a data gap analysis to identify areas of water availability concern.
- A summit with water purveyors on identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.
- A list of procedures for better coordination and communication between water purveyors and county planning departments.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members, county and purveyor staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$1,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other potential funding sources include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation IV.A.01.f**

***Land use regulators are encouraged to consider available ground water resources when establishing minimum parcel sizes in areas where exempt wells will be the main source of domestic water in an effort to avoid future water shortages.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will develop and propose comprehensive plan amendments to the planning commission to address water availability issues, working closely with county staff.
- Spokane County, in coordination with water purveyors, DOH, and Ecology, will identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- County planning commissions will consider recommended comprehensive plan amendments to address water availability.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Water availability should be on each county's check list of development requirements.
- "Water availability" needs to be defined.
- WIT support, in the form of letters, public testimony, etc., could be helpful.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Areas identified and mapped within the watershed where water is/is not available.
- Ground water availability considered whenever relevant land-use decisions are made.
- Proposed comprehensive plan amendments to address water availability issues.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and city and county staff will donate time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Comprehensive plan amendments.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue IV.A.02 Should the counties adopt policies which limit the maximum daily withdrawals from individual domestic exempt wells where detrimental impacts are identified?**

## *Recommendation IV.A.02.a*

*Evaluate policies that will limit the maximum daily withdrawals to less than 5000 gallons per day where detrimental impacts are identified.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will brief the WIT on laws regarding exempt wells, focusing particularly on rights, limitations, and what options WITs or local governments have to restrict or regulate use from exempt wells.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Ecology briefing on laws regarding exempt wells, which identifies what changes to these need to be proposed to the Legislature.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue IV.B.03 What are the methods for reducing summertime water use from domestic exempt wells during low-flow years?**

## *Recommendation IV.A.03.a*

*At a minimum, when flows in the Little Spokane River are expected to fall below minimum instream flows, caution letters should be sent to all domestic exempt well owners in the Little Spokane Watershed asking them to voluntarily conserve water. Methods for saving water and directions to a website with more information will be included with the letter.*

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of domestic exempt well owners in the Little Spokane Watershed.
- WIT members will assist in updating an existing database for the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.
- ★ The WIT, with Spokane County as lead, and support from other counties, cities, water purveyors and others, will identify owners of domestic exempt wells and issue a press release or send them a letter in mid-summer (when NOAA stream flow predictions fall below minimum instream flows) requesting that they voluntarily conserve water. *This will be coordinated with RV.B.01.a and R.III.B.02.a.*

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- It could be useful to know how often flows fall below minimum instream flows.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A database of addresses of domestic exempt well owners in the watershed.
- Letters to owners of domestic exempt wells requesting that they voluntarily conserve water.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and county staff will donate time, as available. Other potential funding sources may include Ecology and the SAJB.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue IV.B.01 Would more accurate water use quantities and locations for domestic exempt wells make a significant difference in the accuracy of the watershed model?**

## *Recommendation IV.B.01.a*

***Run a sensitivity analysis on water use from exempt wells with the watershed model. If the model is recalibrated with different data in the future, another sensitivity analysis may need to be done.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- No immediate action. This is a low-priority action that may not be necessary.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will revisit the concept of running a sensitivity analysis on exempt wells if relevant.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- None. Performance indicators will be developed if the WIT decides to conduct the analysis in the future.



## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$1,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue IV.B.02 Would more accurate water pumping quantities and locations for Group B and small Group A wells make a significant difference in the accuracy of the watershed model?**

## *Recommendation IV.B.02.a*

***Run a sensitivity analysis on unmetered Group A and Group B water use with the watershed model. If the model is recalibrated with different data in the future, another sensitivity analysis may need to be done.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- No immediate action. This is a low-priority action that may not be necessary.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will revisit the concept of running a sensitivity analysis on unmetered Group A and Group B water use if relevant.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- None. Performance indicators will be developed if the WIT decides to conduct the analysis in the future.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$1,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

**Issue IV.C.01 Could the Department of Ecology be clearer and more consistent when assigning water rights quantities for water systems taking over domestic exempt wells that have no record of previous water usage?**

## *Recommendation IV.C.01.a*

***Recommend that the Department of Ecology clarify policy 1230 (Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals (1/11/1999)) to ensure it is consistently implemented.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will brief the WIT on Policy 1230, “Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals.”
- The WIT will determine whether to ask Ecology to clarify Policy 1230 to facilitate its consistent implementation.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Ecology may combine the briefing with that on domestic exempt wells (Recommendation IV.A.02.a).
- Under Policy 1230, allowances for exempt wells are higher than those for public water suppliers.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Ecology briefing on Policy 1230, “Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals.”
- WIT request for clarification of the policy, if necessary.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

# V. Water Rights and Claims

Issue V.A.01 Would a better understanding of water rights in the WRIAs help in making water management decisions for WRIA 55 & 57?

## Recommendation V.A.01.a

***Request the Department of Ecology to monitor and enforce existing water rights holders to meet conditions of their water rights and comply with state law.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Ecology is conducting water rights mapping through the pre-adjudication process.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT and all member agencies will send letters to the Legislature asking for increased funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights. (WB.WR1-1)
- Ecology will meet with the WIT to discuss enforcement issues and options, and identify actions to increase compliance, with educational efforts as the primary approach.
- Ecology will provide the WIT with its water rights enforcement strategy and report on any enforcement actions.
- The WIT will request a Water Master be hired for WRIA 55/57 to deal with water right monitoring and enforcement issues.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT and member agencies will continue requesting water rights enforcement and monitoring funding until adequate monies are granted.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Letters to the Legislature requesting increased funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights.
- A water rights enforcement strategy provided by Ecology.
- Regular reports from Ecology on enforcement actions.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The Legislature will be asked to increase funding for monitoring and enforcement.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- No actions required; legislative funding increases for monitoring and enforcement will be requested.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation V.A.01.b**

***Evaluate how to inventory water use within the watersheds to assist in making future water management decisions.*** (Obligation to Spokane County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- ★ Ecology and DOH will work together to either merge or make compatible their water rights and water use databases.
- The WIT will support additional state-wide funding for water rights/water use database compatibility efforts.
- ★ Spokane County will design a water use inventory for WRIA 55/57 by either hiring a consultant or doing it in-house.
- The WIT will request that Ecology hire a Water Master to oversee data gathering, evaluation and enforcement, and to have direct contact with landowners.
- The WIT will ask DOH for a briefing to describe water use data and options for tracking water use in the watershed.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Implementation of this recommendation may be covered by the pre-adjudication process for the SVRP Aquifer.
- The WIT would like to have water use information on an ongoing basis.

- This effort will be assisted by funding for Ecology and DOH to merge or make compatible their water rights and water use databases.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Merged or compatible water rights data bases.
- A water use inventory for WRIA 55/57.
- A formal request that Ecology hire a Water Master.
- A DOH briefing to describe water use data and options for tracking water use in the watershed.
- Up-to-date water use information for the watersheds that is easily obtainable.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$3,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Funding may need to be identified by Ecology to hire an additional Water Master.
- Funding may come from the pre-adjudication process for the SVRP area.
- Other potential funding sources may include Legislative appropriations, Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or APA-funded County staff time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- No actions required; legislative funding increases for additional Water Masters will be requested.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation V.A.01.c**

***Evaluate the creation of a Municipal Reserve for future water rights for municipal water supplies.***  
(Obligation to Spokane County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will look at Municipal Reserves in other watersheds and obtain more information from Ecology as to the nature of a Municipal Reserve, and how it can be used in WRIA 55/57 for future water rights for municipal water suppliers.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This recommendation is for an evaluation only. There is no decision yet on whether a reserve is necessary.
- Inchoate municipal water rights will need to be considered in this evaluation.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The WIT understands the purpose and implementation considerations of a Municipal Reserve.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and Ecology staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$3,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- If adopted, the Municipal Reserve would be a part of an instream flow rule.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation V.A.01.d**

***Develop strategies to address compliance, enforcement, and validity of water rights and claims within WRIAs 55 and 57. (Obligation to State of Washington)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Ecology is working on pre-adjudication tasks, including inventorying and mapping water rights.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Ecology will brief the WIT on its findings from the pre-adjudication work and seek input on public education and outreach efforts.
- Spokane County, in coordination with other lead agencies of WRIAs in Eastern Washington, will draft a letter to the Legislature requesting additional funding for Ecology to address compliance, enforcement, and validity of water rights and claims, and will encourage other WRIAs to send the letter as well. (WB.WR1-1)

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Ecology briefing to the WIT on pre-adjudication work.
- Letters to the Legislature requesting funding for Ecology's water rights compliance and enforcement efforts.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology and Spokane County will donate staff time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## Issue V.A.02 How can water rights be acquired to increase instream flow?

### *Recommendation V.A.02.a*

***Encourage the use of the State Trust Water Rights Program<sup>7</sup> to secure water rights for instream flow.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- WIT members and the WIT as a whole will write letters to the Legislature asking for additional funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Ecology will conduct education programs directed towards helping the public understand the Washington Water Acquisition Program.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The current Washington Water Acquisition Program is understaffed.
- This is not a fish-critical basin, so it may be less of a priority for the Washington Water Acquisition Program.

---

<sup>7</sup> Titled by Ecology the 'Washington Water Acquisition Program'.

- People are often reluctant to sell their water rights to the State, and may be more interested in the short-term water trust options offered by the State.
- It is hard to know the validity of some water rights in an unadjudicated watershed.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Letters sent to the Legislature requesting additional funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program.
- Improved public understanding of the Washington Water Acquisition Program.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Increased staff funding from the Legislature.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- No actions required; legislative funding increases for Washington Water Acquisition Program staffing will be requested.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue V.B.01 What are the approaches for reducing summertime water use by those with water rights during low-flow years?

## **Recommendation V.B.01.a**

***When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, all water rights holders should be contacted asking them to voluntarily conserve water.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Depending on Ecology staff availability, the agency is making such calls to junior water rights holders in the Little Spokane Watershed most years.
- Ecology is currently developing a database to include data from the 2007-2009 water rights mapping and evaluation pre-adjudication project.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- ★ Ecology, DOH, and Spokane County will establish and maintain a database of addresses of all water rights holders in the Little Spokane Watershed. This database would integrate current property ownership information from the assessor's office and planning or building departments.
- WIT members will assist in updating an existing database for the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.
- Ecology will send a letter ordering curtailment to all junior water rights holders subject to adopted instream flow rules in mid-summer when stream flows drop below the established minimum flow. *This will be coordinated with RIV.A.03.a and R.III.B.02.a.*



## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A database of all water rights holders in the watershed.
- Contact with water rights holders during periods of low flows.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other potential funding sources include Legislative appropriations.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation V.B.01.b**

***When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, a media campaign should be launched to encourage additional water conservation measures.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- NOAA and Avista currently do stream-flow projections.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- RWCC, in cooperation with NOAA and Avista, will gather and compile relevant hydrologic data to note when low-flow years are anticipated in order to initiate media activities to encourage additional water conservation measures.
- RWCC will develop media partners, such as the Spokane Weather Channel, who could publish information on projected stream flows similar to air quality indices.
- RWCC will determine a low streamflow trigger level (likely the same as that for Recommendation IV.A.03.a and V.B.01.a).

- When the low streamflow trigger is reached, the WIT will issue a notice regarding the low water year, and issue Public Safety Announcements and requests for voluntary water conservation measures.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT and the RWCC, with relevant partners, will evaluate the effectiveness of working with media partners, and alter the strategy as necessary.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT and the RWCC, with relevant partners, will evaluate the effectiveness of working with media partners, and alter the strategy as necessary.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This recommendation should be part of the comprehensive conservation strategy.
- This recommendation should be developed in concert with Recommendation V.B.01.a and IV.A.03.a.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A compilation of relevant hydrologic data that notes when low-flow years are anticipated.
- Media partnerships.
- Adoption of a low streamflow trigger level (likely the same as that for Recommendation IV.A.03.a and V.B.01.a).
- Public information actions when low streamflow trigger is reached.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- RWCC and WIT members and NOAA and Avista staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## VI. Strategies for Base Flow Augmentation

Issue VI.A.01 What land management methods **can** be employed to slow the release of winter snowmelt and runoff into streams, thus augmenting baseflow in the watershed?

### *Recommendation VI.A.01.a*

***Support the restoration, where feasible, of wetlands in areas where these features existed historically but have been drained.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Current local government plans may include wetlands restoration or preservation regulations that are not being enforced.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage counties and cities to better enforce current land use codes for wetlands restoration and preservation.
- The SCCD will look at the Conservation Futures Program for potential wetlands areas to purchase.
- Spokane County and the City of Spokane will consider using wetlands as a part of the stormwater management system.
- The WIT will encourage counties to retain or hire a wetlands biologist who makes site visits as part of the permitting and compliance processes, as well as a full-time development code enforcement officer. (WB.G&LU3-2, 3-3)
- The WIT will support and assist counties in obtaining grants or other funding for hiring a wetlands biologist and a full-time development code enforcement officer.
- ★ Spokane County will review wetlands in WRIA 55 and 57 based on the US Fish and Wildlife National Wetland Inventory and the Spokane County Critical Areas standard, compare existing wetlands with historical wetlands, and develop a list of historical wetland areas in WRIA 55 and 57 not currently functioning as wetlands. (WB.SW1-1, 1-2, 1-3)
- ★ Spokane County will present the categorized wetland opportunities list to the WIT for decision on several wetlands for further study, and will develop in-depth reports for chosen wetland opportunities.
- ★ Spokane County will present the in-depth wetland study report to the WIT for their decision on the most likely opportunities for implementation, and will develop cost estimates.
- ★ Spokane County will conduct an on-site investigation, and develop restoration designs, for restoration of functioning wetlands in the Saltese Flats.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will work with the conservation districts to identify targeted approaches to restore historic wetlands, including mitigation and incentives for landowners to restore pastures. (WB.G&LU3-5)
- The WIT and conservation districts will seek funding to implement wetlands restoration.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT and conservation districts will implement wetlands restoration programs, if funded (WB.SW1-4).
- Other immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The WB LSR Committee should play a role in the WIT's wetland activities. (WB.SW1-5)
- The WIT should review Ecology's wetlands mitigation banking program for insights.
- While local land use planners often put wetland-protection conditions in permits, they are not necessarily enforced.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Identification of historic wetlands within the watershed.
- Purchase of new wetlands areas through the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program.
- Wetlands included as an integral part of counties' stormwater management programs.
- Wetlands biologist a part of permanent staff in each county.
- Strategy established to identify and replace historic wetlands.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Conservation Futures Program.
- Spokane County's Saltese Flats Restoration Investigation and Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grants, funded by Ecology.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$10,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.A.01.b**

***Encourage the creation of new wetlands, where feasible, in upland areas and along stream corridors.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SCCD encourages cooperative landowners to create new wetlands using a cost-share component.
- The SCCD conducts riparian planting activities to restore wetlands vegetation.
- The NRCS has a wetlands creation program via dirt relocation.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD and POCD will seek additional funding to enhance their current efforts to create new wetlands.
- WIT members will support the efforts of the SCCD and POCD to obtain additional funds.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The SCCD and POCD will continue efforts to create new wetlands, with NRCS assistance if necessary.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The SCCD and POCD will continue efforts to create new wetlands, with NRCS assistance if necessary.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Creation of new wetlands areas in upland areas or along stream corridors.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Funding may be sought from the NRCS.

- WIT members and SCCD and POCD staff will donate time, as available.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$10,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## *Recommendation VI.A.01.c*

***Encourage forest management and harvest practices that preserve vegetative ground cover to reduce runoff and increase infiltration in keeping with the Forest Practices Act.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SCCD has a small program to encourage certain small acreage forest practices.
- Specific WDNR requirements address this issue.
- WSU Extension provides education to forest land-owners.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage counties and WDNR to require loggers to post a sign bearing their names for five years following logging in order to encourage an improvement in forest practices.
- The Cities of Deer Park, Liberty Lake, and Spokane will develop and adopt urban forestry regulations throughout the watershed.
- Spokane and Stevens Counties will consider adopting forest management and development requirements that a minimum number of existing trees be retained, particularly on slopes.
- The WIT will meet with fire districts to collaborate on education efforts to encourage people not to denude slopes for fire protection.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The POCD will identify existing education materials for owners of small forest lands on how best to manage and harvest timber that is not covered under the Forest Practices Act. The POCD will get permission to use existing materials and modify as necessary for WRIA 55/57. (WB.G&LU2-1)
- The conservation districts, the counties, and other entities will provide educational materials distributed by the POCD to appropriate landowners. (WB.G&LU2-1)
- The WIT will write letters to WDNR and the counties requesting increased enforcement of the State Forest Practices Act and the counties' CAOs related to timber harvest and critical area buffers in the WB LSR watershed. (WB.G&LU2-4)

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Vegetation retention regulations for development adopted in other parts of the state could be used as models, as could language from the upcoming Phase II Eastern Washington stormwater manuals.
- It is important to consider that some erosion control costs can be avoided by retaining vegetation or re-vegetating.
- Forestry regulations could be tied in to the geologic hazards sections of the critical area ordinance.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Requirements for loggers to post signs bearing their names.
- Decreased loss of vegetative cover in forested areas.
- Urban forestry regulations adopted.
- Forest management requirements adopted that require a minimum number of trees to be retained on site.
- Education efforts conducted by fire districts that discourage homeowners from denuding slopes for fire suppression.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Conservation district, city, and county staff will donate time, as available.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Urban forestry regulations need to be adopted.
- Requirements for signs need to be adopted.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.A.01.d**

***Discourage the destruction of existing wetlands.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- Current local government plans may include wetlands restoration or preservation regulations that are not being enforced.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage counties and cities to better enforce current land use codes for wetlands restoration and preservation.
- Spokane and Stevens Counties will identify wetlands within the CAO and associated maps, and develop a strategy to preserve wetlands. (WB.SW1-1)
- The WIT will encourage counties to retain or hire a wetlands biologist who makes site visits as part of the permitting and compliance processes, as well as a full-time development code enforcement officer. (WB.G&LU3-2, 3-3)

- ★ The POCD and Pend Oreille County, in collaboration with the WB LSR Committee, will identify and coordinate public/private purchase of important wetlands in the WB LSR watershed for conservation by working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts. (WB.G&LU2-2).

