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Executive Summary

This Detailed Implementation Plan is designed to be used in coordinating and overseeing the implementation of the 68 recommendations in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. This plan was developed by a group of local citizens and representative agencies called the Watershed Implementation Team (WIT), similar in membership to the group which completed the Watershed Management Plan in 2005. The recommendations in this plan address eight issues central to water resource management in the Hangman (Latah) Creek Watershed; these issues and corresponding recommendations are summarized below. The recommendations in this plan are subject to available funding.

Water Conservation

Many entities in the watershed conduct conservation outreach and education or implement specific conservation plans. The Regional Water Conservation Collaboration (RWCC) will coordinate those strategies to ensure that they complement one another rather than duplicate efforts. Specific actions taken by local stakeholders may include working with water purveyors to implement conservation programs; identifying funding sources for small town infrastructure upgrades; developing new legislation to remove disincentives to irrigation efficiency or conservation; exploring options and funding sources, including the Conservation Futures Program, for holding water rights in the watershed; coordinating water conservation education/information programs; encouraging the use of water conserving programs, actions, and technology in all sectors; and developing a watershed drought management plan.

Ground Water – Surface Water Interactions

Understanding ground water – surface water interactions is crucial to understanding where, at what rate, and by whom the basin’s water is actually being used. The Spokane County Conservation District (SCCD), with support from the WIT, will take the lead on understanding and responding to issues related to the connections between ground water and surface water in the basin. Specific actions may include studying and defining the ground water connections between sub-basins; improving instrumentation through new dedicated monitoring wells and gauging stations; and focused monitoring at the boundary of the watershed to detect aquifer mining and determine the source of ground water used by municipalities.

Stream Flow Augmentation

Stream flow augmentation depends in large part on the understanding developed in the ground water – surface water interaction strategy. Actions will be implemented largely by the SCCD and the WIT, with assistance from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Specific actions will include the development and implementation of a stream flow augmentation program for Hangman (Latah) Creek, including incentives to encourage water rights holders to change their source from surface to ground water where feasible. Stream flow augmentation strategies may also include reclamation and reuse.

Water Rights

Long range water planning depends on an up-to-date accounting of water rights, which in turn relies on cooperation among the WIT, Ecology and local governments, including those in Idaho. Specific actions may include evaluation of the potential to purchase or lease water rights for municipal supply; suggestions of a priority ranking to Ecology for future allocation of water rights in the basin; initiation of a watershed-based negotiation to address cross-state line availability of water; an encouragement to examine the unaccounted water in the public water systems of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah; enforcement of water rights compliance; determination of the need and support for adjudication in the watershed; and, if appropriate, prioritization of sub-basins for adjudication and petition with the State for general adjudication of water rights in the basin.
Water Quality Data

Ongoing water quality data collection is a high priority for WRIA 56. The implementation of the recommended actions will be a joint effort by local stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the SCCD, Spokane County, the City of Spokane, Ecology, and the WIT. Specific actions will include participating in the Lake Spokane, Spokane River and Hangman Creek TMDL processes; and coordinating efforts of various stakeholders, evaluating data gaps and establishing and maintaining stream gauging operations.

Water Quality Protection

Many entities, including the SCCD, the WIT, Spokane Regional Health District, the City of Spokane, Ecology, and Spokane County, have a role to play in protecting water quality. Specific future actions may include minimizing livestock watering impacts to surface waters, including the development of incentives to encourage off-creek watering systems and to improve riparian zones; working with producers to adopt direct-seed technologies; developing incentives and education programs to ensure appropriate septic system construction, care, inspection, upgrades and maintenance; developing and funding wellhead protection and storm water management programs where needed in smaller communities; and coordinating bi-state efforts to protect water quality.

Land Use Compliance

Land use planning and water quantity and quality are inextricably linked. To address these issues, the WIT will need to cooperate with local governments, with technical assistance from other stakeholders. Specific actions may include WIT review of development proposals and local land use authorities’ land use planning within the watershed for compatibility with the watershed management plan; consideration of water availability in comprehensive plan changes that affect housing density or require new withdrawals or new water rights; restrictions, including mitigation, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and appropriate enforcement, on development along streams; delineation of the channel migration zone and 100-year FEMA floodplain; and technical assistance for landowner consultation.

Watershed Restoration

The SCCD will be the lead on many actions in this combined strategy, with assistance and cooperation from Ecology and from local governments. Specific implementation actions may include establishment of a riparian restoration program for the watershed, with identified high-priority shorelines submitted for consideration in the Conservation Futures Program, continued riparian buffer cost-share programs, greenbelts/conservancy corridors established to improve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat; and implementation of public education programs that address riparian area function, benefits, and floodplain encroachment. Additional actions include evaluation of the capability of the watershed to support flows required for returning migratory salmonids, and identification and mapping of fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries, with plans for barrier removal if beneficial and feasible.

Part 1 of this plan consists of a workplan to facilitate effective implementation of recommended actions in 2008-2009, while Part 2 contains the details of how each recommendation will be implemented. Matrices in Part 3 provide a guide to the plan by grouping actions by implementing party and by time of planned implementation. Parts 4 and 5 describe how the WIT met two statutory requirements for the planning process - consideration of the planned future use of existing unused, or inchoate, municipal water rights (RCW 90.82.048), and strategies that provide water for production agriculture, instream flows, and commercial, residential, and industrial use (RCW 90.82.043).

The members of the WIT, shown on page ii, commit to implement the actions assigned to them and to seek funding to assist implementation where needed. The WIT is formed of community members and has encouraged public comment and participation throughout the planning process. Many of the actions detailed
in this plan 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. Effective implementation of the Watershed Management Plan requires flexibility; thus this Plan is a working document which should be periodically revisited and adapted to respond to changing conditions. The WIT recommends that the DIP be reviewed 18 months after the final plan is adopted and submitted to Ecology.

Introduction

Landscape, Land Use, and Environmental Attributes of WRIA 56

Hangman, or Latah, Creek begins in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains of northern Idaho and flows through the southeastern portion of Spokane County, Washington. The geographical boundaries of WRIA 56 encompass the Lower Hangman, Marshall, Rock Creek, Upper Hangman and California Creek sub-basins. The watershed, encompassing over 689 square miles (approximately 430,000 acres), has traditionally been dominated by dryland farming but is now experiencing increased urbanization and changes in land use practices. Along with these changes have come increased demands for water and varied pressures on aquatic and riparian habitat.