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A written strategy to preserve wetlands.
- Site visits by wetlands biologists as part of the permitting and compliance processes.
- A decrease in rates of wetlands loss.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Potential funding sources may include the Conservation Futures Program in Spokane County and Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR in Pend Oreille County.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.A.01.e**

***Encourage agricultural practices that reduce runoff and increase infiltration.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The SCCD currently runs programs to encourage practices such as low-till or direct seeding.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will apply for grants to conduct custom direct seeding in order to obtain farmer buy-in.
- The WIT will support increased funding to the POCD and SCCD for programs that address runoff and infiltration.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Contingent on funding, the SCCD will continue the custom direct seeding program.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Contingent on funding, the SCCD will continue the custom direct seeding program.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- It is difficult to convince farmers to switch to direct seeding practices, yet those who have see very low rates of runoff and/or erosion.
- A custom direct seeding program would be costly and lengthy, as it would need to match rotation schedules of 3-5 years, thus a long-term funding source needs to be identified.
- A mentoring program, custom seeding, and related programs should lead people to change.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Custom direct seeding programs are initiated.
- The POCD and SCCD receive funding for programs that address runoff and infiltration.
- Evidence found of lower sediment loads and nutrients in streams.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The Legislature may be a funding source.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.A.01.f**

***Consider land use policies that preserve vegetation in natural drainages and other areas in new subdivisions, short subdivisions, or binding site plans.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- These types of land use policies are included in the proposed Regional Stormwater Plan for the City of Spokane, City of Spokane Valley, and Spokane County.
- The WIT sent a letter to the Governor supporting the purchase of the Rustler's Gulch property by the State of Washington. (WB.G&LU1-7, 3-7)



## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- A subcommittee of the WIT will conduct briefings to the boards of county commissioners, planning commissions, etc. to inform them of the merits of land use polices or regulations that adequately preserve vegetation in natural drainages.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The POCD will identify and coordinate relevant landowner incentives (e.g., payment for trees in riparian area, land swaps) by working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts. (WB.G&LU2-3)
- Other near-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Boards of county commissioners, planning commissions, and other policy bodies are briefed on the merits of land use policies that preserve vegetation in natural drainages.
- New developments have higher degree of natural vegetative cover in drainages and on slopes.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Some changes in local land-use regulations may be requested.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VI.A.02 What types of storage can be employed to slow the release of winter snowmelt and runoff into streams in the Little Spokane River basin to augment baseflow in the watershed?

## **Recommendation VI.A.02.a**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- ★ The POCD will conduct site identification and feasibility studies of potential instream water storage projects throughout the WB LSR watershed, both to augment summer flows downstream and to alleviate flooding. (WB.SW2-1)
- The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will assess the culvert at the outlet of Eloika Lake and determine if the culvert elevation contributes to lowered lake levels. (WB.SW4-1)
- ★ The SCCD, with assistance from Spokane County and the Eloika Lake Association, will conduct a feasibility analysis of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake to maintain the lake's elevation and serve, if needed, to augment baseflows in downstream reaches of the Little Spokane River. (WB.SW4-2, WB.WQ1-4)

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Depending on the results of the water control structure feasibility analysis, the SCCD, Spokane County, and the Eloika Lake Association will identify a lead agency to issue an RFP and negotiate a contract to install the water control structure. (WB.SW4-2, WB.WQ1-4)
- The POCD, in collaboration with the SCCD, will conduct a feasibility assessment of removing debris from Eloika and Sacheen lakes to increase water storage. The assessment will include recommendations for future actions. (WB.SW2-4)

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- It is possible that additional feasibility analyses may be beneficial in the future.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Site identification and feasibility studies conducted of potential instream water storage projects.
- Determination made on the effects of the culvert at the outlet of Eloika Lake.
- Feasibility analysis conducted of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake.
- Review conducted of sediment sources to Eloika Lake.
- Feasibility assessment conducted of debris removal from Eloika and Sacheen lakes.
- Assessment made of the effects of upstream dissolved phosphate inputs on water storage in Eloika Lake.
- Feasibility analysis conducted of selective dredging in Eloika Lake.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$3,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Other potential funding sources may include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or Legislative appropriations to the WB LSR Committee.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None at this time.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.A.02.b**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in new artificial lakes or ponds as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The consultant hired to conduct a storage feasibility study for existing lakes will also conduct site identification and feasibility analysis of storage in artificial lakes or ponds if funding is sufficient.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Completion of site identification and a feasibility analysis of storage in artificial lakes or ponds.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$3,000 to implementation of this recommendation, additional funding sources may need to be identified.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## *Recommendation VI.A.02.c*

*Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.*

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- No immediate actions necessary at this time.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Additional actions will be considered if new information indicates improved feasibility.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Additional actions will be considered if new information indicates improved feasibility.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Golder Associates determined that recharge and storage at the Lower River (Colbert to Dartford) was likely not feasible, particularly as pumping costs increase<sup>6</sup>.
- Implementation of this recommendation requires different expertise than Recommendation IV.A.02.a.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- None at this time. Performance indicators may be developed in the future if site identification feasibility analyses are undertaken.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$3,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## *Recommendation VI.A.02.d*

*Consider a public education program on the benefits and problems of beaver dams.*

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The POCD will take the lead in collaboration with other counties and state agencies, particularly WDFW, in determining a narrowly focused education strategy on beaver dams.
- ★ WDFW will investigate and address illegal beaver dam removal at the southern end of Eloika Lake. (WB.SW4-3)

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This issue is geographically limited to Sacheen Lake or to the West Branch, thus a basin-wide strategy is not necessary.
- Boy Scouts could get involved in this project.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Beaver dam education strategy implemented.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- POCD and WDFW staff will donate time.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.B.01.a**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WTT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WTT also had a range of opinions on the practicality of implementing this recommendation.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS (2008-2009)**

- ★ Spokane County will hire a consultant to do a feasibility analysis of the use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed. The feasibility analysis will include:
  - An engineering analysis of the feasibility of surface water flow augmentation at one or more sites.
  - A wetlands delineation and assessment.
  - An explanation of the legal issues, including water rights.
  - Identification of all needed permits.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- The region used to be irrigated with surface water through storage and withdrawal from lakes.
- Lake levels associated with lake storage are of concern to lakefront property owners; it is undesirable to have levels too low in the summer or too high in the spring .
- This may represent an opportunity to reestablish wetlands near Newman Lake or Saltese Flats, or alternatively, may lead to mitigation requirements.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Completion of feasibility analysis of the use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- Spokane County will need to identify funding to hire the consultant.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$4,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.B.01.b**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in new reservoirs or manmade ponds as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>.
- Spokane County recently received a Watershed Supplemental grant to do some of this work.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- ★ Spokane County will hire a consultant to do a feasibility analysis of the use of surface runoff storage in new reservoirs, manmade ponds or wetlands as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed. The feasibility analysis will include:
  - An engineering analysis of the feasibility of surface water flow augmentation at one or more sites.
  - A wetlands delineation and assessment.
  - An explanation of the legal issues, including water rights.
  - Identification of all needed permits.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This can be included with the feasibility assessment in Recommendation VI.B.01.a if money allows. Options could include conducting both studies in a small area, or one in a larger area, etc.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Completion of site identification and feasibility analysis of the use of surface water runoff storage in new reservoirs, manmade ponds or wetlands.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Spokane County recently received a Watershed Supplemental grant to do some of this work. Other sources to compliment this effort may include Phase IV Implementation grants or other Ecology grants.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$4,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.B.01.c**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed in the storage assessment prepared by Golder Associates<sup>6</sup>.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- No immediate actions are needed at this time.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- An additional feasibility analyses may be beneficial in the future.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- An additional feasibility analyses may be beneficial in the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Any future work should build on the Golder Associates storage assessment.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- None at this time. Performance indicators may be developed in the future if site identification and feasibility analyses are undertaken.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$4,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.



## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.B.01.d**

***Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers for recovery as a water supply source in the Middle Spokane Watershed.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- This recommendation has been partially completed by the Golder Associates storage assessment<sup>6</sup>.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- No immediate actions are needed at this time.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- It is possible that additional feasibility analyses may be beneficial in the future.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- It is possible that additional feasibility analyses may be beneficial in the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Any future work should build on the Golder Associates storage assessment.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- None at this time. Performance indicators may be developed in the future if site identification and feasibility analyses are undertaken.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$4,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VI.C.01.a**

***Assess the impact and feasibility of moving pumping away from existing wells near the river during the summer low-flow season. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT had a range of opinions on the benefit to the watershed of implementing this recommendation. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- None.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- ★ Spokane County, in close coordination with the City of Spokane and other appropriate water purveyors, will take the lead in designing and coordinating an analysis of the benefits and costs of moving pumping away from wells near the river during the summer low-flow season. The analysis (which may be done in-house or by hiring a consultant) will:
  - Identify locations to do trials
  - Identify measuring points.
  - Evaluate the impacts of exercising full inchoate water rights.
  - Use the Bi-State Aquifer model to investigate benefits to moving pumping away from the river.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- Based on the results of the analysis of moving pumping away from the river during summer low-flow season, the WIT may ask water purveyors to voluntarily shut down some wells during summer low flows.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Long-term actions depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- It is important to model the impacts of not using any pumps within a quarter-mile of the river.
- Changing pumping locations will increase the costs to the system.
- Alternative supplies will need to be identified that can meet the demand.
- Ecology will need to be willing to transfer water right place of use location for a well near the river to a location further away from the river.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- An assessment of moving pumping away from the river during the summer low-flow season.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- The City of Spokane has committed \$30,000 to the implementation of this recommendation.

- Other potential funding sources may include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, other Ecology grants, or County APA-funded staff time.

#### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

#### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## VII. Strategies for Ground Water Recharge Augmentation

Issue VII.A.01 How can stormwater runoff generated by development be used to enhance recharge?

### Recommendation VII.A.01.a

***Support regulations that favor treatment and infiltration of stormwater as an alternative to collection, treatment and discharge to surface water.***

#### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

#### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- County regulations favoring treatment and infiltration of stormwater exist. The City of Spokane Valley follows these regulations.
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane Valley, are collaborating on a Regional Stormwater Plan.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will track regulatory proposals to amend stormwater regulations and comment as appropriate.
- The WIT will discourage regulations that allow stormwater to be piped into the river.

#### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

#### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

#### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This recommendation is site-specific and may not work at all locations.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Stormwater regulations favor treatment and infiltration of stormwater.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.A.01.b**

***Promote the diversion of stormwater from low permeability areas to areas with permeability conducive to infiltration.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will create a work group to examine current stormwater plans, and take recommendations to cities and counties during the public involvement period on:
  - What new policies and/or plan amendments need to be made.
  - Potential incentives, such as bonus densities, that could be included.
  - Public involvement opportunities during the development or amendment of stormwater plans, particularly in the Cities of Spokane and Spokane Valley, and Spokane County.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Policy changes and increased funding could encourage better management of stormwater.
- It is important for counties and cities to develop incentives for undeveloped areas, such as bonus densities.
- The Eastern Washington Stormwater Manual requires design around natural drainages when subdividing.
- Collaboration across ownership parcels, potentially through the permitting process, could improve site designs.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Recommendations made to cities and counties on current stormwater plans.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.A.01.c**

***Support the infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps into shallow aquifers.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The stormwater work group, formed under R.VII.A.01.b, will develop specific policy recommendations that support infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps.
- The WIT will finalize and forward the stormwater work group's recommendations to the counties and will work with the counties to adopt the recommendations.
- During the stormwater planning process, Spokane County and the Cities of Liberty Lake, Spokane, and Spokane Valley will address channeling stormwater infiltration through natural sumps.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Better information is needed on the locations of sumps and shallow aquifers.
- The sub-area planning process could address this issue in Pend Oreille and Stevens counties.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Policy recommendations developed and sent to counties regarding infiltration of stormwater.
- Adoption of policy recommendations considered by counties.
- Stormwater infiltration addressed in cities' and counties' stormwater planning processes.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members and city and county staff will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VII.B.01 To what extent can reclaimed wastewater be used for aquifer recharge to support water supply and/or river baseflow needs?

## *Recommendation VII.B.01.a*

***Support use of reclaimed water from municipal wastewater treatment facilities for aquifer recharge.***

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- All water supplier plans must address reuse.
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District have conducted separate feasibility studies. These studies may complete or partially complete this recommendation and Recommendations VII.B.01.b and c.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- Wastewater utilities are encouraged to hire consultants to evaluate the feasibility of recharging aquifers with reclaimed water. The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District should collaborate in this effort.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Based on the results of the aquifer recharge feasibility analysis, wastewater utilities will conduct site investigations and prepare preliminary design studies.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Aquifer recharge from reclaimed water will be implemented by wastewater utilities where feasible.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Recommendations VII.B.01.a, b, and c are a package.
- Wastewater utilities may be able to implement this recommendation as part of TMDL oversight committee duties.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- A feasibility study conducted of recharging aquifers with reclaimed water.
- Site investigations conducted and preliminary design studies prepared.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$7,000 to implementation of Recommendations VII.B.01.a-c; additional funding may need to be identified.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.B.01.b**

***Upon completion of reclaimed water use acceptability evaluations (I.A.01) including wellhead protection concerns, perform recharge site investigations, preliminary design studies and feasibility studies for a reclaimed water recharge program.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low-medium.

Recommendations VII.B.01.a, b, and c are a package. See Recommendation VII.B.01.a.

## **Recommendation VII.B.01.c**

***If aquifer storage of reclaimed water is politically acceptable and economically feasible, implement an aquifer storage program for reclaimed water.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

Recommendations VII.B.01.a, b, and c are a package. See Recommendation VII.B.01.a.

## **Recommendation VII.C.01.a**

***Apply for supplemental funding under multi-use storage to investigate the technical feasibility of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge. (Obligations were completed)***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- This recommendation was completed but further study will be helpful.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- WIT members will bring information regarding federal, private or other opportunities to fund storage feasibility assessments to the attention of the WIT.
- The WIT, with Spokane County as the lead, will identify grant opportunities and apply for funding to conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- Spokane County and the WIT will conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Immediate and near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- The WIT interprets this recommendation as: “Apply for funding to investigate the technical feasibility of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge”.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Funding obtained to conduct the feasibility analysis.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- Spokane County and the WIT will identify grant opportunities, which may include Ecology grants or the Columbia River Initiative.
- Spokane County’s Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, may support implementation of some of these actions.

### **PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED**

- None needed.



## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.C.01.b**

***Identify potential infiltration areas that could be used to augment summer baseflow in gaining reaches of the Spokane River. (Obligation completed)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The Golder Model Scenario study partially implemented this recommendation.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- None.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- ★ Spokane County, with support from the WIT, will issue an RFP and hire a consultant to identify potential infiltration areas. This will be combined with Recommendations VII.C.02.a and VII.C.02.b. The consultant will evaluate and rank the feasibility of specific sites and processes and assess whether infiltrating water would violate anti-degradation regulations.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The Golder Model Scenario study concluded that there were no locations directly over the Spokane Valley portion of the SVRP Aquifer where spring time injection could augment summer baseflow.
- Recharge using reclaimed water may be evaluated by Spokane County as part of their TMDL requirements.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- An assessment of potential infiltration areas, including a prioritized list of specific sites.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- The City of Spokane has committed \$6,000 to implementation of the package of this recommendation and Recommendations VII.C.02.a-b.
- Additional funding sources may include Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.C.01.c**

***Incorporate findings of VII.C.01.b into the Implementation Phase for WRIA 55 & 57 watershed planning and include specific recommendations in the first Plan Update. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- None.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will review the consultant's findings from the water infiltration assessment and consider elements to incorporate into the first Plan Update.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- None.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

- See Recommendation VII.E.01.A.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- None needed.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VII.C.01.d**

***During the implementation phase, support development of criteria, in collaboration with the Department of Ecology, under which credit for mitigation will be determined. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- None.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- Ecology will continue to work with a subcommittee to begin a state-wide discussion of mitigation credits, including whether specific conservation and augmentation actions count as mitigation, and how mitigation will affect the issuance of new water rights.
- Spokane County will actively participate in the mitigation subcommittee and make suggestions for local criteria.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- Ecology will issue a policy guidance document on mitigation.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- A question for discussion is whether additional water available for appropriation will go first to holders of junior or conditional water rights, or will be available for new water rights.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- WIT is aware of the Ecology subcommittee's work on mitigation credits.
- Rule-making is initiated.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- None needed.

### **PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED**

- None needed.

### **OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES**

- The WIT will provide oversight.

### **Recommendation VII.C.02.a**

***Apply for supplemental funding under multi-use storage to investigate the technical feasibility of mitigating public water supply pumping using artificial recharge. (Obligation completed)***

#### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

This will be combined with Recommendations VII.C.01.b and VII.C.02.b. See Recommendation VII.C.01.b.

### **Recommendation VII.C.02.b**

***Identify locations where infiltration or injection might benefit supply wells and the amount of water that might be beneficially stored based on current and projected pumping. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

#### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

This will be combined with Recommendations VII.C.01.b and VII.C.02.a. See Recommendation VII.C.01.b.

### **Recommendation VII.C.02.c**

***Incorporate findings of this evaluation into the Implementation Phase for WRIA 55 & 57 watershed planning and include specific recommendations. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

This recommendation has been completed. No implementation actions are needed.

### **Recommendation VII.C.02.d**

***During the Implementation Phase develop criteria, in collaboration with the Department of Ecology, under which credit for mitigation for new water appropriations will be determined. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

#### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.

This will be combined with Recommendation VII.C.01.d.

## **Recommendation VII.C.03.a**

***Perform a MIKE SHE Model evaluation of the net effect on the aquifer; resulting from changes to Post Falls HED operations, during summer low-flow operations.***

### **BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY**

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high

### **CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)**

- None.

### **IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)**

- ★ Spokane County, in coordination with Ecology, will incorporate the new license agreement for Avista into the Bi-State Aquifer model once that agreement is finalized.

### **NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)**

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

### **LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)**

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

- The MIKE SHE model has been replaced with the new Bi-State Aquifer study model.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES**

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Modeling evaluation, using the Bi-State Aquifer study model, of the net effect to the aquifer.

### **POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

- The City of Spokane has committed \$5,000 to implementation of this recommendation.
- Additional funding sources may include APA-funded County staff time.

### **PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED**

- None needed.

### **OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES**

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## VIII. Approaches to Plan Implementation

Issue VIII.A.01 What should the structure and membership of the Planning Unit be as it assumes the implementation role?

### *Recommendation VIII.A.01.a*

***Identify key stakeholder groups needed for plan implementation and secure commitment for continued involvement.***

This recommendation has been completed. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed for plan implementation (Appendix 5), and Group A water purveyors were invited to participate.

### *Recommendation VIII.A.01.b*

***Entities that will be involved with implementation and included in the implementation matrix should be represented on the implementation Planning Unit.***

This recommendation has been completed. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed for plan implementation, and Group A water purveyors were invited to participate.

### *Recommendation VIII.A.01.c*

***Develop procedures for WIT participation in plan implementation. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

This recommendation has been completed. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed for plan implementation, and Group A water purveyors were invited to participate. The DIP notes additional roles and responsibilities for WIT members and the WIT as a whole.

### *Recommendation VIII.B.01.a*

***Evaluate studies recommended in the Watershed Plan for data gaps. (Obligation to Spokane County and Stevens County)***

#### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

#### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to obtain missing data.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to obtain missing data.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT will continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to obtain missing data.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- This recommendation is a high priority for the WIT, and has been incorporated into many of the recommended actions in this DIP.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Data gaps in studies prepared for the WIT identified and evaluated.
- Funding obtained to fill data gaps where applicable.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VIII.B.01 What additional information is needed to fully implement the Watershed Plan?

## **Recommendation VIII.B.01.b**

***Evaluate the success of implemented Watershed Plan recommendations.*** (Obligation to Spokane County and Stevens County)

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will ensure that evaluations are written into all scopes-of-work that implement recommendations of the WRIA 55/57 Watershed Plan.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will evaluate implemented recommendations to assess whether they were completed and whether the results were effective.

- The WIT will review the 2008-2009 Workplan and evaluate the results.
- The WIT will review the 2010-2011 Workplan and evaluate the results.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT will evaluate implemented recommendations to assess whether they were completed and whether the results were effective.
- The WIT will review the 2012-2013 Workplan and evaluate the results.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Evaluation components are included in all projects.
- Bi-annual evaluations of the two-year workplans are conducted.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VIII.B.01.c**

***Use adaptive management to fill data gaps and improve the outcomes of implemented recommendations.*** (Obligation to Spokane County)

### BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

### CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

### IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- WIT members will continue to improve projects as funding and information become available.

### NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- WIT members will continue to improve projects as funding and information become available.



## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- WIT members will continue to improve projects as funding and information become available.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Projects continually evaluated for needs and improved where applicable.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VIII.C.01 Can established systems be used to forecast the general nature of streamflow in these rivers?

## **Recommendation VIII.C.01.a**

***Evaluate existing forecasting systems, and support improvements determined valuable by the WIT. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium-high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- The National Weather Service, the NRCS and the USGS currently run forecasting systems.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will encourage the National Weather Service, the NRCS and the USGS to publicize their forecasts.
- The WIT will work with the NRCS to translate their forecast information to the public and begin to publicize these data.
- The WIT will hold a meeting to discuss possible uses of forecasting data, and will consider the example of the Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima provides water forecast information to the surrounding community, predicting water levels in reservoirs based on stream flows and snow pack. These forecasts are used by area water users to prepare for water shortages, and the success of this project should be used as an example.
- It may be possible to use satellite data to measure snow pack and soil moisture.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Forecasting data are available to the public in a form comprehensible to the layperson.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VIII.C.01.b**

***Develop a procedure for presenting flow forecast information that will be used to trigger water resources management procedures. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is high.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- A WIT subcommittee will address how to appropriately convey forecasting information to the media, and appropriate formats for presenting information to the public.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of immediate actions.

## ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the immediate and near-term actions.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- NRCS sites should be evaluated.
- It is more important to have the media publicize upcoming water shortages and the need for immediate conservation than it is to have the perfect web site.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Report recommending how to convey forecasting information to the media and to the public.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VIII.D.01 How can watershed plan projects compete for limited funds?

### **Recommendation VIII.D.01.a**

***State agencies should give priority to projects included in Watershed Plans when reviewing projects for funding.***

No further actions are necessary.

### **Recommendation VIII.D.01.b**

***Identify and pursue additional funding sources for watershed plan projects. (Obligation to Spokane County)***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT believes this recommendation offers a medium benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is medium.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will continue to pursue Ecology grant funding for projects. After the DIP is completed, the WIT will identify other grants or funding sources.
- WIT members will share notice of funding opportunities with the entire WIT.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- The number and dollar amounts of grants received.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- WIT members will donate time to investigate Ecology grants, federal grants, private grants and other sources.
- The City of Spokane has committed \$2,000 to implementation of this recommendation.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

Issue VIII.E.01 How can the Watershed Plan adapt to new information and changing needs of the watersheds?

## **Recommendation VIII.E.01.a**

***The Watershed Plan should be reviewed and revised as needed, if funding is available, at five year intervals after the completion of the detailed Implementation Plan.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT did not rate the benefits and practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT may consider and approve amendments to the Watershed Plan as needed. Once the amendments are approved by the WIT they must also be adopted by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties.
- The WIT will review and revise the DIP as funding allows on an ongoing basis.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Updated Watershed Plan is completed.

## POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology Grants.

## PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

## OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## **Recommendation VIII.E.01.b**

***Amendments to the Watershed Plan can be made, as required, by approval of the Planning Unit or its successor and adoption by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties.***

No further actions are necessary.

## **Recommendation VIII.E.01.c**

***The Detailed Implementation Plan will be reviewed and revised as funding allows on an ongoing basis.***

## BENEFITS AND PRACTICALITY

- The WIT did not rate the benefits and practicality of implementing this recommendation.

## CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS (THROUGH 2007)

- None.

## IMMEDIATE ACTIONS REQUIRED (2008-2009)

- The WIT will update the Workplan in the DIP at the end of 2009.

## NEAR-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2010-2012)

- The WIT will update the Workplan in the DIP every two years.
- The WIT will discuss and propose and implementation structure and sources of funding to continue implementation of the watershed plan beyond Phase IV.

- The WIT will consider the idea of separating WRIA 55 and WRIA 57, in order to be eligible for more funding dollars.

### LONG-TERM ACTIONS REQUIRED (2013 AND BEYOND)

- The WIT will review and revise the full DIP.

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- None.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS / MILESTONES

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:

- Updated Workplan and DIP.

### POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- Ecology Grants.

### PERMITS OR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS REQUIRED

- None needed.

### OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION ROLES

- The WIT will provide oversight.

## Part 3: Implementation Matrices

This section provides the reader with a summary of who will do what, by when, and with what funding. Every action included under a recommendation in Part 2 is included in these matrices. Recommendations are sorted by recommendation number under each heading. Actions are summarized in tables for each implementing WIT member, including the WIT as a whole. In cases where more than one implementer was specifically noted in Part 2, that action was included in the respective tables for each implementer. An “x” in the “Assistance” column indicates either that several implementers are assigned to conduct the action, or that an additional implementer may provide backup support for the action. Actions suggested in the DIP for non-WIT members are included under “Support for Actions by Non-WIT Members”.

In the development of the Watershed Management Plan, Washington State and Spokane, Stevens, and Pend Oreille Counties each agreed to be obligated to implement specific recommendations. These obligations are noted in the left-hand column of the implementation tables for those entities, as well as in the table for the WIT and for WIT members, where codes are used to denote obligated entities, explained at the bottom of the page.

Most actions are to be implemented through donated staff time, indicated by a ‘D’ in the ‘Funding’ column. If other funding sources have been identified, these are noted through letter codes which are explained at the bottom of the page. The need for ongoing grant funding for the WIT facilitator/coordinator and lead agency administrative costs is not specifically noted for each action.

Obligation to <sup>1</sup> :	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
SP, ST	I.A.01.c	Support RWCC efforts to coordinate conservation education programs.	D	2008-2009	
SP	I.A.02.a	Encourage all water purveyors in the WRIA to conduct a survey of their users to determine public knowledge and attitudes about water conservation and outdoor water use.	D	2008-2009	
	I.A.02.b	Develop a package of recommended incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation, with a particular focus on the initial landscape planning prior to development.	D	2008-2009	
	I.A.02.b	Coordinate presentations to boards of county commissioners, city councils, city and county planning commissions, and other appropriate policy bodies to request that specific incentives for xeriscaping and water conservation be implemented.	D	2008-2009	
	I.A.02.b	Continue to seek funding for education and implementation of incentives for water conservation and xeriscaping.	D	2008-2009	
SP	I.A.02.c	Meet with leaders of the WSU landscape design program to discuss options for additional xeriscaping incentives and/or education.	D	2008-2009	
SP	I.A.02.f	Provide assistance to water purveyors in developing a consistent methodology to determine temperature impacts on water use.	D	2008-2009	
SP	I.A.02.g	Send a letter encouraging the State to offer conservation incentives to irrigators on a state-wide or regional basis, cc'ing local legislators.	D	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **OBLIGATED ENTITIES:** PO – Pend Oreille County, SP – Spokane County, ST – Stevens County, WA – State of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation to <sup>1</sup> :	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
SP	I.A.02.g	Encourage water purveyors to consider rate incentives in conservation plans to encourage irrigation efficiency.	D	2008-2009	x
SP	I.C.01.d	Encourage water purveyors, counties, and wastewater utilities to explore water reuse and reclamation opportunities via pilot projects.	D	2008-2009	
SP	II.A.01.d	Identify funding sources to continue operation of the gauge at Barker Road.	D	2008-2009	
SP	II.D.01.a	Seek funding for a study of how river diversions can be accomplished without impairing spawning and incubation of rainbow trout, including a cost/benefit analysis, at some point in the future.	D	2013-future	
SP, WA	II.E.01.a	Recommend flow regimes to Ecology for instream flow rule-making based on the flow regime analysis prepared by the Instream Flow work group.	D	2008-2009	
	III.A.01.c, d	Keep abreast of WDFW studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences, and consider whether to conduct flow studies on the tributaries depending on the status of those studies.	D	2008-2009	
	III.A.01.c, d	Communicate to the Legislature support for WDFW funding needs to conduct studies on mountain whitefish spawning and habitat preferences.	D	2008-2009	
	III.A.01.d	Depending on the status of WDFW mountain whitefish studies, consider whether to conduct studies on optimizing fish habitat.	D	2010-2012	
	III.A.01.f	Evaluate funding needs to conduct a PHABSIM (or other habitat model) analysis of habitat needs on the Little Spokane River.	D	2008-2009	
	III.A.01.f	Determine whether to conduct a study using a habitat model such as PHABSIM.	D	2010-2012	
SP	III.B.01.a	If funding is identified, identify a lead agency to issue an RFP and negotiate a contract to study the effects of exporting water from the SVRP Aquifer to the Little Spokane River.	D	2010-2012	
	III.B.03.b	Continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements.	D	2008-2009	x
	III.B.03.c	Seek funding and cooperation with those who would benefit from the gauges at Chattaroy and/or Elk.	D	2008-2009	
	III.B.04.a, b	Discuss options such as seasonal storage that would be used throughout the watershed to enhance recreation.	D	2008-2009	
SP	III.B.04.c	Hold a meeting to solicit input from recreational user groups on needs and options on the Little Spokane River.	D	2008-2009	
SP	III.B.05.a	Consider whether additional gauges should be installed on tributaries to the West Branch, depending on funding and data needs.	D	2008-2009	
SP	III.C.01.a	Consider seeking funding for an aquatic biota study on the Little Spokane River.	D	2010-2012	
SP	III.C.01.b	Consider strategies such as storage and conservation to meet the integrated flow regime.	D	2013-future	
	IV.A.01.c	Make a formal request to Spokane Regional Health District and the NE Tri-County Health District to evaluate the production rate, and minimum duration of production at that rate, for domestic exempt wells required for issuance of a building permit.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.d, e	Develop recommendations for criteria for demonstrating water availability before development and send them to counties and other land use regulators.	D	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **OBLIGATED ENTITIES:** PO – Pend Oreille County, SP – Spokane County, ST – Stevens County, WA – State of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.



Obligation to <sup>1</sup> :	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
	IV.A.01.d	Provide oral or written briefings to county commissions, planning commissions, or other policy bodies on the need to better ensure sufficient water availability prior to construction.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.e	Seek money to fund a data gap analysis to examine well logs, purveyor information, and the DOH complaint data base to identify areas of water availability concern.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.e	Host a summit with water purveyors on identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.e	Develop a list of procedures for better coordination and communication between water purveyors and county planning departments and begin, with appropriate county staff, to adopt and implement these.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.f	Develop and propose comprehensive plan amendments to the planning commission to address water availability issues, working closely with county staff.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.03.a	Identify owners of domestic exempt wells and issue a press release or send them a letter in mid-summer, when NOAA stream flow predictions fall below minimum instream flows, requesting that they voluntarily conserve water.	E, SAJB	2008-2009	x
	IV.B.01.a	Revisit the concept of running a sensitivity analysis on exempt wells if relevant.	D	2010-2012	
	IV.B.02.a	Revisit the concept of running a sensitivity analysis on unmetered Group A and Group B water use if relevant.	D	2010-2012	
	IV.C.01.a	Determine whether to ask Ecology to clarify Policy 1230 to facilitate its consistent implementation.	D	2008-2009	
	V.A.01.a	Request that a Water Master be hired for WRIA 55/57 to deal with water rights monitoring and enforcement.	D	2008-2009	
	V.A.01.a	Send letters to the Legislature asking for increased funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights, until adequate monies are granted.	D	ongoing	x
SP	V.A.01.b	Support additional state-wide funding for water rights/water use database compatibility efforts by DOH and Ecology.	D	2008-2009	
SP	V.A.01.b	Request that Ecology hire a Water Master to oversee data gathering, evaluation, and enforcement, and to have direct contact with landowners.	D	2008-2009	
SP	V.A.01.b	Ask DOH for a briefing to describe water use data and options for tracking water use in the watershed.	D	2008-2009	
SP	V.A.01.c	Look at Municipal Reserves in other watersheds and obtain more information from Ecology as to the nature of a Municipal Reserve, and how it can be used in WRIA 55/57 for future water rights for municipal water suppliers.	D	2008-2009	
	V.A.02.a	Write letters to the Legislature asking for additional funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program	D	2008-2009	
	V.B.01.b	When the low streamflow trigger is reached, issue a notice regarding the low water year, and issue Public Safety Announcements.	D	2008-2009	
	V.B.01.b	Evaluate the effectiveness of working with media partners, and alter the strategy as necessary.	D	2010-future	x
	VI.A.01.a, d	Encourage counties and cities to better enforce current land use codes for wetlands restoration and preservation.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.a, d	Encourage counties to retain or hire a wetlands biologist who makes site visits as part of the permitting and compliance process.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VI.A.01.a	Prepare a strategy to identify historic sites where important wetlands have been destroyed, and suggest restoration or exchange as mitigation for other projects.	D, WRFS	2010-2012	

<sup>1</sup> **OBLIGATED ENTITIES:** PO – Pend Oreille County, SP – Spokane County, ST – Stevens County, WA – State of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation to <sup>1</sup> :	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
	VI.A.01.c	Encourage counties and WDNR to require loggers to post a sign bearing their name for five years following logging in order to encourage an improvement in forest practices.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.c	Meet with fire districts to collaborate on education efforts to encourage people not to denude slopes for fire protection.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.e	Support increased funding to the POCD and SCCD for programs that address runoff and infiltration.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.C.01.a	Based on the result of the pumping analysis, consider asking water purveyors to voluntarily shut down some wells during summer low flows.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.A.01.a	Track regulatory proposals to amend stormwater regulations and comment as appropriate.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.A.01.a	Discourage regulations that allow stormwater to be piped into the river.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.A.01.b	Create a work group to examine current stormwater plans, and take recommendations to cities and counties during the public involvement period on specific issues.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.A.01.c	Finalize and forward the stormwater work group's recommendations to the counties and work with the counties to adopt the recommendations.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VII.C.01.a	Identify grant opportunities and apply for funding to conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.	D	2008-2009	x
SP	VII.C.01.c	Review the consultant's findings from the water infiltration assessment and consider elements to incorporate into the first plan update.	D	2010-2012	
SP, ST	VIII.B.01.a	Continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to provide missing data.	D	ongoing	
SP, ST	VIII.B.01.b	Ensure that evaluations are written into all watershed project scope-of-works.	D	2008-2009	
SP, ST	VIII.B.01.b	Evaluate implemented recommendations to assess whether they were completed and effective.	D	ongoing	
SP, ST	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 Workplans and evaluate the results.	D	2010-2012	
SP, ST	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2012-2013 Workplan and evaluate the results.	D	2013-future	
SP	VIII.C.01.a	Encourage the National Weather Service, the NRCS and the USGS to publicize their forecasts.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VIII.C.01.a	Work with the NRCS to translate their forecast information to the public and begin to publicize these data.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VIII.C.01.a	Hold a meeting to discuss possible uses of forecasting data, and consider the example of the Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VIII.D.01.b	Continue to pursue Ecology grant funding for projects. Once the DIP is completed, continue to identify other grants or funding sources.	D	ongoing	
	VIII.E.01.a	Review and revise the Watershed Plan as needed.	E	2013-future	
	VIII.E.01.c	Update, review, and revise the DIP.	E	ongoing	
	VIII.E.01.c	Develop an implementation strategy and identify funding sources of implementation beyond Phase IV.	E	2010	
	VIII.E.01.c	Consider the idea of separating WRIA 55 and WRIA 57 in order to be eligible for more funding dollars.	E	ongoing	

<sup>1</sup> **OBLIGATED ENTITIES:** PO – Pend Oreille County, SP – Spokane County, ST – Stevens County, WA – State of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation to <sup>1</sup> :	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Watershed Implementation Team members	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
	I.A.01.b	Provide customer water saving incentives consistent with the TMDL requirements.	D	2008-2009	
	I.A.02.b, .d	Compile a summary of xeriscaping incentives, requirements or other components from local comprehensive plans and development regulations (including permitting requirements) that address xeriscaping or other water conservation actions.	D	2008-2009	
	II.A.01.d	Through the Instream Flow work group (below), continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, updating the WIT periodically.	D	ongoing	x
	II.E.01.a	Form an Instream Flow work group to look at relevant studies, including TMDL work and instream studies, and to consider water conservation and habitat issues as part of the instream flow regime.	D	2008-2009	
	III.C.01.a	Continue to participate in the TMDL process.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.a	Support each county's efforts to establish low residential densities (and other land use policies that support recommendations in the Watershed Plan) by sending letters, providing public testimony, and other actions.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.03.a	Identify owners of domestic exempt wells and issue a press release or send them a letter in mid-summer, when NOAA stream flow predictions fall below minimum instream flows, requesting that they voluntarily conserve water.	E, SAJB	2008-2009	
	IV.A.03.a, V.B.01.a	Assist in updating an existing database for the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.	D	2008-2009	
	V.A.01.a	Send letters to the Legislature asking for increased funding for monitoring and enforcement of water rights, until adequate monies are granted.	D	2008-2009	x
	V.A.02.a	Write letters to the Legislature asking for additional funding for the Washington Water Acquisition Program.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.b	Support the efforts of the SCCD and POCD to obtain additional funds.	D	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.f	Conduct briefings to the boards of county commissioners, planning commissions, and others to inform them of the merits of land use policies that adequately preserve vegetation in natural drainages.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.A.01.c	Through the stormwater work group, develop specific policy recommendations that support infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps.	D	2008-2009	
	VII.C.01.a	Bring information regarding federal, private, or other opportunities to fund storage feasibility assessments to the attention of the WIT.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VIII.B.01.c	Continue to improve projects as funding and information becomes available.	D	ongoing	
SP	VIII.C.01.b	Through a work group, address how to appropriately convey forecasting information to the media, and appropriate formats for presenting information to the public.	D	2008-2009	
SP	VIII.D.01.b	Share notice of funding opportunities with the entire WIT.	D	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **OBLIGATED ENTITIES:** PO – Pend Oreille County, SP – Spokane County, ST – Stevens County, WA – State of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Spokane County Conservation District	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
I.A.02.b	Continue the development of a target education program on outdoor landscaping and provide technical assistance to developers in designing xeriscaped developments.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.b-d	Seek funding to develop new water conservation or xeriscaping demonstration sites, as needed.	D	2010-2012	
I.A.02.c	Continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.c, d	Continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.c, d	Develop a descriptive inventory of xeriscaping and water conservation demonstration sites.	D	2008-2009	
I.A.02.e	Continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes.	D	2008-2009	x
III.B.03.c	Contract with the USGS to maintain the Elk stream gauge on the mainstem of the Little Spokane River with current real-time data available via satellite on the USGS web page.	SGOM	2008-2009	x
III.B.04.c	Seek willing landowners for the Conservation Futures program.	D	2008-2009	
III.B.05.a	Seek funding to continue operation and maintenance of current gauges.	D	2008-2009	
VI.A.01.a	Look at the Conservation Futures program for potential wetlands areas to purchase.	D	2008-2009	
VI.A.01.b	Seek additional funding to enhance current efforts to create new wetlands.	D	2008-2009	
VI.A.01.b	Continue efforts to create new wetlands, with NRCS assistance if necessary.	D	ongoing	
VI.A.01.e	Apply for grants to conduct custom direct seeding in order to obtain farmer buy-in.	D	2008-2009	
VI.A.01.e	Contingent on funding, continue the custom direct seeding program.	D	ongoing	
VI.A.02.a	Conduct a feasibility analysis of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake to maintain the lake's elevation and serve, if necessary, to augment baseflows in downstream reaches of the Little Spokane River.	C, E, WB	2008-2009	x

Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Pend Oreille Conservation District	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
I.A.02.b	Continue the development of a target education program on outdoor landscaping and provide technical assistance to developers in designing xeriscaped developments.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.c	Continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.c, d	Continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.	D	2008-2009	x
VI.A.01.b	Seek additional funding to enhance current efforts to create new wetlands.	D	2008-2009	
VI.A.01.b	Continue efforts to create new wetlands, with NRCS assistance if necessary.	D	ongoing	
VI.A.01.d	Identify and coordinate public/private purchase of important wetlands in the WB LSR watershed for conservation by working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts.	CF, WB	2008-2009	x
VI.A.02.d	Take the lead in collaboration with other counties and state agencies, particularly WDFW, in determining a narrowly focused education strategy on beaver dams.	D	2008-2009	x

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Spokane County	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
O	I.A.01.a	Implement an indoor conservation program targeting Spokane County sewer customers as part of their TMDL program.	D	2008-2009	
O	I.A.01.a, c	Continue and expand current water conservation education efforts as appropriate	D	2008-2009	x
O	I.A.02.a	Encourage all water purveyors in the WRIA to conduct a survey of their users to determine public knowledge and attitudes about water conservation and outdoor water use.	D	2008-2009	x
	I.A.02.b	Develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits and cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and for builders; both will include sample landscape designs.	D	2008-2009	x
O	I.A.02.c	Meet with leaders of the WSU landscape design program to discuss options for additional xeriscaping incentives and/or education.	D	2008-2009	x
	I.A.02.e	Continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes.	D, E, C, APA	2008-2009	x
	I.A.02.f	Provide assistance to water purveyors in developing a consistent methodology to determine temperature impacts on water use.	D	2008-2009	x
O	I.A.02.g	Evaluate implemented irrigation incentives and changes in irrigation efficiencies.	D	2013-future	
O	I.A.02.g	Develop and implement golf course water conservation strategies.	APA, C, W	2008-2009	x
O	I.A.02.g	Develop and implement a water conservation strategy for public parks.	APA, C, W	2008-2009	x
O	I.C.01.a	Survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and share survey data.	C, E	2008-2009	x
O	I.C.01.b	Consider proposed changes in tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse.	D	2010-2012	
O	I.C.01.c	Expand to new pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	D	2010-2012	x
O	I.C.01.d	Present conclusions from initial pilot projects on water reuse and reclamation.	D	2010-2012	x
O	I.C.01.d	Conduct additional pilot studies or research on water reuse and reclamation as necessary.	D	2010-2012	x
O	II.A.01.d	Continue to examine correlations between the flows at Barker Road and Post Falls, updating the WIT periodically.	D	ongoing	x
O	II.D.01.a	Seek funding for a study of how river diversions can be accomplished without impairing spawning and incubation of rainbow trout, including a cost/benefit analysis, at some point in the future.	D	2013-future	x
O	II.E.01.a	Recommend flow regimes to Ecology for instream flow rule-making based on the flow regime analysis prepared by the Instream Flow work group.	D	2008-2009	x
O	III.B.03.a	Support SCCD efforts to obtain funding for, and collect data from, the gauge(s) at Chattaroy and/or Elk.	D	2008-2009	x
O	III.B.01.a	Work on developing an outline for studying water export from the SVRP Aquifer to the Little Spokane Watershed, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology, and cost.	D	2008-2009	x
O	III.B.04.c	Consider including parks or access points in future updates of the Shoreline Master Program and Parks Plan.	D	2013-future	
O	III.C.01.a	Consider seeking funding for an aquatic biota study on the Little Spokane River.	D	2010-2012	x
O	III.C.01.b	Consider strategies such as storage and conservation to meet the integrated flow regime.	D	2013-future	x
	IV.A.01.a	Inform the WIT when rural density changes are proposed.	D	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Spokane County, continued	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
	IV.A.01.a	Provide a summary of upcoming policy changes or clarifications with respect to residential densities that affect water supplies.	D	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.b	Coordinate with water purveyors to establish water supply consultation requirements for new developments.	D	2008-2009	x
	IV.A.01.d	Develop ordinance language on water availability required for land development and present it to the WIT.	D	2008-2009	x
	IV.A.01.d	Bring proposed ordinances on water availability required for land development to the relevant planning committees and work towards adoption with the WIT's support.	D	2008-2009	x
	IV.A.01.e	Using purveyors' input, conduct a data gap analysis of areas of water availability concern.	E	2008-2009	
	IV.A.01.f	Identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA.	D	2008-2009	x
O	V.A.01.b	Design a water use inventory for WRIA 55/57 either by hiring a consultant or doing it in-house.	D, E, APA	2008-2009	
O	V.A.01.c	Look at Municipal Reserves in other watersheds and obtain more information from Ecology as to the nature of a Municipal Reserve, and how it can be used in WRIA 55/57 for future water rights for municipal water suppliers.	D	2008-2009	x
	V.A.01.d	In coordination with other lead agencies of WRIsAs in Eastern Washington, draft a letter to the Legislature requesting additional funding for Ecology to address compliance, enforcement, and validity of water rights and claims. Encourage other WRIsAs to send the letter as well.	D	2008-2009	
	V.B.01.a	Provide data to Ecology and DOH to establish and maintain a database of addresses of all water rights holders in the watershed.	LA	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.a	Consider using wetlands as a part of the stormwater management system.	D	2008-2009	x
	VI.A.01.a	Review wetlands in WRIA 55/57, develop a list of historical wetland areas in WRIA 55/57 not currently functioning as wetlands, and work with the WIT to study certain areas for restoration.	WRFS	2008-2009	
	VI.A.01.c	Consider adopting forest management and development requirements that a minimum number of existing trees be retained, particularly on slopes.	D	2008-2009	x
	VI.A.02.a	Conduct a feasibility analysis of the installation of a water control structure at the outlet of Eloika Lake to maintain the lake's elevation and serve, if necessary, to augment baseflows in downstream reaches of the Little Spokane R.	C, E, WB	2008-2009	x
	VI.B.01.a, b	Hire (a) consultant(s) to do a feasibility analysis of the use of surface runoff storage, in existing lakes and/or in new reservoirs, manmade ponds or wetlands, as a means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.	WRFS, C, E	2008-2009	
O	VI.C.01.a	Take the lead in designing and coordinating an analysis of the costs and benefits of moving pumping away from wells near the river during the summer low-flow season.	D, C, E, APA	2008-2009	x
	VII.A.01.c	During the stormwater planning process, address channeling stormwater infiltration through natural sumps.	D	2008-2009	x
	VII.B.01.a, b, c	Collaborate with the City of Spokane and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District to hire consultants to evaluate the feasibility of recharging aquifers with reclaimed water.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VII.C.01.a	Identify grant opportunities and apply for funding to conduct a feasibility analysis of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VII.C.01.b, VII.C.02.a-b	Issue an RFP and hire a consultant to identify potential infiltration areas, evaluate and rank the feasibility of specific sites and processes, and assess whether infiltrating water would violate anti-degradation regulations.	C, E	2008-2009	x

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Spokane County, continued	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
O	VII.C.01.c	Review the consultant's findings from the water infiltration assessment and consider elements to incorporate into the first Plan Update.	D	2010-2012	x
O	VII.C.01.d, VII.C.02.d	Actively participate in Ecology's mitigation subcommittee, and make suggestions for local criteria	D	2008-2009	
	VII.C.03.a	Incorporate the new license agreement for Avista into the Bi-State Aquifer model once that agreement is finalized.	D, C, APA	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.B.01.a	Continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to provide missing data.	D	ongoing	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Ensure that evaluations are written into all watershed project scope-of-works.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Evaluate implemented recommendations to assess whether they were completed and effective.	D	ongoing	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 Workplans and evaluate the results.	D	2010-2012	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2012-2013 Workplan and evaluate the results.	D	2013-future	x
O	VIII.B.01.c	Continue to improve projects as funding and information becomes available.	D	ongoing	x
O	VIII.C.01.a	Encourage the National Weather Service, the NRCS and the USGS to publicize their forecasts.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.C.01.a	Work with the NRCS to translate their forecast information to the public and begin to publicize these data.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.C.01.a	Hold a meeting to discuss possible uses of forecasting data, and consider the example of the Bureau of Reclamation in Yakima.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.C.01.b	With a WIT work group, address how to appropriately convey forecasting information to the media, and appropriate formats for presenting information to the public.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.D.01.b	Continue to pursue Ecology grant funding for projects. After the DIP is completed, identify other funding sources.	D	ongoing	x

Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Pend Oreille County	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
	I.A.01.a,c, I.B.01.a	Continue education efforts as appropriate and coordinate with partners.	D	Ongoing	x
	I.C.01.a	Survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and share survey data.	D	2008-2009	x
	I.C.01.b	Consider proposed changes in tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse.	D	2010-2012	
	I.C.01.c	Expand to new pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	D	2010-2012	x
O	III.B.03.a	Support SCCD efforts to obtain funding for, and collect data from, the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk.	D	2008-2009	x
	III.B.03.b	Continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements.	D	2008-2009	x
	III.B.04.c	Consider including parks or access points in future updates of the Shoreline Master Program and Parks Plan.	D	2013-future	
	VI.A.01.d	Identify and coordinate public/private purchase of important wetlands in the WB LSR watershed for conservation by working to develop partnerships with public/private entities such as land conservancies and land trusts.	CF, WB	2008-2009	x
	VI.A.02.a	Conduct site identification and feasibility studies for instream water storage projects throughout the WB LSR watershed.	E, C, WB	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Stevens County	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
	I.A.01.a,c, I.B.01.a	Continue education efforts as appropriate and coordinate with partners.	D	Ongoing	x
	IV.A.01.d	Develop ordinance language on water availability required for land development and present it to the WIT.	D	2008-2009	x
	IV.A.01.d	Bring proposed water availability ordinances to the relevant planning committees and work towards adoption with the WIT's support.	D	2008-2009	x
	VI.A.01.a, .d	Identify wetlands within the CAO and associated maps, and develop a strategy to preserve wetlands.	D	2008-2009	x
	VI.A.01.c	Consider adopting forest management and development requirements that a minimum number of existing trees be retained, particularly on slopes	D	2008-2009	
O	VIII.B.01.a	Continue to evaluate data gaps and pursue grant funds to provide missing data.	D	ongoing	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Ensure that evaluations are written into all watershed project scope-of-works.	D	2008-2009	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Evaluate implemented recommendations to assess whether they were completed and whether the results were effective.	D	ongoing	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 Workplans and evaluate the results.	D	2010-2012	x
O	VIII.B.01.b	Review the 2012-2013 Workplan and evaluate the results.	D	2013-future	x

Cities	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Cities <sup>2</sup>	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
D, L, M, S, SV	I.A.02.b	Develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits and cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and for builders; both will include sample landscape designs.	D	2008-2009	x
S, L	I.A.02.g	Develop and implement golf course water conservation strategies.	APA, C, W	2008-2009	x
D, L, S, SV	I.A.02.g	Develop and implement a water conservation strategy for public parks.	APA, C, W	2008-2009	x
D, L, M, S, SV	I.C.01.a	Survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and share survey data.	C, E	2008-2009	x
D, L, M, S, SV	I.C.01.a	Develop water reclamation and reuse education/outreach programs that build on the public perception survey data and address specific regional concerns and goals.	E, C, SAJB, SW, WB	2008-2009	
D, L, M, S, SV	I.C.01.b	Consider proposed changes in tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse.	D	2010-2012	
D, L, S	VI.A.01.c	Develop and adopt urban forestry regulations throughout the watershed.	D	2008-2009	x

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

<sup>2</sup> **CITIES:** **D:** Deer Park, **L:** Liberty Lake, **M:** Millwood, **S:** Spokane, **SV:** Spokane Valley



Specific implementers	Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the State Caucus	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
Ecology		I.A.02.e	Continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes.	E, C, APA	2008-2009	x
Ecology, DOH		I.C.01.a	Develop water reclamation and reuse education and outreach programs that build on the public perception survey data and address regional concerns and goals.	E, C, SAJB, SW, WB	2008-2009	
Ecology	O	II.A.01.a, II.E.01.a	Initiate rule-making to adopt instream flows for the Middle Spokane River.	D	2008-2009	
WDFW		II.A.01.c	Continue to implement a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation and emergence for rainbow trout.	D	2008-2009	x
WDFW		II.A.01.c	Evaluate the rainbow trout spawning, incubation and emergence protocol, revise if necessary, and continue with implementation.	D	2010 - future	x
Ecology		III.B.02.a	Meet with the WIT to develop strategies to enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff in the Little Spokane Watershed for exempt wells that have junior water rights.	D	ongoing	
Ecology		III.B.03.b	Continue to seek stable funding for flow measurements.	D	2008-2009	x
Ecology		III.B.04.a, b	Continue to regulate water rights when flows at Dartford fall below 115 cfs and when flows at Elk Park fall below 38 cfs as required by the instream flow rule.	D	2008-2009	
Ecology, DOH		IV.A.01.f	Identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA.	D	2008-2009	x
Ecology		IV.A.02.a	Brief the WIT on laws regarding exempt wells, focusing particularly on rights, limitations, and what options WITs or local governments have to restrict or regulate use from exempt wells.	D	2008-2009	
Ecology		IV.C.01.a	Brief the WIT on Policy 1230, "Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals".	D	2008-2009	
Ecology		V.A.01.a	Provide the WIT with its water rights enforcement strategy and report on any enforcement actions.	D	2008-2009	
Ecology, DOH		V.A.01.b	Work to either merge or make compatible water rights and water use databases.	LA	2008-2009	
Ecology	O	V.A.01.d	Brief the WIT on findings from the pre-adjudication work.	D	2008-2009	
Ecology		V.A.02.a	Conduct education programs directed towards helping the public understand the Washington Water Acquisition Program.	D	2010-2012	
Ecology		V.B.01.a	With data provided by counties, establish and maintain a database of addresses of all water rights holders in the Little Spokane Watershed.	LA	2008-2009	x
Ecology		V.B.01.a	Send a letter ordering curtailment to all junior water rights holders subject to adopted instream flow rules in mid-summer when stream flows drop below the established minimum flow.	D	2008-2009	x
WDFW		VI.A.02.d	Collaborate in determining a narrowly focused education strategy on beaver dams.	D	2008-2009	x
WDFW		VI.A.02.d	Investigate and address illegal beaver dam removal at the southern end of Eloika Lake.	LA, WB	2008-2009	

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** APA – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), C – City of Spokane, CF – Conservation Futures Program, D – Donated staff time, E – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, LA – Legislative Appropriation, S – Spokane County, SW – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, SAJB – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, W – Water Purveyors, WB – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, WRFS - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, SGOM - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Specific implementers	Obligation? (O)	Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the State Caucus, continued	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
Ecology		VII.C.01.d	Develop a subcommittee to begin a state-wide discussion of mitigation credits, including whether certain conservation and augmentation actions count as mitigation, and how mitigation will affect the issuance of new water rights.	D	2008-2009	
Ecology		VII.C.01.d	Develop policy guidance regarding mitigation credits.	D	2010-2012	
Ecology		VII.C.03.a	Work with Spokane County to incorporate the new license agreement for Avista into the Bi-State Aquifer model once that agreement is finalized.	C, APA	2008-2009	x

Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by Water Purveyors	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
I.A.01.a	Consider providing customers in the watershed with graphs or other information depicting average monthly or bi-monthly consumption and seasonal consumption to encourage conservation.	D	2008-2009	
I.A.01.a, c, I.B.01.a	Continue and expand current water conservation education efforts as appropriate.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.01.b	Continue to measure water savings and reevaluate cost-effectiveness on an annual basis.	D	2010-future	
I.A.02.e	Initiate personal, one-to-one communications with the largest water users in their service area to develop specific water conservation strategies.	D	2008-2009	
I.A.02.f	Expand existing pilot irrigation efficiency projects to add new entities.	D	2008-2009	
I.A.02.f	Evaluate data on weather trends to determine temperature impacts on water use, correlating average monthly temperature and precipitation with water use.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.f	Evaluate the benefits of pilot projects on irrigation efficiency.	D	2010-2012	
I.C.01.c	Expand to new pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	D	2010-2012	x
I.C.01.d	Present conclusions from initial pilot projects on water reuse and reclamation.	D	2010-2012	x
I.C.01.d	Conduct additional pilot studies or research on water reuse and reclamation as necessary.	D	2010-2012	x
III.B.01.a	Whitworth Water District will work on developing an outline for studying water export from the SVRP Aquifer to the Little Spokane Watershed, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology, and cost.	D	2008-2009	x
IV.A.01.b	Work with counties to establish water supply consultation requirements for new developments.	D	2008-2009	x
IV.A.01.f	Identify areas of limited water availability, particularly examining rural areas and growth areas under the GMA.	D	2008-2009	x

Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the Spokane Aquifer Joint Board	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
I.A.01.a, c, I.B.01.a	Continue and expand current water conservation education efforts as appropriate	D	2008-2009	x