Dryland agriculture has been the dominant land use in the Hangman (Latah) Creek Watershed since the early 1900s. By the early 1920s a significant portion of the farmable land had been cleared and cultivated for the production of wheat, barley, peas, and lentils. Hydrological modifications, including stream channel straightening, ditches to move water off the farm fields, and stream meander cutoffs by roads, have altered the watershed causing heavy sediment loading, poor water quality, and accelerated stream bank erosion. The river currently experiences sudden intensive high flows during the winter and spring months, with extremely low flows during the summer months. Water quality samples from Hangman (Latah) Creek routinely violate Washington State standards for temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and fecal coliform.

History of Watershed Management Planning in WRIA 56

Over several decades, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), local conservation districts, private landowners, and agricultural producers have encouraged implementing BMPs, initiated conservation tillage operations, stabilized stream banks, and rehabilitated riparian areas. A watershed management plan developed in the early 1990’s provided a better understanding of the behavior and water quality concerns of the watershed. Although several baseline studies were conducted, water quantity issues in Hangman (Latah) Creek, such as instream flow protection and basin-wide water use, were not fully evaluated.

In 1999, the SCCD applied for initial funding to begin watershed planning under the 1998 Watershed Planning Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW). This law was passed by the Washington Legislature to assist local communities in addressing water resource issues with watershed-based planning. Under the statute, local citizens, agencies, and other interested parties join together in a local process to assess current and desired future conditions, develop management approaches for the watershed's resources, and balance competing demands for water. Planning occurs within the existing structure of Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs), although in some cases multiple WRIAs are combined for planning purposes. Local governments initiate the watershed planning process, and apply for a sequence of grants from Ecology in four major phases.

Phase I provides funding for the organization of local planning units, including the selection of a lead agency and convening of a planning unit formed of representatives of local government, interest groups, and citizens.
This stage relies on cooperation from initiating agencies including all counties within the WRIA and the largest city and water purveyor within the WRIA. Upon successful completion of Phase I, planning units may apply for Phase II funding to conduct watershed assessments, which may range from a compilation of existing data on water resources to new studies of selected parameters such as water quality. Phase III provides funding for development of a watershed management plan through a consensus process by planning units. The watershed management plan must be approved by county legislative bodies.

Phase IV, added to the planning process in 2003 under RCW 90.82.43, provides the funding and authority for this Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP). Phase IV funding provides planning units with a mechanism for coordinating and overseeing the actual implementation of the alternatives and recommendations of their watershed management plan. Certain elements are required to be incorporated in this stage of the planning process, such as a consideration of inchoate water municipal water rights. In addition, the law specifies that “(3) The implementation plan must clearly define coordination and oversight responsibilities; any needed interlocal agreements, rules, or ordinances; any needed state or local administrative approvals and permits that must be secured; and specific funding mechanisms. (4) In developing the implementation plan, the planning unit must consult with other entities planning in the watershed management area and identify and seek to eliminate any activities or policies that are duplicative or inconsistent.” (RCW 90.82.43)

Process Used to Develop this Plan

Following the adoption of the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan in 2005, the WRIA 56 Planning Unit agreed by consensus to move to Phase IV. Participating local governments and other stakeholders signed a Memorandum of Agreement to form the WIT (see Appendix 3). This decision-making body, with similar membership and statutory authority as that of the Planning Unit, has been responsible for developing the DIP.

The SCCD, 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 Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc. assisting with the DIP development.

The WIT has held bimonthly meetings to develop the DIP. Decisions made in the process of developing this plan were reached in a manner consistent with the Memorandum of Agreement signed by local governments and the Operating Rules of the WIT.

Public Outreach

Members of the public have been welcome at all WIT meetings, and are encouraged to attend and participate in future meetings. Public citizens may also join the WRIA 56 mailing list in order to stay updated on WIT activities, review materials used in WIT meetings, and learn about other events and programs relevant to the watershed. More information, including meeting notices, can be obtained by calling the SCCD at (509) 535-7274, or visiting the website at www.sccd.org.

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 the SCCD, Ecology, the City of Spokane, Spokane County, Whitman County, 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; as well as Spokane County Conservation District assessment funds. Additional potential funding sources for specific projects identified in the DIP include:
the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including State and Tribal Assistance grants;
the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural and Community Development Program and Farm
Service Agency (FSA), including the Conservation Reserve Program;
the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), including the Wetland Reserve Program;
the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS);
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds;
Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) funding;
the Washington State Department of Health (DOH), including the Drinking Water State Revolving
Fund;
the Washington State Department of Community, Economic and Trade Development (CTED),
including the Community Development Block grant;
Washington State Legislative appropriations, including the Restructuring/Revitalization Program;
Washington State University Cooperative Extension;
The North American Wetlands Conservation Act grants program;
Spokane County Conservation Futures Program; and
Spokane County.

The WIT has identified specific actions in this DIP to be funded in 2008 and 2009 by Phase IV grant funds
from Ecology. The projected allocations for 2009 will need to be refined based on the results of 2008
activities. Currently there are more needs identified for 2009 than can be funded from the $100,000 available.
In addition to the Phase IV grants, the WIT will allocate the Planning Unit Support grant funds from Ecology
($30,000-$40,000 over two years) to the SCCD to fund staff and administrative expenses for the WIT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2008 Phase IV Grant</th>
<th>2009 Phase IV Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stream Gauge</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelts</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Barriers</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian improvements</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC Assessments</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000-60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought Management Plan</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$35,000-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights Questionnaire</td>
<td>$125,000-161,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Coordination</td>
<td>$35,000-40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$92,000-97,000</td>
<td>$126,000-161,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SCCD and Spokane County have applied for Watershed Planning and Implementation funds from
Ecology to fund specific actions in this DIP. Proposed projects include monitoring aquifer mining,
promoting direct-seed tillage, continuing to organize the RWCC, continuing to operate and maintain
the stream gauge on Hangman Creek at the Idaho-Washington border, negotiating with the City of Tekoa to
provide additional water to Hangman Creek during summer months, conducting a geophysical orientation
survey in the West Plains region of Spokane County, as well as administrative support for the WIT's
watershed planning and implementation efforts.