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Rec. #	Actions to be Implemented by the City of Spokane	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
I.A.01.a, c	Continue and expand current water conservation education efforts as appropriate.	C, D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.b	Develop and distribute information on the benefits of xeriscaping to applicants for land use permits, including information on conservation-related watershed benefits and cost savings. Versions will be created for homeowners and for builders; both will include sample landscape designs.	D	2008-2009	x
I.A.02.e	Continue to conduct irrigation efficiency classes.	C, D	2008-2009	x
I.C.01.a	Survey citizens on their perceptions of water reclamation and reuse, and share survey data.	C, D	2008-2009	x
I.C.01.b	Consider proposed changes in tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse.	D	2010-2012	
I.C.01.c	Capture data for existing pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	C, D	2008-2009	
I.C.01.c	Expand to new pilot projects on water reclamation and reuse.	C, D	2010-2012	x
I.C.01.d	Present conclusions from initial pilot projects on water reuse and reclamation.	C, D	2010-2012	x
III.B.01.a	Work on developing an outline for studying water export from the SVRP Aquifer to the Little Spokane Watershed, which will include considerations of data availability, methodology, and cost.	C, D	2008-2009	x
VI.A.01.a	Consider using wetlands as a part of the stormwater management system.	C, D	2008-2009	x
VI.A.01.c	Develop and adopt urban forestry regulations throughout the watershed.	D	2008-2009	x
VI.C.01.a	Assist in designing and coordinating an analysis of moving pumping away from wells near the river during the summer low-flow season.	C, E, APA	2008-2009	x
VII.A.01.c	During the stormwater planning process, address channeling stormwater infiltration through natural sumps.	D	2008-2009	x
VII.B.01.a, b, c	Collaborate with Spokane County and Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District to hire consultants to evaluate the feasibility of recharging aquifers with reclaimed water.	C, D	2008-2009	x

Specific implementers	Rec. #	Support for Actions by Non-WIT Members	Funding	Timeline	Assistance
RWCC	I.A.01.b	Prepare a master list of water conservation actions by waste water utilities and water purveyors in the region and recommend standardized methods to measure conservation from these activities.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	I.A.01.c	Take the lead on coordinating existing regional conservation education programs and reporting to the WIT on such programs.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	I.A.01.c	Report back to the WIT on conservation education programs.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	I.A.02.b	Coordinate education activities for xeriscaping to reduce duplication of efforts and increase efficiency and effectiveness of various city and county efforts.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	I.A.02.b	Compile WIT members' xeriscaping information and identify areas where additional xeriscaping incentives or requirements could be useful.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	I.A.02.c	Continue to create and implement xeriscaping education materials and programs for developers.	D	2008-2009	x

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

Specific implementers	Rec. #	Support for Actions by Non-WIT Members, continued	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Timeline	Assistance
RWCC	I.A.02.c, d	Continue to give presentations on xeriscaping to planning commissions, city councils, and county commissioners.	D	2008-2009	x
RWCC	I.B.01.a	Explore how and where to gather and present per capita water usage data.	D	2008-2009	
wastewater utilities	I.C.01.d	Present conclusions from initial pilot projects on water reuse and reclamation.	D	2010-2012	x
wastewater utilities	I.C.01.d	Conduct additional pilot studies or research on water reuse and reclamation as necessary.	D	2010-2012	x
Avista, IDF& G	II.A.01.c	Continue to implement a protocol to optimize spring spawning, incubation, and emergence for rainbow trout.	D	2008-2009	x
Avista, IDF& G	II.A.01.c	Evaluate the rainbow trout spawning, incubation, and emergence protocol, revise if necessary, and continue with implementation.	D	2010 - future	x
Avista, USGS	II.A.02.a	Continue to fund operation of the Post Falls gauge as a real-time gauge.	D	2008-2009	
County planning commissions	IV.A.01.f	Consider recommended comprehensive plan amendments to address water availability.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	V.B.01.b	Evaluate the effectiveness of working with media partners, and alter the strategy as necessary.	D	2010-future	x
RWCC, Avista, NOAA	V.B.01.b	Gather and compile relevant hydrologic data to note when low-flow years are anticipated in order to initiate media activities to encourage additional water conservation measures.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	V.B.01.b	Develop media partners, such as the Spokane Weather Channel, who could publish information on projected stream flows similar to air quality indices.	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	V.B.01.b	Determine a low streamflow trigger (likely the same as that for Recommendation IV.A.02.a & V.B.01.a)	D	2008-2009	
RWCC	V.B.01.b	Evaluate the effectiveness of the media campaign, and alter the strategy as necessary.	D	2010-future	x
consultant	VI.A.02.b	If funding is sufficient, conduct site identification and feasibility analysis of storage in artificial lakes or ponds.	TBD	2008-2009	
wastewater utilities	VII.B.01.a	Hire a consultant to evaluate the feasibility of recharging aquifers with reclaimed water.	TBD	2008-2009	
wastewater utilities	VII.B.01.a	Based on the results of the aquifer recharge feasibility analysis, conduct site investigations and prepare preliminary design studies.	D	2010-2012	
wastewater utilities	VII.B.01.a	Implement aquifer recharge from reclaimed water where feasible.	TBD	2013-future	

<sup>1</sup> **FUNDING SOURCES:** **APA** – Aquifer Protection Area-funded County contracts (does not include donated staff time), **C** – City of Spokane, **CF** – Conservation Futures Program, **D** – Donated staff time, **E** – Phase IV Implementation Grants, Watershed Supplemental Grants, or other Ecology grants, **LA** – Legislative Appropriation, **S** – Spokane County, **SW** – Spokane County Wastewater Utilities, **SAJB** – Spokane Aquifer Joint Board, **W** – Water Purveyors, **WB** – Legislative appropriations to the West Branch Little Spokane River Committee, **WRFS** - Spokane County's Wetlands Restoration Feasibility Study grant, funded by Ecology, **SGOM** - The SCCD's Little Spokane River Stream Gage Operation & Maintenance grant, funded by Ecology.

## Part 4: Municipal Inchoate Water Rights Inventory

Under RCW 90.82.048(1), Detailed Implementation Plans “must address the planned future use of existing water rights for municipal water supply purposes...that are inchoate, including how these rights will be used to meet the projected future needs identified in the watershed plan, and how the use of these rights will be addressed when implementing instream flow strategies identified in the watershed plan”. Furthermore, the law requires Planning Units to ask inchoate water right holders to “participate in defining the timelines and milestones” in the Plan. This section describes how WRIA 55/57 fulfilled these requirements.

Many municipalities in Washington were originally issued water rights based on system capacity, and today do not use the entire quantity of water which was allocated to them. Water rights in good standing, held by purveyors which meet the definition of ‘municipal’ as described in RCW 90.03.015, are defined as ‘inchoate’. These rights may be available for future municipal use. For example, if a municipal water supplier holds a water right in good standing for 200 AF/YR (acre-feet per year) and 300 gpm (gallons per minute), and its municipal customers use at most 100 AF/YR and 150 gpm, the additional 100 AF/YR and 150 gpm of the right is considered inchoate, and is available to be put to use in the future as demand increases.

This section summarizes collected water right and water use data which could help the WIT to address the planned future of municipal inchoate water rights. The summary does not address what the future of those inchoate municipal rights may be, but does suggest approaches to explore that question. It must be emphasized that while these data provide some guidance as to which purveyors hold inchoate water rights, they do not indicate the availability of inchoate water rights in the watersheds today or in the future. The estimates of inchoate water rights are based on information provided voluntarily by the water providers and do not constitute an official examination of the entity's water right. Domestic wells, irrigation water rights, in-stream flows, and other water uses besides municipal are not specifically addressed here.

### Data Collection

Determination of which systems in the watersheds hold inchoate water rights was made by assessing water rights and water use data for each system in the watersheds, as available. The WIT’s consultants, Cascadia Consulting Group, gathered that information as follows:

1. Using the DOH on-line Sentry database, Cascadia created a list of all Group A water purveyors in WRIA 55/57 which appear to be municipal water rights holders as defined in RCW 90.03.015. This process resulted in a list of 57 water systems.
2. Cascadia obtained a list of all active water rights in WRIA 55/57 from Ecology’s Water Right Tracking System (WRTS) database.
3. Cascadia obtained additional information on some systems’ water use and water rights from previous survey work conducted by Reanette Boese of Spokane County Utilities, and from Water System Plans held at the regional DOH office in Spokane.
4. To collect more complete data, and to confirm the accuracy of collected data, the WIT conducted a water rights survey. WIT members contacted each purveyor by phone, and Spokane County sent a follow-up letter describing the inchoate water rights inventory process. This letter was accompanied by a survey form which included any available data on the system’s water rights and water use. Purveyors were invited to correct or complete the data as applicable, and to answer questions about plans for future water supply. Owners or operators of 29 systems responded to this survey (51% response rate). A sample survey form and summarized answers are provided in Appendix 2.

## Estimated Inchoate Water Rights Summary

The following table summarizes inchoate water rights in WRIA 55/57. Details on water rights and water use are found in Table 2. Systems are grouped by whether or not they draw from the SVRP Aquifer, and by whether they fall within WRIA 55 or WRIA 57. Water use and water right data are rounded to the closest whole number. Instantaneous rights and use are reported in gpm. Instantaneous allocations in cubic feet per second (cfs) were converted to gpm for the purposes of this analysis (allocations in cfs are noted in Table 2). Annual rights and use are reported in AF/YR. Sources of information are indicated through footnotes. If information was obtained from multiple sources and confirmed by the water rights survey, the survey is noted as the source. In some cases, the figure listed for total water rights is less than the sum of all listed water rights. This indicates that some or all of the rights are consolidated. In cases where water use exceeds water rights, the inchoate water right is noted as '0'.

**Table 1. Summary of WRIA 55/57 Inchoate Water Rights**

System Name	Inchoate water right?	Size of inchoate right		Portion of right which is inchoate	
		gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 57</b>					
CARNOPE IRRIGATION DISTRICT 7 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	775	N/A	58%
CONSOLIDATED IRRIG DIST 19 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	33468	7030	41%	31%
*EAST SIDE LIBERTY LAKE IMP CLUB <sup>2,3</sup>	Unknown	nca	0	N/A	0%
*EAST SPOKANE WATER DIST 1 <sup>2,3</sup>	Unknown	nca	0	N/A	0%
*GREEN RIDGE ESTATES <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	32	N/A	0%
HUTCHINSON IRRIGATION DIST #16 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	1071	N/A	48%
HUTTON SETTLEMENT	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
IRVIN WATER DISTRICT #6 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	465	N/A	26%
LIBERTY LAKE SEWER & WATER DISTRICT <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	1353	N/A	34%
MILLWOOD, TOWN OF <sup>1</sup>	Yes	400	1204	10%	50%
MOAB IRRIGATION DIST # 20 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	1917	N/A	65%
MODEL IRRIGATION DIST #18 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	80	1677	1%	41%
MODERN ELECTRIC WATER CO. <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	11682	N/A	61%
NORTH GLEN WATER ASSN / LINCOLN GREEN <sup>1</sup>	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ORCHARD AVENUE IRRIGATION DIST 6 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	1383	N/A	44%
*PASADENA PARK IRR DIST 17 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	344	N/A	8%
PINECROFT MOBILE HOME PARK	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
*PIONEER WATER COMPANY <sup>4</sup>	Yes	nca	22	N/A	22%
SPOKANE CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #1 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	0	235	0%	14%
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #2 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	3350	1298	27%	27%
*SPOKANE, CITY OF <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	40613	N/A	44%
TIMBERLINE MOBILE HOME PARK <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	54	N/A	72%
TRENTWOOD IRRIGATION DISTRICT 3 <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	3085	N/A	73%
*VERA WATER & POWER <sup>1</sup>	Yes	15800	1883	34%	19%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>53098</b>	<b>76123</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>43%</b>

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Ecology WRTS database

<sup>3</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

<sup>4</sup> Water System Plan

System Name	Inchoate water right?	Size of inchoate right		Portion of right which is inchoate	
		gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 55</b>					
NORTH SPOKANE IRRIGATION DISTRICT 8 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	1700	1307	31%	62%
RIVERVALE WATER ASSN	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #3 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	1500	2072	47%	69%
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #4 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	1180	1124	34%	50%
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #5 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	360	182	46%	54%
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #6 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	50	0	10%	0%
SPO CO WATER DIST #3, SYS #7 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	600	233	55%	52%
SPOKANE, CITY OF <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	17008	N/A	56%
WHITWORTH COLLEGE <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	846	N/A	93%
*WHITWORTH WATER DISTRICT 2 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	5092	14065	16%	66%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>10482</b>	<b>36837</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>Outside SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 57</b>					
SNOWBLAZE <sup>1</sup>	Yes	0	14	0%	58%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>Outside SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 55</b>					
ALOHA PINES <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	123	N/A	84%
B & J WATER CO	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
BLUE SKY COUNTRY FARMS	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
CHATTAROY SPRINGS WATER ASSOCIATION <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	15	N/A	48%
CHATTAROY VALLEY MOBILE ESTATES <sup>4</sup>	Yes	nca	68	N/A	68%
DEER PARK, CITY OF <sup>1</sup>	Yes	3163	1655	54%	56%
CHATTAROY SPRINGS NORTH <sup>2</sup>	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
DIAMOND LAKE SEWER DISTRICT <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	703	0%	85%
ELOIKA PINES ESTATES <sup>2</sup>	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
REFLECTION WATER ASSOCIATION <sup>2,3</sup>	Yes	nca	68	N/A	75%
RIVERSIDE VILLAGE MHP <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	87	N/A	42%
STEVENS CO PUD - CHATTAROY SPRINGS WEST <sup>1</sup>	Unknown	u	u	N/A	N/A
STEVENS CO PUD - CLAYTON <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	243	N/A	78%
STEVENS CO PUD - HALFMOON RANCHOS <sup>1</sup>	Unknown	u	0	N/A	0%
STEVENS CO PUD - RIVERSIDE <sup>1</sup>	Yes	u	165	N/A	78%
SYRINGA HEIGHTS MOBILE HOME PARK	Unknown	nca	nca	N/A	N/A
VEL VIEWATER DIST 13 <sup>1</sup>	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Totals</b>		<b>3163</b>	<b>3131</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>WRIA 55/57 – Total estimated inchoate water rights</b>		<b>66743 gpm</b>	<b>116105 AF/YR</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>48%</b>

Note: These totals are expected to be smaller than the actual quantity of inchoate water rights in WRIA 55/57, as data was not available for all water systems.

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

<sup>3</sup> Ecology WRTS database

<sup>4</sup> Water System Plan

Table 2. WRIA 55/57 Water Systems - Water Rights and Use Data

System Name Water Right	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right	
	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 57</b>						
<b>Carnhope Irrigation District 7<sup>1</sup></b>	5,000	1332	u	558	u	775
G3-28115CWCRIS	2500	1150				
G3-00776-D	2,500	182				
<b>Consolidated Irrigation District 19<sup>1</sup></b>	81,550	22410	48082	15380	33,468	7,030
G3-*07171C	4580	1250	2200	261		
G3-*09452C	695	225				
G3-*07172C	13200	3550	9100	3967		
G3-*09453C	1760	580				
G3-*07173C	10100	2700	6692	1811		
G3-*09454C	1295	450				
G3-*07174ALCWRIS	5560	1500	3890	1143		
G3-*09455C	580	280				
G3-*07175C	18500	4950	13000	2545		
G3-*09450C	3280	650				
G3-*07176C	18800	5000	13200	5653		
G3-*09451C	3200	1275				
<b>*East Side Liberty Lake Improvement Club<sup>2,3</sup></b>	1,162	371	nca	394	nca	0
G3-21382C	812	236				
02290A	350	135				
<b>*East Spokane Water District 1<sup>2,3</sup></b>	3250	1234	nca	1648	nca	0
G3-29937	995					
G3-*02418C	600	448				
G3-*03395C	920	448				
G3-*00793S	585	270				
G3-22768	200	68				
<b>*Greenridge Estates<sup>2,3</sup></b>	400	72	nca	40	nca	32
G3-25912C	75	36				
G3-27809	150	36				
G3-28311	175	0				
<b>Hutchinson Irrigation District #16<sup>1</sup></b>	7000	2210	u	1139	u	1071
4304	1500	930				
G3-*00726SWRIS	5500	1280				
<b>Hutton Settlement</b>	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>Irvin Water District #6<sup>1</sup></b>	6400	1768	u	1303	u	465
G3-27211C	1700	1273				
G3-29978	2700					
G3-00415ALC	2000	495				
<b>Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District<sup>2,3</sup></b>	11175	3935	nca	2582	nca	1353
G3-27708	4500	3600				
G3-29362	1500					
G3-26247	2100	1825				
G3-01023C	2250	1680				
G3-00811C	825	430				

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Ecology WRTS database

<sup>3</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities



System Name	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right		
	Water Right	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 57, continued</b>							
<b>Millwood, Town of<sup>1</sup></b>		4200	2400	3800	1196	400	1204
G3-*05174CWRIS		500	800	500	339		
G3-26769CWRIS		2500	1195	2200	399		
G3-*02404CWRIS		1200	405	1100	458		
<b>Moab Irrigation District # 20<sup>1</sup></b>		6000	2932	u	1016	u	1917
G3-01478C		4000	1932				
G3-24609C		2000	1000				
<b>Model Irrigation District #18<sup>1</sup></b>		9780	4115	9700	2438	80	1677
G3-*00736S		4200	779				
G3-26072ALCWRIS		1000	1600				
G3-20159CWRIS		600	540				
G3-00342C		1000	526				
G3-*CV2P871(119)		80	670				
G3-26369CWRIS, Well 7		800	0				
G3-*CV1-3PP280(689)		4200	779				
G3-*06050CWRIS		525	670				
G3-*07874CWRIS		1000	670				
G3-21962CWRIS		200	0				
<b>Modern Electric Water Company<sup>1</sup></b>		37875	19061	u	7379	u	11682
G3-*04909ALC (3421A), Consolidated		36325	29061				
G3-*09500C (7127A)		1550	1300				
<b>North Glen Water Association / Lincoln Green<sup>1</sup></b>		350	37	intertie with Whitworth Water District		N/A	N/A
G3-01336C		350	37				
<b>Orchard Avenue Irrigation District 6<sup>1</sup></b>		9160	3161	u	1778	u	1383
G3-*00820ALCWRIS (581)		2000	1191				
G3-*CV1P461(0736-D)		6360	1970				
G3-*08186C (6072-A)		800	264				
<b>*Pasadena Park Irrigation District 17<sup>1</sup></b>		7250	4420	u	4076	u	344
G3-*05641C		2000	1870				
G3-20429		2000	1503				
G3-00881D		1250	127				
G3-*07330ALC		2000	920				
G3-28003CWRIS		180	72				
<b>Pinecroft Mobile Home Park</b>		nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>*Pioneer Water Company<sup>2</sup></b>		360	99	nca	77	nca	22
G3-25594P		360	99				
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #1<sup>1</sup></b>		2605	1708	3500	1759	0	0
G3-*01125C (1270-A)		500	137				
G3-01269 (1269-A)		500	137				
G3-*02807C (2143-A)		500	538				
G3-*04732CWRIS (3255-A)		500	800				
G3-00854C		605	370				
G3-*00607SWRIS		120	46				
G3-29100P		2000	3200				
G3-*01101C		500	137				