At the end of 2007, Ecology granted funding for the West Plains geophysical orientation survey and for WIT
support, at $125,000 and $30,000, respectively.

**Organizational Structure**

Implementation and administration of the plan is lead by the SCCD, which as Lead Agency has
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 56 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 is divided into five sections, followed by two appendices.

**Part 1: 2008-2009 Workplan** describes the eight overarching strategies for implementation, with specific actions and timelines. These strategies address water conservation, ground water – surface water interactions, stream flow augmentation, water rights, water quality data, water quality protection, land use planning compliance, and watershed restoration. Each strategy includes specific immediate actions to occur in 2008-2009, which are drawn from the 68 recommendations detailed in Part 2.

**Part 2: Implementation Details for Each Recommendation** describes how each of the WIT’s 68 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** provides the reader with a quick look at who will do what, by when, and with what funding.

**Part 4: Inchoate Water Rights Inventory** documents existing municipal inchoate water rights in the watershed, as required by RCW 90.82.048.

**Part 5: Strategies to Provide Water for Specific Uses** describes the actions in the plan which may increase the amount of available water for production agriculture, instream flows, and/or commercial, industrial, and residential use, as required under RCW 90.82.043.

**Appendix 1: Benefits and Practicality Ratings** contains results from WIT members’ votes on their expectations of the benefits to the watershed and practicality of implementation of each recommendation.

**Appendix 2: Sample Water Rights Survey Form** contains the form sent to each identified municipal water purveyor in WRIA 56.

**Appendix 3: Memorandum of Agreement** is a copy of the document signed by local governments which governs the operations of the WIT.
Part 1: 2008-2009 Workplan

Implementation actions in 2008-2009 are grouped here under eight overarching strategies, organized by timeline. These strategies address water conservation, ground water – surface water interactions, stream flow augmentation, water rights, water quality data, water quality protection, land use planning compliance, and watershed restoration. Numbers in parentheses following each action provide a reference to the recommendation(s) under which that action was developed.

Water Conservation

Objective: Water conservation measures are adopted throughout the basin

Many local stakeholders are involved in activities that encourage responsible use of water resources. The Regional Water Conservation Collaboration (RWCC) will be the lead on coordinating the conservation activities of these varied stakeholders, with the intent of implementing conservation strategies that complement one another and avoid duplication of efforts. Funding sources will need to be identified for many of the actions. Until such time as there is an established regional authority to conduct combined water conservation activities, specific implementation actions from the Watershed Management Plan may be conducted by stakeholders, individually or cooperatively. These activities, from the Plan, include working with water purveyors to implement conservation programs (R4.a); identifying funding sources for small town infrastructure upgrades (R4.b); developing new legislation to remove disincentives to irrigation efficiency or conservation (R4.c); exploring options and funding sources, including the Conservation Futures Program, for holding water rights in the watershed (R4.d-f); coordinating water conservation education/information programs (R4.g); encouraging the use of water conserving programs, actions, and technology in all sectors (R4.h); and developing a watershed drought management plan (R4.i).

Tasks:

Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

1st Quarter, 2008

- The WIT will review the new water conservation requirements under the Municipal Water Law. (R4.a)
- The WIT and member agencies will send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting that the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law be changed to provide better incentives for conservation. (R4.c)

2nd Quarter, 2008

- The WIT, with Ecology as the lead, will investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates to improve water management and conservation. At the invitation of these local governments, the WIT will assist in applying for funding for water infrastructure updates. (R4.b)

3rd Quarter, 2008

- The WIT will discuss the goals of a drought management plan and prepare an outline of plan components. This work should be conducted with the Spokane County Department of Emergency Management, and should include a review of the ‘Spokane County Multi-jurisdiction All Hazard Mitigation Plan’. (R4.i)
- The WIT will prepare an outline of a scope of work, a preliminary budget and a list of potential funding sources to prepare a drought management plan. (R4.i)

1st Quarter, 2009

- The WIT will identify funding sources that could be used to match Conservation Futures funds. (R4.f)
3rd Quarter, 2009
- Depending on the potential of utilizing the Conservation Futures Program for purchasing water rights, the WIT will develop an implementation strategy for purchase of specific water rights. (R4.f)

Ongoing
- The WIT will review and comment, if necessary, on conservation goals developed by water purveyors in accordance with DOH rules under the Municipal Water Law (R4.a).

Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

1st Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will ask water purveyors if they will collaborate with the WIT and other purveyors in the development and implementation of conservation efforts required by DOH. (R4.a)

2nd Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will use the WIT’s existing list of Group A and B purveyors in the watershed and check the status of their water system plans and conservation program updates with DOH. (R4.a)
- Ecology will provide the WIT with examples of other basins’ drought management plans. (R4.i)

3rd Quarter, 2008
- Ecology will brief the WIT on water trusts and water banking. (R4.e)

1st Quarter, 2009
- Spokane County, in cooperation with the City of Spokane and the Spokane County Department of Emergency Management, will bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures Program can be used for purchasing water rights. (R4.f)

2nd Quarter, 2009
- ★3 The SCCD will hire a contractor to develop a watershed drought management plan. The plan will include specific actions to be taken to conserve and preserve water in the basin. (R4.i) Funding Source: The WIT has allocated $30,000 - $60,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.

Ongoing
- Ecology will notify the WIT if it receives water rights requests for out-of-basin transfers. (R4.d)

WIT Support for Actions by Others
- The RWCC should coordinate a conservation e-mail list and invite purveyors to participate. (R4.a)
- The RWCC should continue to coordinate a regional water conservation education program. (R4.g)
- Water purveyors, wastewater utilities, and others implementing conservation programs should keep the WIT informed of their efforts. (R4.h)

---

3 ★ Denotes action items that need a dedicated source of funding. If no funding is provided, action will be delayed.
Ground Water - Surface Water Interactions

Objective: Better understanding of ground water – surface water interactions in the basin

Understanding ground water – surface water interactions is crucial to understanding where, at what rate, and by whom the basin’s water is actually being used. The SCCD, with support from the WIT, will be the lead on understanding and responding to issues related to the connections between ground water and surface water in the basin. Technical support may come from Ecology and the USGS as needed. Funding sources need to be identified. Specific implementation actions, subject to available funding, may include studying and defining the ground water connections between sub-basins (R5.a); updating instrumentation through new dedicated monitoring wells and gauging stations (R5.d-e); and focused monitoring to detect aquifer mining and determine the source of ground water used by municipalities at the boundary of the watershed (R5.b-c). In the future, separate watershed management units may be identified and managed differently for water rights if studies indicate a disparity between sub-basins and their ground water – surface water relationships.

Tasks:
Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

1st Quarter, 2008
- The WIT, with the SCCD as the lead, in consultation with Ecology, will identify potential locations for a gauging station between the upper and lower watershed. (R5.d)
- The SCCD will install a gauge between the upper and lower watershed, if appropriate resources are identified, and will continuously collect and maintain data from the gauge. (R5.d) **Potential Funding Sources:** The WIT has allocated $16,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants, SCCD assessment funds, TMDL funding, Spokane County, and wastewater treatment plants.

1st Quarter, 2009
- The WIT (with staff support from the SCCD) will identify priority areas, prepare a detailed Scope of Work outline, develop a budget, and identify potential funding sources to study ground water connections between sub-basins. (R5.a)
- The WIT (with staff support from the SCCD) will identify priority areas, prepare a detailed Scope of Work outline, develop a budget, and identify potential funding sources for monitoring of ground water levels to identify potential aquifer mining. (R5.b)

Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

1st Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will identify ongoing funding to maintain the gauging station near the state line (R5.e)

Ongoing
- The SCCD will monitor the data from the gauging station near the state line. (R5.e)
Stream Flow Augmentation

Objective: Increased stream flows in Hangman (Latah) Creek

The strategy to increase stream flows in Hangman (Latah) Creek depends in large part on the understanding developed in the ground water – surface water interaction strategy. Actions will be implemented largely by the SCCD and the WIT, with assistance from Ecology. Multiple potential funding sources have been identified and will be pursued. Specific implementation actions, subject to available funding, may include the development and implementation of a stream flow augmentation program for Hangman (Latah) Creek (R7.b), along with the development of incentives to encourage water rights holders to change their source from surface to ground water where feasible (R7.c). Stream flow augmentation strategies may also include reclamation and reuse (R1.b).

Tasks:
Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

1st Quarter, 2008
- ★ The SCCD will develop a mentoring program and provide other assistance and encouragement for no-till/direct seed tillage operations throughout the watershed. (R7.b) *Potential Funding Sources:* SCCD Assessment funds and state or federal grant funds.
- Ecology will provide a presentation and written policy guidance to the WIT explaining the required water rights source change process. (R7.c)

2nd Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will identify landowners in the Rock Creek sub-watershed who may be willing to reforest lands and will explore funding options with the Conservation Reserve Program. Stream flow changes will be monitored by the existing SCCD gauge on Rock Creek. (R7.b)

3rd Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will explore funding and cost-sharing options for landowners to build living snow fences, and will explore potential cost savings from road plowing. (R7.b)

Ongoing
- The SCCD and WIT members will continue to involve landowners in building catchment basins, living and constructed snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips throughout the watershed. (R7.b)
- The SCCD will coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights. (R7.b)
- The WIT will include education components in projects and in newsletters to inform watershed residents about the stream augmentation efforts in the watershed and their importance. (R7.b)
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Ecology will continue their water conservation programs, as deemed necessary. (R1.b)
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Ecology will continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options. (R1.b)

WIT Support for Actions by Others
- The RWCC will continue to develop and coordinate regional conservation efforts. (R1.b)
**Water Rights**

**Objective:** Water rights are accounted for and allocated in accordance with WIT priorities

Long-range water planning depends on an up-to-date accounting of water rights, which in turn relies on cooperation among the WIT, Ecology, and local governments, including those in Idaho. Specific implementation actions include evaluation of the potential to purchase or lease water rights for municipal supply (R1.a), suggestions of a priority ranking to Ecology for future allocation of water rights in the basin (R3.a), initiation of a watershed-based negotiation to address cross-state line availability of water (R3.b), an examination of the unaccounted water in the public water systems of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah (R7.a), enforcement of water rights compliance (R6.a), determination of the need and support for adjudication in the watershed, and, if appropriate, prioritization of sub-basins for adjudication and petition with the State for general adjudication of water rights in the basin (R6.b-.c).

**Tasks:**

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

**1st Quarter, 2008**
- The WIT will coordinate a regional meeting with Ecology and other WRIAs to identify the appropriate actions and resources required to address compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims. Following the meeting, the WIT, in coordination with other regional WRIAs, will communicate its concerns to Ecology regarding appropriate compliance activities. The letter will be copied to appropriate state legislators. (R6.a)

**2nd Quarter, 2008**
- The WIT, with close coordination with the Coeur d'Alene (CDA) Tribe, will invite representatives of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss initiating watershed-based negotiation to address cross-state water availability. (R3.b)

**1st Quarter, 2009**
- The WIT will identify water available for acquisition and recommend that it be allocated according to the recommended priorities for future water rights allocations contained in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R3.a)

**Ongoing**
- The WIT will encourage the towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah, and other applicable water systems, to request grant funding in order to evaluate and investigate the causes for unaccounted water in their public water systems. The WIT will also assist in identifying funding sources. (R7.a)

**Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

**1st Quarter, 2008**
- Ecology will identify any existing cross-state regional groups as models for a possible cooperative agreement on cross-state water availability. (R3.b)
- Spokane County will investigate whether block grant funding is available to cover multiple jurisdictions’ investigations of unaccounted water in their public water systems. (R7.a)

**1st Quarter, 2009**
- ★ The SCCD will send a questionnaire to water rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed. (R6.b) **Funding Source:** The WIT has allocated $10,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.
Ongoing
- Ecology will include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56. (R3.a)

**Water Quality Data**

**Objective: Relevant water quality data is incorporated into area TMDLs**

Ongoing water quality data collection is a high priority for WRIA 56. The data collection should be consistent with the data gap analysis and recommendations from the Hangman (Latah) TMDL. The implementation of the recommended actions will be a joint effort by local stakeholders including, but not limited to, the SCCD, Spokane County, Ecology, City of Spokane, and the WIT. Funding sources need to be identified. Specific implementation actions may include participating in the Lake Spokane, Spokane River, and Hangman (Latah) Creek TMDL processes (R8.a-.b); evaluating data gaps and establishing and maintaining stream monitoring operations; and drawing conclusions from the data to inform the TMDL process (R8.c-.f).