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Water System Plan

System Name	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right		
	Water Right	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 57, continued</b>							
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #2<sup>1</sup></b>		12450	4748	9100	3450	3350	1298
G3-20947C		1400	1787				
7361-A		3150	2530				
G3-25972C		2700	4320				
G3-26018C		1200	1920				
310-A		100	104				
757-D		100	64				
2084-A		285	269				
2315-A		740	688				
G3-*06017C (6245-A)		2400	688				
3211-A		375	600				
<b>*Spokane, City of<sup>1</sup></b>		142600	91980	u	51367	u	40613
504-D; Cert. of Change I-3-52 & I-3-435; G3-*00373		54750	36000				
548-A; G3-*00352CWRIS. 00548 CE		63000	51240				
505-D; G3-*00374S		14000	1870				
503-D; Transfer 593; G-*00370BBHSWRIS . 00503B CE		7000	350				
504-D; Cert. of Change I-3-52 & I-3-435; G3-*00373		1250	2000				
507-D		2600	520				
<b>Timberline Mobile Home Park<sup>2,3</sup></b>		500	75	nca	21	nca	54
G3-27237CWRIS		500	75				
<b>Trentwood Irrigation District 3<sup>2,3</sup></b>		9750	4250	nca	1165	nca	3085
G3-26592C		2000	4250				
G3-*06748C		3000					
G3-*09701C		2000					
G3-*09702C		2000					
G3-*00604C		750					
<b>*Vera Water and Power<sup>1</sup></b>		46400	10081	30600	8198	15800	1883
G3-27084C		13400	10081				
G3-*00696S		3400					
G3-*00697S		1400					
G3-*09128C		4000					
G3-*07938C		3100					
G3-*00693S		7100					
G3-*00695S		6300					
G3-00711D		6300					
G3-*00694S		6000					
G3-*00997S		1100					

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

<sup>3</sup> Ecology WRTS database

System Name	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right	
	Water Right					
	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 55</b>						
<b>North Spokane Irrigation District 8<sup>1</sup></b>	5500	2114	3800	807	1700	1307
G3-00556ALCWRIS	2300	1085				
G3-*00674SWRIS	1000	2114				
G3-*00675SWRIS	1000	2114				
G3-*07576CWRIS	1200	483				
<b>Rivervale Water Association</b>	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #3<sup>1</sup></b>	3200	3000	1700	928	1500	2072
G3-*03850CWRIS	1600	1500				
G3-*03849CWRIS	1600	1500				
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #4<sup>1</sup></b>	3430	2243	2250	1119	1180	1124
G3-*00205C (29-A)	100	160				
G3-*04733C (3256-A)	700	288				
G3-*05293C (3779-A)	500	470				
G3-*08023C (6086-A)	300	265				
G3-00949C	1500	1772				
G3-26510C	300	460				
G3-23578C	30	16				
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #5<sup>1</sup></b>	780	336	420	154	360	182
G3-01019C	450	336				
G3-*06502C (6017-A)	330	38				
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #6<sup>1</sup></b>	500	135	450	146	50	0
G3-*04929CWRIS (6278-A)	500	135				
<b>Spokane County Water District #3, System #7<sup>1</sup></b>	1100	447	500	214	600	233
G3-26880C	1100	347				
G3-01417C	425	92				
<b>Spokane, City of<sup>1</sup></b>	42500	30510	u	13502	u	17008
506-D; G3-*00376ACSWRIS . 00506A CE	11600	1280				
3903-A: Cert. of Change 442; G3-*05309CWRIS . 03903 CE	7000	11480				
503-D; Transfer 594; G3-*00371CBHSWRIS . 00503C C	7000	350				
4503-A; G3-*05855CWRIS . 04503 CE	7900	12640				
728-A; G3-*CV2P658	9000	4760				
<b>Whitworth College<sup>2,3</sup></b>	2000	910	nca	64	nca	846
G3-00734 SWRIS	550	150				
G3-28270 CWRIS	1450	760				

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Right Survey form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

<sup>3</sup> Ecology's WRTS database

System Name	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right		
	Water Right	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Within SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 55, continued</b>							
<b>*Whitworth Water District 2<sup>1</sup></b>		31472	21323	26380	7258	5092	14065
G3-00326C		1200	185	3250	253		
G3-20621ALCWRIS		1966	3171	1500	812		
G3-*06910CWRIS		1000	829	0	0		
G3-*06911CWRIS		1000	1161	1050	2		
G3-26135CWRIS		3000	2000	3390	1362		
G3-26134CWRIS		3000	4800	3200	999		
G3-24203CWRIS		3250	986	3100	399		
G3-01316CWRIS		450	168	450	85		
G3-27874		5000	3700	4890	1912		
G3-26203C		100	160	0	0		
G3-00486C		750	1200	0	0		
G3-04046A		1150	776	0	0		
G3-09631C		500	159	1150	571		
3658A		180	78	0	0		
4368A		100	18	0	0		
G3-04928C		500	68	0	0		
G3-04226C		100	160	0	0		
G3-30161		5000		4400	863		
G3-04560C		50	28	0	0		
G3-26227C		250	400	0	0		
G3-23978C		100	61	0	0		
G3-23977C		1600	658	0	0		
G3-00636C (805D)		1000	332	0	0		
G3-23977C		226	226	0	0		
<b>Outside SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 57</b>							
<b>Snowblaze<sup>1</sup></b>		0.33 cfs	24	0.33 cfs	10	0	14
S3-01582C		0	24				
<b>Outside SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 55</b>							
<b>Aloha Pines<sup>2,3</sup></b>		126	146	nca	23	nca	123
G3-29282		26	73				
G3-29631		100	73				
<b>B &amp; J Water Company</b>		nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>Blue Sky Country Farms</b>		nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>Chattaroy Springs Water Association<sup>2,3</sup></b>		60	32	nca	17	nca	15
G3-28729CWRIS		40	32				
G3-25548CWRIS		20	32				
<b>Chattaroy Valley Mobile Estates<sup>4</sup></b>		600	100	nca	32	nca	68
G3-28057P		600	100				

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

<sup>3</sup> Ecology WRTS database

<sup>4</sup> Water System Plans

System Name	Water Right		Water Use		Inchoate Water Right		
	Water Right	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR	gpm	AF/YR
<b>Outside SVRP Aquifer boundaries, WRIA 55, continued</b>							
<b>Deer Park, City of<sup>1</sup></b>		5905	2933	2742	1279	3163	1655
G3-26674C		1000	1210	930	540		
G3-00142C		1205	1210	340	223		
G3-*00086D		450	140	0	0		
G3-*000303A		400	650	222	95		
G3-25385C		400	640	0	0		
G3-00489C		200	40	0	0		
G3-24591C		1500	579	830	274		
G3-22546C - consolidated		1600	1104	420	146		
<b>Chattaroy Springs North<sup>2</sup></b>		30	25	nca	nca	nca	nca
G3-29495		10	13				
G3-27039		20	13				
<b>Diamond Lake Sewer District<sup>1</sup></b>		520	823	u	120	u	703
G3-26439C		10	12				
G3-26738C		10	16				
G3-24240C		250	400				
G3-24239CWRIS		250	400				
<b>Eloika Pines Estates<sup>2</sup></b>		300	38	nca	nca	nca	nca
G3-27024		100	12				
G3-25842C		200	26				
<b>Reflection Water Association<sup>2,3</sup></b>		0.9 cfs	90	nca	22	nca	68
S3-24100CWRIS		1	90				
<b>Riverside Village Mobile Home Park<sup>1</sup></b>		750	205	u	118	u	87
G3-25508CWRIS		80	66				
G3-25304CWRIS		20	22				
G3-27797		650	117				
<b>Stevens County PUD – Chattaroy Springs West<sup>1</sup></b>		40	33	u	u	u	u
G3-28627		40	33				
<b>Stevens County PUD - Clayton<sup>1</sup></b>		706	312	u	69	u	243
S3-25907		0.25 cfs	76				
G3-28469C		350	200				
G3-26466C		100	11				
SWC7992-A		108	0				
G3-26170C		36	25				
<b>Stevens County PUD – Halfmoon Ranchos<sup>1</sup></b>		100	64	u	65	u	0
G3-00806(A)		100	64				
<b>Stevens County PUD - Riverside<sup>1</sup></b>		440	210	u	46	u	165
G3-28260		190	100				
G3-26151C		125	59				
G3-24001C		60	6				
G3-21375C		65	45				
<b>Syringa Heights Mobile Home Park</b>		nca	nca	nca	nca	nca	nca
<b>Vel View Water District 13<sup>1</sup></b>		100	27	intertie with City of Spokane		N/A	N/A
G3-27467CWRIS		100	27				

'nca' indicates data is not currently available, as purveyor has not returned survey.

'u' indicates data is unknown, as purveyor did not indicate information on survey.

\* denotes systems for which the location of the service area differs from the location of the point of withdrawal with respect to SVRP and/or WRIA boundaries.

<sup>1</sup> Water Rights Survey Forms filled out by purveyor

<sup>2</sup> Ecology WRTS database

<sup>3</sup> Reanette Boese, Spokane County Utilities

## Future Water Availability

It is important to note that inchoate water rights merely provide an estimate of the quantity of permitted water rights for municipal water users. Possessing inchoate water rights does not guarantee that the water will be available. If a watershed has been over-appropriated, holders of inchoate water rights may find that the stream or aquifer does not have sufficient water. Furthermore, inchoate water rights do not indicate whether the water is accessible by a system of wells, pumps, and pipes that can withdraw the quantity granted in the water right. Water quality and potability are also not considered in inchoate water rights. Additionally, inchoate water rights may not indicate where water is actually being used through inter-ties or other agreements to provide water outside a service area.

While surveys were received for only 51% of the 57 municipal water systems in WRIA 55/57, these 29 systems hold an estimated 94% of the watersheds' instantaneous allocations for municipal systems, and 95% of the annual allocations.<sup>1</sup> Most municipal water users in WRIA 55/57 have inchoate water rights for both instantaneous and annual amounts, although at least six systems appear to not hold either instantaneous or annual inchoate rights. The size of the inchoate portions range from 1% of current water use to 13 times larger than current use. On average, inchoate water rights represent roughly 48% of purveyors' annual allocations and 27% of instantaneous allocations.

Over 75% of the survey respondents indicated that they intend to use their entire municipal water right over the next 20 years (See Appendix 2). These responses were not verified by analyzing projected growth or estimating future demand. It is important to note that water purveyors cannot predict water demand without clear growth projections from counties.

There are two areas where the WIT may want to consider further analysis:

- Analysis of projected growth and water demand within water systems, and
- Analysis of the impact on instream and other water uses if all of the inchoate water rights are withdrawn.

### **Growth/Demand Analysis**

#### **1. Build-Out Analysis**

The WIT could conduct a build-out analysis for specific water systems or for the entire watershed. A build-out analysis looks at current zoning and calculates the number of new residential, commercial, and industrial uses that could be developed in currently vacant parcels. These numbers are used to estimate future water demand. This can be compared to the inchoate water rights to determine whether existing water rights are adequate to meet future demand.

#### **2. Assess Water Use Data in Water System Plan**

The WIT may want to review the water system plans from the municipal systems in the WRIA and tabulate the projected water use data. At a minimum, the WIT should consider noting the use data on all new plans that are released and comparing it to the figures used to compute inchoate water rights.

#### **3. Municipal Reserve for Instream Flows**

When a draft instream flow rule is proposed by Ecology, the WIT should assess whether inchoate water rights will be sufficient to meet projected future demand, or whether a Municipal Reserve is needed. This would need to be combined with some analysis of demand (items 1 and 2 above).

### **Analysis of Impacts of Full Use of Inchoate Water Rights**

The WIT may want to consider modeling the impacts to streamflows if all of the inchoate water rights are put to use. The ideal model would consider the point of withdrawal, seasonal variations, and other considerations. However, it may be possible to conduct a simpler (and less expensive) analysis to give a more general overview of the impacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: Water rights data was not available for six small systems in WRIA 55/57. Their estimated contribution to the total quantity of water rights would affect these percentages by about half a percentage point (0.5%).

## Part 5: Strategies to Provide Water for Specific Purposes

Under RCW 90.82.043(2), planning units are obligated to address in their DIP “strategies to provide sufficient water for: (a) Production agriculture; (b) commercial, industrial, and residential use; and (c) instream flows”. The WIT made at least 93 recommendations that address provision of water for these needs.

Relevant recommendations are summarized under the appropriate headings below, with references in parentheses to the specific recommendation number. Specific timelines and milestones to achieve these objectives are outlined under the detailed presentation of each recommendation (Part 2).

“Instream flows,” in this case, is interpreted to mean strategies that augment stream flow, with the specific purpose of aiding instream uses. These may include improving habitat for fish and other aquatic biota, as well as recreational and aesthetic uses. Recommendations that address specific instream flow rules adopted by Ecology are included under this category.

### PRODUCTION AGRICULTURE AND/OR COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL USE

- Reduce per capita water consumption. (I.A.01.a – I.A.02.g)
- Support education programs that foster public acceptance of water conservation, reuse and reclamation. (I.B.01.a)
- Support actions that result in the increased use of reclaimed and reused water. (I.C.01.a-I.C.01.d)
- Develop approaches to land use management that limit the impacts of withdrawals from domestic exempt wells. (IV.A.01.a, IV.C.01.a)
- Support water resources management approaches that augment water supply in the Little and Middle Spokane River Basins during the summer high-water-use period. (VI.A.01.a -VI.A.02.d, VI.B.01.a- VI.B.01.d)
- Improve understanding of water rights in the basins. (V.A.01.a-d)
- Support the use of reclaimed or reused water for aquifer storage and recovery practices, to support water supply needs. (VII.B.01.a-c)
- Support the practice of groundwater recharge using Spokane River water diversions during high flow periods, to mitigate municipal water supply pumping. (VII.C.02.a-VII.C.03.a)

### INSTREAM FLOWS

- Assure that instream flows for the Little and Middle Spokane River meet the needs of rainbow trout and other associated aquatic biota. (II.A.01.a- II.A.02.b, II.D.01.a, III.A.01.a – III.A.01.f)
- Manage water resources in the Little and Middle Spokane River for additional beneficial uses, including recreational and aesthetic uses. (II.B.01.a- II.B.02.c, II.E.01.a, III.B.01.a- III.C.01.b)
- Acquire water rights to increase instream flows. (V.A.02.a)
- Reduce summertime water use to help increase river flow during low-flow years. (V.B.01.a-b)
- Support water resources management approaches that augment stream flow in the Middle Spokane River during summer low-flow season. (VI.C.01.a)
- Support stormwater management approaches that foster the maintenance or enhancement of natural groundwater recharge rates due to direct precipitation. (VII.A.01.a-VII.A.01.c)
- Support the use of reclaimed or reused water for aquifer storage and recovery practices, to support Spokane River baseflow needs. (VII.B.01.a-c)
- Support the practice of groundwater recharge using Spokane River water diversions during high flow periods, to support Spokane River baseflow. (VII.C.01.a-d)

## Appendix 1: Benefits and Practicality Ratings

Below are results from WIT members' votes on their expectations of the benefits to the watershed and practicality of implementation of each recommendation. These votes occurred during discussion of the plan in bimonthly meetings; total votes vary depending on number of members present and voting. Scores were used to create the "Benefits and Practicality" narrative rating under each detailed recommendation.

Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
I.A.01.a	Determine indoor conservation issues (approaches) on which the public needs to be educated (i.e. in-door low-flow devices such as showerhead, facets, toilets and appliances and habits).	0, 6, 2	5, 2, 0
I.A.01.b	Local authorities / wastewater utilities should evaluate customer indoor water saving incentives as a means to save on new facility costs. If cost effective, incentives should be included in facility and comprehensive planning processes and implemented through local regulation.	5, 3, 1	7, 2, 0
I.A.01.c	City and county governments will develop and implement a regional education and awareness program to promote wise and efficient use of the water supply with voluntary participation by water suppliers.	7, 3, 0	6, 4, 0
I.A.01.d	Municipal water suppliers will develop water conservation programs independently and cooperatively in accordance with Washington State Department of Health regulations and other water suppliers are encouraged to develop their own water conservation programs.	7, 3, 0	7, 2, 0
I.A.02.a	Determine the outdoor conservation issues (approaches) on which the public needs to be educated (i.e., soil development, plant root development, native/drought-resistant vegetation, xeriscaping).	4, 2, 2	7, 0, 0
I.A.02.b	Counties/cities consider developing incentives for xeriscaping and use of native and/or drought-resistant vegetation through existing and future planning processes.	4, 6, 0	4, 5, 0
I.A.02.c	Include options for xeriscaping in landscape requirements for commercial and industrial developments.	4, 6, 0	5, 5, 0
I.A.02.d	Encourage the xeriscaping option for urban open space in planned developments.	5, 5, 0	4, 6, 0
I.A.02.e	County/cities/water purveyors encourage implementation of water conservation in watering of public properties such as parks, school lawn areas, athletic fields, boulevards, and highway green areas.	5, 4, 0	4, 6, 0
I.A.02.f	Evaluate the benefits of retrofitting irrigation systems with automatic controllers and other high efficiency components for schools, golf courses, parks, cemeteries, and other large-scale public irrigation projects	12, 2, 0	9, 3, 0
I.A.02.g	Encourage and evaluate incentives for irrigators (e.g. agricultural and golf course) to implement all feasible irrigation efficiencies.	9, 4, 0	5, 8, 0
I.B.01.a	Encourage the use of several educational methods to reach all segments of the population, those in schools, government, and businesses.	7, 5, 0	9, 3, 0
I.C.01.a	Evaluate the public perception of water reclamation and reuse and determine how to educate the public to increase their understanding of the benefits and risks.	0, 9, 4	0, 8, 5
I.C.01.b	Evaluate the potential for tax incentives, permitting and/or regulatory credits that can be used by corporations that want to implement water reuse strategies.	0, 10, 3	0, 9, 4
I.C.01.c	Evaluate development of cost-effective options for reclamation and reuse in small-scale and decentralized settings.	0, 3, 10	0, 3, 10
I.C.01.d	Research possible water reuse and reclamation opportunities.	0, 10, 3	2, 6, 4



Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
II.A.01.a	Establish a minimum instream flow for the Spokane River at the Barker Road transect (USGS Gauge 12420500) of 500 cfs to provide significant weighted useable area for juvenile and adult rainbow trout.	11, 2, 0	11, 2, 0
II.A.01.b	Avista's 2007 operating license for the Spokane River Hydroelectric Development should require a minimum discharge to provide habitat for juvenile and adult rainbow trout that would be protected through a minimum instream flow for the Spokane River at the Barker Road transect (USGS gauge 12420500) of 500 cfs.	9, 2, 1	5, 1, 5
II.A.01.c	Flow in the Middle Spokane River should be managed to optimize spring spawning, incubation and emergence for rainbow trout. A protocol should be established between the WDFW, IDF&G and Avista to accomplish this task. Specific flow levels and timing would be established as early as possible each year and based on snow pack and expected runoff conditions for that year.	8, 4, 0	12, 1, 0
II.A.01.d	Continue operation of the Greenacres gauge (at Barker Road) and study the correlation between the Barker Road and Post Falls flows.	8, 4, 1	9, 3, 1
II.A.02.a	The flow regime in critical habitat areas for aquatic biota identified in the Spokane River between the Post Falls HED and Sullivan Road are more closely related to flow at the Spokane River near Post Falls gauge (USGS 12419000) and/or the Greenacres gauge (12420500) than at the Spokane River at Spokane gauge (USGS 12422500). To improve flow management in this reach, take steps to upgrade the Post Falls gauge to that of a "real time" gauge.	10, 3, 0	12, 1, 0
II.A.02.b	Instream flow for the Lower Spokane River could be managed using USGS Gauge 12422500, the Spokane River at Spokane. Conduct fish habitat studies focusing on juvenile and adult rearing on at least 3 sites in the Lower Spokane River between the Monroe Street HED and the Nine-Mile HED pool. This work could be conducted as part of the WRIA 54, Lower Spokane River Watershed Plan and/or as an Avista relicensing PM&E.	10, 3, 0	12, 1, 0
II.B.01.a	Support a consensus-based agreement within the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group of at least 300 cfs in the north channel of the Spokane River through Riverfront Park as the basis for aesthetic flows.	0, 3, 6	0, 4, 5
II.B.02.a	Use the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group findings as the basis for recreation flows in the Middle Spokane River.	N/A	N/A
II.B.02.b	Evaluate the use of periodic increases in flow during low-flow periods for recreational use in the Middle Spokane River while taking into account effects on aquatic biota, water quality, and safety.	N/A	N/A
II.B.02.c	Evaluate the impact on aquatic biota, water quality, and safety of managing the declining spring runoff and fall drawdown with releases from the Post Falls HED to optimize recreational use of the Spokane River according to the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group.	N/A	N/A
II.C.01.a	Encourage the Department of Ecology to use the CEQUALW2 model (with necessary changes) to consider different flow regimes as part of the Spokane River / Lake Spokane TMDL process.	4, 4, 0	3, 4, 0
II.D.01.a	Evaluate how river diversions can be accomplished without impairing spawning and incubation of rainbow trout.	1, 5, 4	0, 3, 6
II.E.01.a	After the Avista HED license application is filed, the Spokane River / Lake Spokane Dissolved Oxygen TMDL data gathering phase, and instream studies on rearing below Monroe Street HED are completed, integrate all of the recommended instream flows into one regime for the whole watershed. The flow regime will be submitted to the Department of Ecology for instream flow rule making. Ecology obligation.	8, 2, 1	5, 4, 1

Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
III.A.01.a	Recommend no changes in the minimum instream flows for the reaches controlled by the "At Dartford" gauge, the Chattaroy gauge, and the Elk Park gauge in WAC 173-555 at this time. As new data become available the minimum instream flows should be evaluated.	N/A	N/A
III.A.01.b	Additional studies on instream flow needs for the mainstem and tributaries should be conducted if problems arise with the existing conditions.	N/A	N/A
III.A.01.c	Studies should be conducted on the major tributaries to determine the extent of and areas where spawning occurs. When this information becomes available, flow studies on the tributaries should be conducted to determine flow needs for the tributaries.	7, 3, 1	2, 6, 3
III.A.01.d	Recommend a study on the Little Spokane River tributaries on optimizing habitat for the target species and linking the preferred flows on the tributaries to flows at the control points.	N/A	N/A
III.A.01.e	Expanded study on the mainstem would require reapplication of PHABSIM using site-specific preference curves and multiple transect measurements.	N/A	N/A
III.A.01.f	Recommend a study of the fish habitat instream flow needs for the reach of the Little Spokane River below the "At Dartford" gauge to better determine the water available for future withdrawals.	1, 8, 1	1, 8, 1
III.B.01.a	Monitor the effects of exporting water from the SVRP Aquifer into the Little Spokane Watershed on the flow of the Little Spokane River.	0, 7, 3	0, 4, 6
III.B.02.a	The Department of Ecology should enforce the minimum instream flow shutoff of water rights junior to WAC 173-555 on irrigation from exempt wells in the Little Spokane Watershed where it does not cause additional fire danger.	3, 2, 3	2, 0, 7
III.B.03.a	Using existing data, study the effects of reactivating the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk for regulation of the upstream water users.	3, 5, 0	3, 5, 1
III.B.03.b	If further study is desired, the Planning Unit should work with Pend Oreille County, the Department of Ecology, Spokane Community College and others to continue flow measurements as needed.	4, 5, 0	4, 5, 0
III.B.03.c	If the benefits are sufficient to offset costs and legal constraints do not exist, beneficiaries of the operation of a Chattaroy and/or Elk control point, in cooperation with the Department of Ecology, should reactivate and fund the gauge at Chattaroy and/or Elk with real time capabilities as needed for regulation.	3, 6, 0	2, 7, 0
III.B.04.a	Promote management practices, when feasible, that maintain minimum flows of at least 90 cfs at the "At Dartford" gauge in the Lower Little Spokane River (Little Spokane River Natural Area) to support current and future recreational activities.	4, 3, 2	1, 3, 4
III.B.04.b	Promote management practices, when feasible, that maintain minimum flows of at least 90 cfs at the "At Dartford" gauge for Pine River Park and 32 cfs at Elk Park to support existing and future recreational activities.	4, 3, 2	0, 3, 6
III.B.04.c	Investigate and/or determine if future parks or access points are needed for recreational use of the Little Spokane River.	0, 5, 4	0, 4, 5
III.B.05.a	Determine the feasibility of installing a gauge(s) on the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.	7, 2, 0	5, 4, 0
III.C.01.a	When the lower Little Spokane River aquatic biota study and the Water Quality Management Plan/TMDL process are completed, integrate all of the recommended instream flows into one regime to evaluate the need for revisiting the instream flow rule for the whole watershed taking wildlife habitat and other uses into account.	0, 7, 0	0, 5, 3
III.C.01.b	Develop strategies for achieving the integrated flow regime.	0, 8, 0	0, 6, 2

Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
IV.A.01.a	Support low residential densities in areas of the counties designated as rural in order to protect water supplies.	0, 5, 4	0, 6, 4
IV.A.01.b	The counties should implement a policy or procedure requiring a person who is developing property within a water service area to consult with the water purveyor about the potential for public water service before creating a development or single-family residence dependent on domestic exempt wells.	9, 1, 0	8, 2, 0
IV.A.01.c	Request counties, cities, and/or the Regional Health Districts to evaluate the quantity of water necessary (currently 1 gallon per minute) from a domestic exempt well before a building permit is issued.	4, 6, 1	7, 4, 0
IV.A.01.d	Local land use regulations should contain specific criteria by which applicants for land development such as subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, or certificates of exemption for the purpose of creating additional building sites must demonstrate sufficient water availability.	11, 0, 0,	10, 1, 0
IV.A.01.e	Water purveyors are encouraged to participate with land use regulators and the Department of Health in identifying and addressing areas of water availability concern.	6, 4, 0	9, 2, 0
IV.A.01.f	Land use regulators are encouraged to consider available ground water resources when establishing minimum parcel sizes in areas where exempt wells will be the main source of domestic water in an effort to avoid future water shortages.	10, 1, 0	6, 4, 1
IV.A.02.a	Evaluate policies that will limit the maximum daily withdrawals to less than 5000 gallons per day where detrimental impacts are identified.	4, 2, 3	0, 5, 5
IV.A.03.a	At a minimum, when flows in the Little Spokane River are expected to fall below minimum instream flows, caution letters should be sent to all domestic exempt well owners in the Little Spokane Watershed asking them to voluntarily conserve water. Methods for saving water and directions to a website with more information will be included with the letter.	0, 0, 8	0, 6, 4
IV.B.01.a	Run a sensitivity analysis on water use from exempt wells with the watershed model. If the model is recalibrated with different data in the future, another sensitivity analysis may need to be done.	3, 3, 4	0, 0, 10
IV.B.02.a	Run a sensitivity analysis on unmetered Group A and Group B water use with the watershed model. If the model is recalibrated with different data in the future, another sensitivity analysis may need to be done.	3, 3, 4	0, 0, 10
IV.C.01.a	Recommend that the Department of Ecology clarify policy 1230 (Consolidation of Rights for Exempt Ground Water Withdrawals (1/11/1999)) to ensure it is consistently implemented.	0, 7, 1	0, 2, 3
V.A.01.a	Request the Department of Ecology to monitor and enforce existing water rights holders to meet conditions of their water rights and comply with state law.	5, 5, 0	3, 4, 3
V.A.01.b	Evaluate how to inventory water use within the watersheds to assist in making future water management decisions.	5, 5, 0	2, 7, 1
V.A.01.c	Evaluate the creation of a Municipal Reserve for future water rights for municipal water supplies.	0, 2, 7	1, 2, 6
V.A.01.d	Develop strategies to address compliance, enforcement, and validity of water rights and claims within WRIsAs 55 and 57.	5, 4, 0	2, 6, 1
V.A.02.a	Encourage the use of the State Trust Water Rights Program to secure water rights for instream flow.	0, 11, 2	0, 2, 9
V.B.01.a	When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, all water rights holders should be contacted asking them to voluntarily conserve water.	4, 5, 1	4, 2, 4

Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
V.B.01.b	When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, a media campaign should be launched to encourage additional water conservation measures	4, 4, 0	6, 4, 0
VI.A.01.a	Support the restoration, where feasible, of wetlands in areas where these features existed historically but have been drained.	7, 6, 0	0, 11, 4
VI.A.01.b	Encourage the creation of new wetlands, where feasible, in upland areas and along stream corridors.	4, 11, 0	0, 9, 5
VI.A.01.c	Encourage forest management and harvest practices that preserve vegetative ground cover to reduce runoff and increase infiltration in keeping with the forest practices act.	8, 7, 1	9, 6, 1
VI.A.01.d	Discourage the destruction of existing wetlands.	13, 2, 0	12, 4, 0
VI.A.01.e	Encourage agricultural practices that reduce runoff and increase infiltration.	14, 2, 0	9, 7, 0
VI.A.01.f	Consider land use policies that preserve vegetation in natural drainages and other areas in new subdivisions, short subdivisions, or binding site plans.	13, 3, 0	13, 3, 0
VI.A.02.a	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.	8, 2, 0	4, 3, 3
VI.A.02.b	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in new artificial lakes or ponds as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.	2, 6, 2	1, 0, 8
VI.A.02.c	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers as means of augmenting baseflow in the Little Spokane Watershed.	2, 4, 5	0, 0, 11
VI.A.02.d	Consider a public education program on the benefits and problems of beaver dams.	2, 4, 5	4, 5, 2
VI.B.01.a	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in existing lakes as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.	4, 7, 0	3, 5, 3
VI.B.01.b	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of surface runoff storage in new reservoirs or manmade ponds as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.	1, 7, 2	0, 4, 7
VI.B.01.c	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers as means of augmenting baseflow in the Middle Spokane Watershed.	10, 1, 0	2, 7, 2
VI.B.01.d	Continue site identification and feasibility analysis for use of recharge and storage in aquifers for recovery as a water supply source in the Middle Spokane Watershed.	3, 7, 1	0, 4, 7
VI.C.01.a	Assess the impact and feasibility of moving pumping away from existing wells near the river during the summer low-flow season.	2, 4, 5	0, 6, 5
VII.A.01.a	Support regulations that favor treatment and infiltration of stormwater as an alternative to collection, treatment and discharge to surface water.	10, 0, 0	6, 4, 0
VII.A.01.b	Promote the diversion of stormwater from low permeability areas to areas with permeability conducive to infiltration	8, 2, 0	0, 8, 2
VII.A.01.c	Support the infiltration of stormwater through natural sumps into shallow aquifers.	2, 8, 0	6, 9, 1
VII.B.01.a	Support use of reclaimed water from municipal wastewater treatment facilities for aquifer recharge.	2, 6, 2	0, 6, 4
VII.B.01.b	Upon completion of reclaimed water use acceptability evaluations (I.A.01) including wellhead protection concerns, perform recharge site investigations, preliminary design studies and feasibility studies for a reclaimed water recharge program.	0, 8, 2	0, 5, 5
VII.B.01.c	If aquifer storage of reclaimed water is politically acceptable and economically feasible, implement an aquifer storage program for reclaimed water.	0, 7, 3	0, 3, 7
VII.C.01.a	Apply for supplemental funding under multi-use storage to investigate the technical feasibility of increasing summer river flow using non-natural recharge.	9, 1, 0	3, 6, 0

Rec #	Recommendation	Benefit (H, M, L)	Practicality (H, M, L)
VII.C.01.b	Identify potential infiltration areas that could be used to augment summer baseflow in gaining reaches of the Spokane River.	6, 4, 0	4, 6, 0
VII.C.01.c	Incorporate findings of VII.C.01.b into the Implementation Phase for WRIA 55 & 57 watershed planning and include specific recommendations in the first Plan Update.	3, 7, 0	5, 5, 0
VII.C.01.d	During the implementation phase, support development of criteria, in collaboration with the Department of Ecology, under which credit for mitigation will be determined.	3, 8, 0	0, 2, 8
VII.C.02.a	Apply for supplemental funding under multi-use storage to investigate the technical feasibility of mitigating public water supply pumping using artificial recharge.	3, 7, 1	0, 8, 3
VII.C.02.b	Identify locations where infiltration or injection might benefit supply wells and the amount of water that might be beneficially stored based on current and projected pumping.	1, 8, 1	0, 7, 2
VII.C.02.c	Incorporate findings of this evaluation into the Implementation Phase for WRIA 55 & 57 watershed planning and include specific recommendations.	0, 9, 1	2, 5, 1
VII.C.02.d	During the Implementation Phase develop criteria, in collaboration with the Department of Ecology, under which credit for mitigation for new water appropriations will be determined.	2, 8, 0	0, 1, 8
VII.C.03.a	Perform a MIKE SHE Model evaluation of the net effect on the aquifer; resulting from changes to Post Falls HED operations, during summer low-flow operations.	7, 2, 1	7, 2, 1
VIII.A.01.a	Identify key stakeholder groups needed for plan implementation and secure commitment for continued involvement.	N/A	N/A
VIII.A.01.b	Entities that will be involved with implementation and included in the implementation matrix should be represented on the implementation Planning Unit.	N/A	N/A
VIII.A.01.c	Develop procedures for Planning Unit participation in Plan implementation.	N/A	N/A
VIII.B.01.a	Evaluate studies recommended in the Watershed Plan for data gaps.	9, 3, 0	8, 3, 0
VIII.B.01.b	Evaluate the success of implemented Watershed Plan recommendations.	8, 3, 0	5, 6, 0
VIII.B.01.c	Use adaptive management to fill data gaps and improve the outcomes of implemented recommendations.	7, 4, 0	8, 2, 0
VIII.C.01.a	Evaluate existing forecasting systems, and support improvements determined valuable by the Planning Unit.	8, 3, 0	7, 4, 0
VIII.C.01.b	Develop a procedure for presenting flow forecast information that will be used to trigger water resources management procedures.	12, 0, 0	10, 2, 0
VIII.D.01.a	State agencies should give priority to projects included in Watershed Plans when reviewing projects for funding.	N/A	N/A
VIII.D.01.b	Identify and pursue additional funding sources for watershed plan projects.	1, 11, 0	0, 12, 0
VIII.E.01.a	The Watershed Plan should be reviewed and revised as needed, if funding is available, at five year intervals after the completion of the detailed Implementation Plan.	N/A	N/A
VIII.E.01.b	Amendments to the Watershed Plan can be made, as required, by approval of the Planning Unit or its successor and adoption by the boards of county commissioners of all three counties.	N/A	N/A
VIII.E.01.c	The detailed Implementation Plan will be reviewed and revised as funding allows on an ongoing basis.	N/A	N/A

## Appendix 2: Sample Water Rights Survey Form and Responses

Thank you for choosing to participate in our voluntary survey of Group A municipal water right holders! Your participation is greatly appreciated, and the information you provide will help the WRIA 55/57 Planning Unit as it prepares its Detailed Implementation Plan.

Please fax this form to Laila Parker at (206) 343-9819 or mail it to Laila in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or at the following address by **August 25, 2007**:

1109 First Avenue, Suite 400  
Seattle, WA 98101

If you have any questions, please contact Laila at [laila@cascadiaconsulting.com](mailto:laila@cascadiaconsulting.com) or (206) 343-9759, x143.

**Please Confirm/Clarify the Information on your Water Facilities Inventory Report:**

Purveyor Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Water System ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please fill out the matrix below for each of your water rights. Please use the highest annual totals your system has used. Please note whether any of your rights are consolidated, and if so, what your maximum annual volume and instantaneous flow rate are.

Water Right Control Number	Total Water Right		2006 Water System Use <sup>3</sup>	
	Q <sub>i</sub> <sup>1</sup>	Q <sub>a</sub> <sup>2</sup> (AF/YR)	Q <sub>i</sub> (max GPM or CFS)	Q <sub>a</sub> (annual total)

*If applicable:*

Consolidated Rights: \_\_\_\_\_

Maximum Annual Volume: \_\_\_\_\_ AF/YR

Maximum Instantaneous Flow Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ GPM or CFS

*Please see the reverse side.*

<sup>1</sup> In GPM(gallons per minute) for groundwater rights, cfs (cubic feet per second) for surface water rights

<sup>2</sup> Acre-feet per year

<sup>3</sup> master meter total or highest annual volume and instantaneous flow rate ever used

**Are your existing water rights adequate to support future growth for the next 20 years?**

**Yes** \_\_\_\_\_      **No** \_\_\_\_\_      **Unknown** \_\_\_\_\_

**If not, please describe your plan to meet future demand.**

This information may be in your water system plan; if not, one way to estimate this is to use the average number of connections added annually over the last 4-5 years and project it to 20 years. Will you have enough connections to meet that current growth rate of connections for 20 years?

**Are you planning to use your entire water right over the next 20 years?**

**Yes** \_\_\_\_\_      **No** \_\_\_\_\_      **Unknown** \_\_\_\_\_

**Is there anything else we should know about provision of municipal drinking water in your area, or are there any other comments you'd like to share?**

Thanks very much!

### Summary of Responses to Survey Questions

The water rights survey sent to all municipal water purveyors identified in WRIA 55/57 included questions about sufficiency of water rights to meet future demand. We received responses to these questions from 17 owners or operators of water systems. Please note that the accuracy of the answers summarized below has not been verified.