**Tasks:**

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

*1st Quarter, 2008*
- The WIT will brainstorm potential funding sources to maintain stream monitoring operations. (R8.e)

*4th Quarter, 2008*
- The SCCD, in coordination with USGS and WIT members, will create a work plan through the TMDL process to collect and analyze sediment loading data. (R8.d)

*1st Quarter, 2009*
- The WIT will review the prioritized water quality data needs listed in the Hangman (Latah) TMDL. (R8.c)
- If identified high-priority data gaps in the Hangman (Latah) TMDL are not already addressed in this DIP, the WIT will develop implementation strategies to address those gaps and to seek funding. (R8.c)

*Ongoing*
- The SCCD will prepare grant applications or otherwise obtain funding for stream monitoring. (R8.e)

**Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members**

*Ongoing*
- The SCCD, Spokane County, and City of Spokane will continue to participate in the development and implementation of the Lake Spokane and Spokane River TMDLs. They will provide periodic briefings and updates to the WIT. (R8.a)
- The SCCD, Spokane County, City of Spokane, and the CDA Tribe will continue to participate in the development and implementation of the Hangman (Latah) TMDL, and will provide periodic briefings and updates to the WIT. (R8.b)
**Water Quality Protection**

**Objective: Non-point source threats to water quality are reduced**

The implementation of the recommended actions will be a joint effort by local stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the SCCD, the WIT, Spokane Regional Health Department, City of Spokane, Ecology and Spokane County. Funding may come from SCCD-obtained grants, the Rural Community Assistance Corporation, and other sources to be identified. Specific implementation actions may include the development of a bi-state agreement between state agencies, conservation districts, and other stakeholders to work cooperatively towards protecting water quality (R8.b); minimizing livestock-watering impacts to surface waters, including the development of incentives to encourage off-creek watering systems and to improve riparian zones (R8.g-.i); working with producers to adopt direct-seed technologies (R7.b); development of incentives and education programs to ensure appropriate septic system construction, care, inspection, upgrades, and maintenance (R9.a-.c); and the development and funding of wellhead protection and storm water management programs where needed in smaller communities (R10.a-.d).

**Tasks:**

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

**2nd Quarter, 2008**

- The WIT will have a briefing by Ecology and/or other stormwater experts on options to improve stormwater management in small communities. Representatives of small communities will be invited to participate. (R10.c)
- WIT members and the WIT as a whole will provide comments to Spokane County on suggested amendments to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). (R8.g)

**3rd Quarter, 2008**

- The SCCD and the WIT will assist and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) Creek watershed. (R8.b)

**1st Quarter, 2009**

- The WIT will facilitate a meeting with Spokane Regional Health District staff to discuss optimal education programs for septic system owners. (R9.a)
- The WIT will meet with staff from the Spokane Regional Health District to discuss compliance with septic system inspection requirements, and means for improving compliance. (R9.b)
- The WIT will meet with the Spokane Regional Health District to develop a list of possible incentives for septic system replacements and upgrades, and to identify potential funding sources. (R9.c)

**2nd Quarter, 2009**

- The WIT may develop specific implementation actions for a septic system maintenance program, based on discussions with the Health District. (R9.b)
- The WIT will encourage the Spokane Regional Health District to develop and conduct an annual mailing of educational materials to all septic owners, which would inform septic owners of inspections regulations. (R9.a)

**3rd Quarter, 2009**

- The WIT will invite small towns to participate in identifying and addressing wellhead protection needs. (R10.a)
- The WIT will facilitate a meeting of interested representatives of small communities to discuss options for wellhead protection. (R10.a)
Ongoing
- A sub-committee of the WIT will review new and updated Water System Plans’ wellhead protection strategies as part of the ongoing review of Water Systems Plans’ consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R10.a)

Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members
1st Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will apply its available cost-share monies for BMP implementation towards off-creek livestock watering systems. (R8.h)
- Spokane County should consider amendments to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) and Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water. (R8.g)
- The SCCD will develop an action plan that identifies priority riparian areas and incentives for landowners to improve such areas, contingent on an infrastructure framework in place to protect these improvements. (R8.i)
- Ecology, in collaboration with DOH, will contact the Rural Community Assistance Corporation to prepare a list of potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities. (R10.b, .d)

3rd Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD and the WIT will assist and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) Creek watershed. (R8.b)
- The SCCD will begin implementing the action plan to improve riparian zones, as funding allows. (R8.i)
- Potential Funding Sources: The WIT has allocated $50,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants and SCCD Assessment funds.

Ongoing
- The SCCD will write grant applications for programs for fencing, off-creek livestock watering systems, and other means to minimize stock water impacts to surface waters, including long-term cost share projects with stable funding. (R8.g, .h)
- The SCCD, in cooperation and coordination with the WIT, will offer technical assistance to landowners to address stock watering impacts to surface waters. (R8.g)

Land Use Planning Compliance

Objective: Local land use planning is consistent with the Watershed Management Plan.

This combined strategy will involve extensive cooperation among the WIT and local governments, with technical assistance from the SCCD. Specific implementation actions include WIT review of development /construction proposals and city land use planning within the watershed for compatibility with the watershed management plan (R11.a, b); consideration of water availability in comprehensive plan changes which affect housing density or require new withdrawals or water rights, as well as in regulation of minimum parcel size (R2.b–c); restrictions, including mitigation, BMP measures, and appropriate enforcement, on development along streams (R11.c–e, .g); new delineation of the channel migration zone and 100-year FEMA floodplain (R11.i–j); and technical assistance for landowner consultation (R11.f).
Tasks:

Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

1st Quarter, 2008
- The WIT will review Spokane County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP, and coordinate with the Spokane County Planning Department. (R11.d)
- The WIT will review Whitman County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP, and will coordinate with staff of the Whitman County Planning Department. (R11.d)
- The WIT will request that Spokane County hire staff with technical backgrounds (e.g. a wetlands specialist) to review development applications and apply SMP and CAO regulations, and would support joint efforts between Spokane and Whitman Counties and the City of Spokane to contract for this expertise on a regional basis. (R11.g)

2nd Quarter, 2008
- The WIT will work with small cities in the Whitman County portion of WRIA 56 to develop a process for SEPA review that ensures consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R11.a)

3rd Quarter, 2008
- The WIT will meet with appropriate Spokane and Whitman County planning personnel to develop a process for WIT input and comment on development proposals. (R11.a)

2nd Quarter, 2009
- If necessary, the WIT will prioritize river sections to be reassessed for floodplain extent. (R11.j)

Ongoing
- The WIT will review all appropriate development /construction proposals during SEPA review and provide comments on the proposals’ consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R11.a)
- WIT members, as needed, will send letters to the appropriate officials commenting on whether proposed SMP or CAO revisions are consistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R11.c)
- The WIT will schedule briefings on current updates to SMPs or CAOs at WIT meetings as appropriate. (R11.c)
- As proposals for development within the 100-year floodplain arise in the WRIA, WIT members will request that the issue be placed on the WIT agenda. After review and discussion, the WIT will then decide whether to suggest specific mitigation measures for the project. (R11.d)
- The WIT, with the SCCD as lead, will review the number and type of waivers, exemptions, and other exceptions granted to the SMP and CAO requirements, and will consider submitting comments opposing exceptions it considers to be inconsistent with the adopted Watershed Management Plan. The first step in this process will be to establish a process to receive notice and copies of waivers, exemptions, etc. (R11.g)
- The WIT, with Spokane County as the lead, will identify upcoming GMA Comprehensive Plan updates and schedule time for review and comment with respect to water availability. (R2.b)
- The WIT will review and comment on GMA Comprehensive Plan updates with respect to water availability. (R2.b)
- The WIT and WIT members will provide comment and input on proposed streamside/shoreline land uses and suggest riparian buffers and other BMPs that should be required. (R11.e)
- The WIT will support funding requests for the 100-year floodplain delineation. (R11.j)

Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

2nd Quarter, 2008
- Spokane County will identify all small cities within Spokane County that do not have an agreement with the county for SEPA review. The WIT will work with these cities to develop a process for SEPA review that ensures consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R11.a)
- The SCCD will develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals that are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations. (R11.e)
The City of Spokane and Spokane County will inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in their SMPs and CAOs. (R11.e)

The SCCD, with support from WIT members, will prepare a list of scheduled updates or revisions to local comprehensive plans, development regulations, CAO, SMP, and other land use regulations. The first step will be to establish a process to receive notice and copies of these documents. (R11.b,.c)

**3rd Quarter, 2008**

- The SCCD will determine which specific development/construction documents the WIT wants to review and will identify a process to obtain those documents. (R11.a)
- Ecology, upon request of the WIT, will coordinate with the Spokane County Engineering office, FEMA and the WIT to pursue resources to reassess the boundaries of the FEMA 100-year floodplain. (R11.j)
- The SCCD will obtain more information on funding opportunities to reassess 100-year floodplain delineation under FCAAP. (R11.j)

**1st Quarter, 2009**

- The SCCD will conduct education and outreach with public and elected officials regarding the importance and economic value of protecting channel migration zones. (R11.i)

**Ongoing**

- The SCCD will serve as the single point of contact responsible for distributing appropriate development/construction proposals within the watershed to the rest of the WIT and scheduling relevant agenda items at WIT meetings. (R11.a)
- WIT members from local governments will notify the WIT of upcoming land use changes. (R11.b)
- The SCCD will prepare comment letters on behalf of the WIT regarding County and City land use planning. (R11.b)
- If applicable, cities and counties will consider WIT-proposed changes to the SMP and/or CAO. (R11.c)
- The SCCD will continue current technical assistance programs for streamside landowners, increase individual contacts as funding allows, and inform streamside landowners of technical assistance programs such as NRCS, WSU Extension, FSA, etc. The SCCD will continue to work with the Pend Oreille Conservation District when necessary to coordinate or inform about activities. (R11.f)
- Local governments should incorporate the delineated channel migration zone into their floodplain, stormwater, shoreline, and critical area codes, and add it to local SEPA check lists. (R11.i)
- Ecology will regularly update the WIT on the status of the FEMA 100-year floodplain review. (R11.j)
- WIT members, with coordination by the SCCD, will note any SMPs or CAOs that are inconsistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan. (R11.c)
- The City of Spokane and Spokane County will inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in their SMPs and CAOs. (R11.e)

**Watershed Restoration**

**Objective: Ongoing activities to restore the watershed and protect habitats.**

The SCCD will be the lead on many actions in this combined strategy, with assistance and cooperation from Ecology and from local governments. Specific implementation actions include establishment of a riparian restoration program for the watershed, with identified high-priority shorelines submitted for consideration in the Conservation Futures Program; continued riparian buffer cost-share programs; greenbelts/conservancy corridors established to improve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat; and public education programs implemented that address riparian area function, benefits, and floodplain encroachment (R11.h,.k-.q). Additional actions include evaluation of the capability of the watershed to support flows required for returning migratory salmonids, and identification and mapping of fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries, with plans for barrier removal if beneficial and feasible (R12.a-.c).
Tasks:

Actions Assigned to the WIT as a Whole

2nd Quarter, 2008
- The WIT will prioritize locations for greenbelts or conservancy corridors, and begin working with landowners. (R11.h)

2nd Quarter, 2009
- The WIT will facilitate a meeting with Spokane and Whitman County departments of Emergency Management Service to discuss options for a coordinated flood response plan. (R11.m)

3rd Quarter, 2009
- The WIT will develop specific riparian restoration needs for WRIA 56 based on TMDL-related modeling and studies of soils and non-point sources. (R11.n)
- The WIT will use the SCCD riparian assessment tool to identify high priority shorelines. (R11.p)

Actions Assigned to Specific WIT Members

2nd Quarter, 2008
- The SCCD will research and define the terms “greenbelts” and “corridors”. (R11.h)

3rd Quarter, 2008
- ★ The SCCD will identify locations where property owners may sell or lease land for greenbelts or conservancy corridors and will summarize agreement options such as local ordinances, easements, leases, and purchases. (R11.h) Funding Source: The WIT has allocated $10,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.
- The SCCD, Ecology, Spokane County, Whitman County and other local governments will meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops. (R11.l)

4th Quarter, 2008
- ★ The SCCD will identify and map all fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries. (R12.a) Potential Funding Sources: The WIT has allocated $12,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants and SCCD Assessment funds.