**Question: Are your existing water rights adequate to support future growth for the next 20 years and beyond?**

Response	Number of Systems
Yes	13
No	3
Unknown	1
Total	17

**Question: Are you planning to use your entire water right over the next 20 years?**

Response	Number of Systems
Yes	13
No	1
Unknown	3
Total	17

Location	System	Rights adequate for future growth?*	Plan to meet future demand	Expect to use entire right?*
Within Spokane Valley – Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer, WRIA 57	Carnhope Irrigation District 7	Yes		unknown
	Hutchinson Irrigation District 16	Yes		unknown
	Irvin Water District 6	Yes		Yes
	Model Irrigation District 18	Yes	Conservation	Yes
	Orchard Ave. Irrigation District 6	Yes		Yes
	Pasadena Park Irrigation Dist. 17	No	Additional water rights	Yes
	Trentwood Irrigation District	Yes	City intertie	Unknown
	Vera Water and Power	No	Conservation, new water rights	Yes
Within SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 55	Whitworth Water District	Unknown		Yes
Within SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 55 & 57	City of Spokane	Yes		Yes
Outside SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 57	Snowblaze	Yes		Yes
Outside SVRP Aquifer, WRIA 55	Stevens County PUD – Chattaroy Springs West	Yes		Yes
	Stevens County PUD – Riverside	Yes		Yes
	Stevens County PUD – Halfmoon Ranchos	Yes		Yes
	Stevens County PUD – Clayton	Yes		Yes
	City of Deer Park	Yes		No
	Diamond Lake Sewer District	No	Apply for additional rights, or curtail additional connections	Yes

These responses were not analyzed or verified for accuracy.



## Appendix 3: West Branch Little Spokane River Committee Recommendations

*The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank.*

























## Appendix 4: Avista Comments on the Draft DIP

*The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank.*



## Appendix 5: Phase IV Memorandum of Agreement

(v16)

[space reserved for file number ]:\_\_\_\_\_

Attachments:

A, Resource Obligations for Grant Matching

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT:  
TOWARDS DEVELOPING A DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR  
WRIAS 55 & 57  
THE LITTLE AND MIDDLE SPOKANE WATERSHEDS

WHEREAS, Chapter 90.82 RCW concerning Watershed Planning, provides a collaborative process for participating governmental entities, non-governmental organizations, and other interested parties to have input into the local watershed planning process and

WHEREAS, this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) seeks to further that statutory process with respect to watershed planning for The Little and Middle Spokane Water Resources Inventory Areas (WRIAs) 57 & 57; and

WHEREAS, the process in ch. 90.82 RCW and this MOA is not intended to formally determine or resolve any legal dispute about water rights under state or federal law. Rather, the process provides an alternative, voluntary process for cooperative planning and managing the use of Washington's water resources; and

WHEREAS, effective watershed planning cannot take place without full participation of government entities, non-governmental organizations, and other interested parties within the WRIA; and

WHEREAS, The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (ver. 6/16/2005) has been adopted in joint session on January 31, 2006 by the Pend Oreille County Board of Commissioners, Spokane County Board of Commissioners, and the Stevens County Board of Commissioners.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

**1.0 Purpose:** The purpose of this MOA is to take steps as possible and appropriate under RCW 90.82.030 to involve local water resource users and local interest groups to give input and direction into the watershed planning process. The goal of this collaboration is to reach a collective understanding on the development of a Detailed Implementation Plan identified in RCW 90.82.043 and RCW 90.82.048. REFERENCE: The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (ver. 06/16/2005).

This MOA is not an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement under ch. 39.34 RCW. Interlocal Cooperation Agreements pursuant to ch. 39.34 RCW are limited to Public Agencies to accomplish governmental purposes and such Interlocal Cooperation Agreements may result from the collaborative process supported in this MOA however.

## **2.0 Definitions:**

“Consensus” means unanimous agreement.

“Detailed Implementation Plan” or “DIP” has the same meaning as used in RCW 90.82.043 and RCW 90.82.048, as the document with the strategies implementing the Plan. [For references to “Plan,” see the Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan below.]

“Implementing Party” is any entity, including but not limited to an Indian Tribe, agreeing to participate and having legal authority to contract to implement elements in the DIP. An Implementing Party may be either an Implementing Government or an Implementing Non-Governmental Member (NGM). These groups are further described:

“Implementing Governments” are those governmental entities, including Indian Tribes, having a role in Plan implementation as described in the DIP, with legislative and regulatory authority, whose jurisdiction lies wholly or partly within the boundary of WRIAS 55 & 57, and who are signatories to this MOA. For the purposes of implementing the Plan, Ecology represents only itself. This shall not prevent other State Agencies from joining this MOA by written agreement.

Implementing NGMs are non-governmental persons or entities entering into contractual relationships to implement elements as identified in the Plan. An implementing NGM need not be a Watershed Implementation Team member.



“Implementation Matrix” is a document showing all recommended elements of an approved WRIA Plan as the final step in plan development and recommendations, as further explained in Section 6.3.

“Implementing rules” has the definition in RCW 90.82.020 (2), which are the rules needed to give force and effect to parts of the Plan that create rights or binds any party, including a state agency, or that establish water management policy.

“Initiating Governments” are those local governments initiating the Watershed planning process as identified in RCW 90.82.060(2) for the area designated by the Washington State Department of Ecology as WRIAS 55 & 57, also known as The Little and Middle Spokane Watersheds. They continue as Implementing Governments and signatories to this MOA, to wit: Pend Oreille County, Stevens County, Spokane County, Vera Water & Power, Whitworth Water District #2 and, the City of Spokane.

“Lead agency” is that entity that shall convene the Watershed Implementation Team (WIT) and administer the Phase Four Watershed Planning Grant Funds [Ref. RCW 90.82.040(2)]. The Lead agency contracts for services, using funds available under ch. 90.82 RCW or contributed through other sources. The Lead agency has no power to bind another Government without its expressed written consent, through its governing body. The Lead agency shall likewise be responsible for application and management of grant funds for purpose of this MOA. Designation of a Lead agency does not limit the option of another Government to apply for and manage grant funds for plan implementation. [Cross reference, RCW 90.82.060 (6)]

“Minimum instream flow” has the definition of RCW 90.82.020 (3).

“Planning Unit” was a committee formed pursuant to Chapter 90.82 RCW by the Initiating Governments to initiate the ch. 90.82 process, which resulted in the adopted The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (the Plan). For the purpose of developing the Detailed Implementation Plan, to implement The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (ver. 06/16/2005), the Planning Unit will be replaced by the Watershed Implementation Team (WIT) as further described below.

“The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (ver. 06/16/2005)”, sometimes also referenced as the “Plan” is defined in RCW 90.82.020 (6) with respect to WRIAS 55 & 57. It includes any rules adopted in conjunction with the product of the Planning Unit.

“Watershed Implementation Team” (WIT) is the successor of the Planning Unit, formed for the purpose of implementing The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan (ver. 06/16/2005). WIT membership is listed in Appendix A. The list may be amended by its members as provided in Section 5.

“WRIA” is a water resource inventory area, as provided for under RCW 90.82.020 (4). This MOA concerns WRIAs 55 & 57.

**3.0 Governments Scope:** Watershed Planning for WRIAs 55 & 57 includes an opportunity to receive state grant funding, when local match funding can be met, for Phase Four, Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) development, as provided for in Chapter 90.82 RCW and RCW 90.82.040.

3.1 The main focus of Phase Four will be planning: 1) who will implement that Plan, 2) how the Plan will be implemented, and 3) the commitment of resources by those implementing entities.

3.2 Approval of the completed DIP shall be by the same formalities as this MOA; by written instrument duly executed in like manner as this MOA.

**4.0 Lead Agency:** Spokane County is the Lead agency under this MOA. The Lead agency shall administer the grant funds and contract for services to support development of the detailed implementation plan. Project budgets and utilization of consultants shall be agreed upon by the WIT per the process described in section 6.0 of this agreement.

**5.0 Watershed Implementation Team (WIT):** The WIT is composed of the parties signing this MOA and those members of the WRIAs 55 & 57 Planning Unit, when the Planning Unit approved The Little and Middle Spokane Watershed Management Plan during the Planning Unit meeting on June 16, 2005, all as listed in Appendix A. Future membership may be amended in accordance with this MOA.

5.1 Parties in Exhibit A have appointed a representative or representatives to the WIT. New non-governmental representation in the WIT may be developed as outlined in Section 5.3. Each member of the WIT is responsible to appoint one primary representative and as many alternates as desired. Alternates may serve in lieu of the primary contact.

5.2 The appointed Representatives of Implementing Governments shall be voting members of the WIT. With respect to NGMs, after a person desiring to participate in the WIT has attended three consecutive regular WIT monthly meetings, the WIT may accept such person as a voting member by a vote of the WIT

members pursuant to sec. 6 of this MOA. In voting to accept a WIT candidate, the WIT shall be guided by considerations of assuring that water resource user interests and directly involved local-level interest groups have a fair and equitable opportunity to give input and direction to the process. [Cross reference, RCW 90.82.030 (1)]

**5.2.1** An existing NGM representative may be removed from voting status if such person misses three consecutive regular WIT monthly meetings. A motion to remove is introduced at a regular WIT meeting. Thereafter, the Lead agency and/or a designee shall contact the party in question, no less than 10 business days before the next regular meeting. The majority of the WIT members in attendance at the next regular meeting may then terminate voting membership by majority vote. A removed NGM representative may join again as provided in 5.2.

**5.2.2** Where a voting Government representative on the WIT misses three consecutive regular monthly meetings, written notice may be given to said party of intent to remove voting status at least 10 business days before a regular monthly meeting where the question is to be considered. At such meeting, the removal must be approved by a majority of the WIT members in attendance and the appointing Government shall then be given written notice of such action. The removal does not become effective unless the appointing Government fails to appoint or reappoint a representative within sixty (60) days of being notified. The appointing Government can appoint a new representative or reappoint a removed representative with fully restored voting rights at any time thereafter.

**5.2.3** Government withdrawal: see section 8.3.

**5.3** The WIT may adopt rules for operation, decision-making, and membership to supplement those presented in this MOA but not in conflict with the MOA.

## **6.0 Process:**

**6.1** In so far as possible, all decisions of a quorum of the WIT will be by consensus, but the Implementing Governments must reach Consensus, whether or not in attendance at a meeting. In addition, no decision may bind any Implementing Government to an obligation without written approval of its governing body, with the exception of state and federal agencies, whose

representatives can agree to obligations. For the purposes of this MOA, “Obligation” is defined in sec. 6.3.4.

**6.2** Where Consensus has been reached among Implementing Government representatives, whether or not in attendance, but a consensus cannot be reached among other WIT members after a reasonable amount of time, approval for purposes of participation of such non-government members shall be by majority vote among those non-government members in attendance at a meeting and shall decide the issue for such members. A ‘reasonable amount of time’ as used in this paragraph is determined by majority vote of all those WIT members in attendance at the meeting, except that a reasonable amount of time shall not be less than deferring a vote until the next regular meeting following the meeting with the call to vote.

**6.3** Implementation Matrix. The Plan included an Implementation Matrix which sets forth Issues and Recommendations. The Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) shall identify items creating an obligation on the part of any of the Implementing Entities (Governments and NGOs), including their status as lead or cooperating (supporting), as well as level of effort (including cost as available or reasonable estimate).

**6.3.1** For the purposes of this MOA, the parties further state their intent that no Implementing Rule, as defined in RCW 90.82.020, shall bind an Implementing Government without its’ written consent, approved in the manner described above.

**6.3.2** An Implementing Government which accepts and completes an obligation as specified in the DIP shall be regarded as having fulfilled it’s responsibilities for these issues, recommendations, and/or strategies under the Watershed Management Plan or other related regulatory requirements during the finite terms specified under the DIP.

**6.3.3** NGMs may consent to element(s) of the actions that impose an obligation on such NGMs by written approval of their governing bodies, with the exception of state and federal agencies, whose representatives can agree to obligations. This shall not preclude any requirement for a contractual agreement for NGM Implementers to utilize funding from an Implementing Government.

**6.3.4** “Obligation” means any required action that imposes fiscal impact, a re-deployment of resources or a change of existing policy.

**6.4** All technical decisions will be based on best available science. For purposes of Watershed Planning in WRIAS 55 & 57, the WIT will use the criteria in WAC 365-195-905. For such elements that include implementation by Indian Tribal agencies, best available science criteria may be modified to include best available science determinations by tribal natural resource agencies or departments.

**6.5** Technical advisory group(s) and/or work group(s) may be established by the WIT to provide reports and recommendations on specific issues.

## **7.0 Funding:**

**7.1** By signing this Agreement, the Implementing Governments intend to bind themselves to the Grant Authority to provide resources as shown in Attachment A to meet the “matching” portion of the grant for Phase Four. Such execution also satisfies the requirements of written consent of said signatory under this MOA as regards Attachment A.

**7.2** Grant funds, match and staff or other contributed resources may be used for any purpose approved by the Grant Authority and the contributing entities, including the preparation of technical reports for review by the WIT and/or technical committees and/or focus groups as approved by the WIT. The initial budget for Phase Four will also be reviewed and approved by the WIT.

**7.3** Participation in the WIT and/or technical committees and/or focus groups by all participants, including officials and staff, shall be contributed time not eligible for reimbursement from grant funding unless expressly approved by Implementing Governments, consistent with the provisions of Chapter 90.82 RCW.

**7.4** The Implementing Governments recognize the financial burden watershed planning places on smaller units of government and support their effort to secure outside sources of funding to ensure effective participation by these entities.

## **8.0 Duration:**

**8.1** This MOA becomes effective on the date as provided in section 11 and terminates 18 months after such date.

**8.1.1** In accordance with RCW 90.82.040(2)(e), a Detailed Implementation Plan shall be approved by the WIT within one year from the date on which Phase Four funds are accepted and utilized by the Lead Agency. Said Detailed Implementation Plan shall then require approval by the governing body of each signatory agency of this agreement, with the exception of state and federal agencies, whose representatives can agree to obligations.

**8.1.2** In the event that the WIT has developed and approved a Detailed Implementation Plan, the WIT may continue to operate pending ratification by governing bodies as per 8.1.1, above.

**8.2** Notwithstanding 8.1, by written agreement signed by all parties to this MOA, this MOA may be extended an additional period as agreed, not to exceed two (2) years.

**8.3** Any WIT Member may withdraw from this MOA and the planning process at any time. If any member withdraws, that member shall not be deemed a party to any plan elements or agreement produced. Withdrawal must be by written notice to the Lead Agency, effective thirty (30) days after receipt of notice by the Lead Agency. Upon receipt of notice, the Lead Agency shall communicate the same in writing to all signatories within ten (10) days. A withdrawing party shall not be entitled to any refund or withdrawal of funds or resources obligated under this MOU absent consent of the affected signatories. Unobligated funds or resources shall be released to the withdrawing party.

**9.0 Modification:** This MOA may be modified or amended only by a subsequent written document, signed by all participating parties.

## **10.0 Preservation of Rights:**

**10.1** The parties acknowledge that Chapter 90.82 RCW provides that the planning process shall not result in provisions which conflict with federally reserved tribal rights. They agree that tribal participation in this process shall not constitute an admission or agreement by the participating tribe that any estimate of federally reserved tribal rights are binding on it, unless the affected tribe expressly so agrees in writing at the conclusion of the process, and such tribal agreement is approved in

writing by the appropriate agency of the United States Government (e.g. Bureau of Indian Affairs).

**10. 2** Reports and data from original studies conducted by or on behalf of the WIT are public records pursuant to 40.14.010 RCW (preservation statute).

**11.0 Effective Date:** This MOA shall become effective and commence upon execution by all parties as listed hereinafter. In the event the Lead Agency determines, after a reasonable effort, that it is not possible to obtain the signatures of all parties listed, it shall communicate the same to the remaining parties in writing. Any group of remaining parties may then agree to continue. After the Lead Agency obtains the written consent of such group, which may be give by the chief executive of a participant, it gives written notice to all the remaining participants. The date of such notice is the commencement date. The deadline for giving this notice is October 1, 2006 unless extended by consent of the participants.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we the undersigned have executed this MOA as of the date as indicated.

PEND OREILLE COUNTY:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth Oliver, Chair

SPOKANE COUNTY:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Todd Mielke, Chair

STEVENS COUNTY:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Merrill J. Ott, Chair

CITY OF SPOKANE:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dennis Hession, Mayor

WHITWORTH WATER DISTRICT #2:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chris Johnson, President

VERA WATER & POWER:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
David Peterson, Chair

SPOKANE AQUIFER JOINT BOARD:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ty Wick, President



WASHINGTON STATE DEPT. OF ECOLOGY:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Grant Pfeifer, Regional Director

CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Diana Wilhite, Mayor

CITY OF LIBERTY LAKE:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Peterson, Mayor

CITY OF DEER PARK:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Whisman, Mayor

TOWN OF MILLWOOD:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel N. Mork, Mayor

SPOKANE COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald Scheele, Chair

<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Robert G. Beaumier, Jr., Assistant City Attorney City of Spokane</p>	<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Ron Arkills, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Spokane County</p>
<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Terri Pfister City Clerk City of Spokane</p>	<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Daniela Erickson Clerk of the Board Spokane County</p>
<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Approved as to form:</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p>

**Attachment A**

**Implementing Governments agree to provide no less than the following resources for the duration of this MOA to meet the requirement that the Little and Middle Spokane (WRIAS 55 & 57) WIT provide the 10% match required for Phase Four Grant funding. (cross reference RCW 90.82.040 & 90.82.040 (2)(e))**

<i>Implementing Government</i>	<i>Resource description (hours * \$ rate)</i>	<i>Resource value (\$)</i>
City of Spokane	(s) 60 * \$ 49	2940.00
	(c) \$0	0
City of Spokane Valley	(s) 60 * \$42	2520.00
	(c) \$0	0
Spokane County	(s) 60 * \$44	2640.00
	(s) 60 * \$50	3000.00
	(c) \$0	0
Pend Oreille County	(s) 60 * \$31	1860.00
	(c) \$0	0
Whitworth Water District	(s) 60 * \$66	3960.00
	(s) 60 * \$20	1200.00
	(c) \$0	0
Spokane Aquifer Joint Board	(s) 60 * \$67	4020.00
	(c) \$0	0
Vera Water & Power	(s) 36 * \$66	2376.00
	(c) \$0	0
City of Liberty Lake	(s) \$0	0
	(c) \$0	0
City of Deer Park	(s) \$0	0
	(c) \$0	0
Town of Millwood	(s) \$0	0
	(c) \$0	0
Spokane County Conservation District	(s) \$0	0
	(c) \$0	0
Wash. Dept. of Ecology	**	* *

Resource description codes:

(s) - staff participation: specify hours per annum and rate of compensation

(c) – direct funding: cash paid to the Lead Agency for WRIA WIT activities

Resource Rates are based on base salary, benefits, and a 25% mark up for overhead.

\* \* State funding not eligible for grant matching