1st Quarter, 2009
- Spokane County will begin the non-point source study for the Spokane River TMDL. (R11.n)
- The SCCD will identify high priority shorelines and willing landowners as model funding recipients for the Conservation Futures Program. (R11.o)
- The SCCD will seek willing landowners along high priority shorelines to be considered for the Conservation Futures Program. (R11.p)

2nd Quarter, 2009
- The SCCD, with support from the WIT, will determine the steps necessary to revise the policies of the Conservation Futures Program, and will initiate dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy towards reserving funds for acquisition (including purchase, rental, lease, and easements) of high priority shorelines. (R11.o)
- If funding is secured for identifying and mapping fish barriers, the SCCD, with participation from Ecology, WDFW, the CDA Tribe, and the WIT, will assess the benefits and impacts of removal of fish barriers, and develop an action plan for barrier removal where it is expected to have a high benefit. (R12.a)

3rd Quarter, 2009
- The SCCD will complete the modeling and soil studies for the Hangman TMDL. (R11.n)
The SCCD will complete Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) assessments on Spangle Creek, Cove Creek, Little Hangman Creek, and Rattler Run as funding and staff resources allow. (R12.b) **Funding Source:** The WIT has allocated $20,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.

*4th Quarter, 2009*

- The SCCD, or whoever is specifically identified in the TMDL studies, will conduct riparian restoration activities. (R11.n)

*Ongoing*

- The SCCD will apply for FCAAP or other funding to study hazards within the 100-year floodplain, and will identify other monies for a match of up to 50%. (R11.k)
- The SCCD will apply for FCAAP or other funding to purchase or otherwise acquire land or structures within the 100-year floodplain, or to relocate hazardous structures. (R11.k)
- WIT member agencies will seek funding to implement priority restoration projects. (R11.n)
- The SCCD will apply for continued funding for its riparian buffer cost-share program. (R11.q)

**WIT Support for Actions by Others**

- Avista will evaluate their dams to determine whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows for returning salmonids, supported by a technical team including the CDA tribe and WDFW. (R12.c)
Part 2: Implementation Details for Each Recommendation

Part 2 describes in detail how each of the 68 recommendations in the Watershed Management Plan will be implemented. These recommendations are organized as they were in the Watershed Management Plan, grouped by 13 issues identified by the Planning Unit. 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.

Issue 1: Projected Future Growth. According to current data collection efforts and reports, some municipal water systems may not have enough water to meet project future growth.

Recommendation R1.a
Evaluate the potential to purchase or lease valid current water rights for municipal supply.

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.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- The WIT will meet with Ecology to evaluate the potential to purchase or lease valid current water rights for municipal supply. Detailed action steps, if any, will be developed at that time.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the near-term actions.

Implementation Considerations
- The source of the water from within the watershed will affect both the viability and desirability of this recommendation.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- WIT meeting with Ecology.
- List of detailed action items.

Potential Funding Sources
- None needed.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R1.b**

Reclamation, conservation, and reuse strategies shall be encouraged to increase water available for beneficial uses in the 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 medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- The Town of Cheney is doing some reclamation via wetlands.
- The City of Spokane has been studying the feasibility of irrigation districts purchasing reclaimed water from the City.
- The City of Spokane Water Department and Wastewater Management Department, in partnership with Ecology and the Spokane Aquifer Joint Board (SAJB), are involved in a regional water conservation awareness and education program.
- Spokane County and the City of Spokane are assessing reclamation from waste water treatment plants.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Ecology will continue their water conservation programs.
- The City of Spokane, Spokane County, and Ecology will continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options.
- The RWCC will continue to develop and coordinate regional conservation efforts.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

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

Implementation Considerations

- Conservation offers a higher potential benefit than reclamation and reuse options.
- The RWCC is currently focused primarily on education and outreach efforts.
- Small towns and cities may be considering reclamation and reuse options in the future.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- New and ongoing water conservation programs, projects, and activities by Ecology, City of Spokane, Spokane County, and the RWCC.

Potential Funding Sources
- Ecology, City of Spokane, and Spokane County will donate staff time.
- The RWCC needs an ongoing funding source to coordinate regional conservation efforts.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Issue 2: Growth Management.** Projected growth over the next 20 years could have severe impacts on the water resources in the basin. Growth should be managed to minimize impacts.

**Recommendation R2.a**
Separate watershed management units may be identified and managed differently for water rights if future studies indicate a disparity between sub-basins and their ground water – surface water relationships.

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)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- None.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- None.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- If the implementation of Recommendation R5.a to study and define ground water connections between sub-basins suggests that there is a disparity between sub-basins and their ground water – surface water relationships, consideration will be given to identifying separate watershed units to be managed differently for water rights.

Implementation Considerations
- The WIT may reconsider this recommendation if future studies indicate a disparity between sub-basins and their ground water – surface water relationships.
Performance Indicators / Milestones
- None.

Potential Funding Sources
- None needed.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- None.

**Recommendation R2.b**

*All proposed changes in GMA Comprehensive Plans that affect housing density and require new withdrawals and/or issuance of new water rights from the watershed should be based on 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 medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT, with Spokane County as the lead, will identify upcoming GMA Comprehensive Plan updates and schedule time for review and comment with respect to water availability.
- The WIT will review and comment on GMA Comprehensive Plan updates with respect to water availability.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- At the beginning of each year the WIT will identify upcoming GMA Comprehensive Plan updates and schedule time for review and comment with respect to water availability.
- The WIT will review and comment on GMA Comprehensive Plan updates with respect to water availability.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations
- An established ground water monitoring network will allow a better understanding of the impacts of increased withdrawals.
Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- The percentage of GMA Comprehensive Plan Updates that are reviewed and commented on by the WIT each year.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time to review and comment on the plans will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R2.c
Land use regulators should utilize water availability estimates described in the Watershed Management Plan. Minimum parcel size should be based on sub-basin estimates in areas where new exempt wells will be the main source of domestic water.

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- Water availability was evaluated in Appendix M of the Watershed Management Plan.
- A written confirmation of available water is required from a water purveyor for anyone building in a municipal service area.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT will host a meeting with land use planners and planning commissioners from throughout the watershed to discuss how to integrate the Watershed Management Plan into land use permitting processes.

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)
- None.

---

1 Hydrology of the Hangman (Latah) Creek Watershed, Buchanan and Brown, 2003.
Implementation Considerations
- Spokane County offers a Certificate of Exemption for some developments. The WIT may want to comment on this practice.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A meeting with local land use planners and planning commissioners.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated as needed.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Issue 3: Priorities of Future Water Allocation.** It is important to ensure adequate water supplies for instream and out-of-stream uses within the basin. Priorities need to be set for the watershed.

**Recommendation R3.a**

*Future allocations of water rights should be apportioned accordingly:*
1. Municipal
2. Domestic (group, domestic exempt)
3. Stock water (requiring less than 5,000 gallons per day for ranging cattle)
4. Light Industrial
5. Commercial (retail, commercial livestock)
6. Stock water (requiring greater than 5,000 gallons per day)
7. Agriculture (irrigated)
8. Heavy Industrial

*It is understood that water right issuance is prioritized “first in time, first in right.” This prioritization by the PU may be used in the future to designate water rights and other legislation.*

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- Ecology will include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56.
Near-Term Actions Required (2010--2012)
- The WIT will identify water available for acquisition and recommend that it be allocated according to the recommended priorities for future water rights allocations contained in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.
- Ecology will include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Ecology will include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56.

Implementation Considerations
- None.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Future water rights allocations follow the priorities identified by the WIT.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R3.b
Initiate a watershed based negotiation to achieve a cooperative agreement to address cross-state-line availability of water (both surface- and ground water).

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 WIT, in close coordination with the CDA Tribe, will invite representatives of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss initiating watershed-based negotiation to address cross-state water availability.
- Ecology will identify any existing cross-state regional groups as models for a possible cooperative agreement on cross-state water availability.
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 actions.

Implementation Considerations
- None.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Occurrence of at least one meeting.
- Distribution of a list of existing cross-state regional groups and their agreements.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time for the immediate actions will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None for the immediate actions.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Issue 4: Water Conservation, Reclamation, and Re-Use. The Planning Unit recognizes that the watershed may be fully allocated. Water savings will occur from implementing water conservation measures. Communities may want to consider instituting a plan to prevent shortages in the future.

Recommendation R4.a
Work with water purveyors to implement conservation programs required by the Department of Health through the new Municipal Water Law (HB 1338).

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 SCCD will use the WIT’s existing list of Group A and B purveyors in the watershed to check the status of their water system plans and conservation program updates with DOH.
- The SCCD will ask water purveyors to collaborate with the WIT and other purveyors in the development and implementation of conservation efforts required by DOH.
- The WIT will review the new water conservation requirements under the Municipal Water Law.
- The RWCC should coordinate a conservation e-mail list and invite purveyors to participate.
- The WIT will review and comment, if necessary, on conservation goals developed by water purveyors in accordance with DOH rules under the Municipal Water Law.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010--2012)
- The WIT will review and comment, if necessary, on conservation goals developed by water purveyors in accordance with DOH rules under the Municipal Water Law.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations
- If there is significant interest by purveyors, additional funding, staff time, and technical assistance may be required to collaborate and assist on conservation efforts.
- Ecology is facilitating a region-wide conservation education effort through the RWCC.
- The RWCC will need overall funding for the water conservation efforts.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Summary of the status of WRIA 56 purveyors’ water system plans and conservation programs.
- Written correspondence to purveyors inviting them to collaborate on water conservation efforts.
- A water conservation list-serv.
- WIT meeting to review the new rules for water conservation.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time needed to review new water conservation rules will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R4.b**
Identify funding sources for small-town infrastructure upgrades (i.e. leak detection, repair, storage, metering).

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 low-high.
Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- The WIT supported the City of Rockford’s application for funding under the supplemental watershed planning grant program for upgrades to its water reservoir and metering program.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT, with Ecology as the lead, will investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates to improve water management and conservation.
- The WIT will offer to assist municipalities in applying for funding for water infrastructure upgrades.

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 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 of funding options.
- The number of towns or cities applying for financial assistance and/or investing in water infrastructure upgrades.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time to investigate funding sources will be donated by the WIT member agencies and Ecology.
- The funding sources for implementation will be determined through the immediate actions and will be used to fund near-term and long-term actions.
- Potential funding sources include the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DOH), the Community Development Block grant (CTED), the Rural and Community Development Program (USDA), State and Tribal Assistance grants (EPA), and the Restructuring/Revitalization Program (Washington Legislative appropriation). Technical assistance in applying for funds could be found at the Small Community Initiative Program (CTED) or the Interagency Coordination Council conference held in Wenatchee in late October.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R4.c**
Develop new legislation to prevent water saved by improved irrigation efficiency or conservation from being subject to relinquishment (for systems who are not municipal water suppliers).
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 and member agencies will send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting that the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law be changed to provide better incentives for conservation.

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 actions.

Implementation Considerations
- The Association of Washington Cities, the Washington Association of Counties, and other key lobbying associations should be cc’d on the letters sent to legislators.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- The number of letters sent by WIT members to legislative leaders and the Governor.
- Legislative actions to revise the law (which is largely outside the control of the WIT).

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time to prepare and send the letters will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- Change in state law.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R4.d**
Options for keeping current water rights and place of use in the watershed should be explored.

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)
- Ecology will notify the WIT if it receives water right requests for out-of-basin transfers.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010--2012)
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

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 WIT is aware of any requests to Ecology for out-of-basin transfers.

Potential Funding Sources
- None needed.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- None

**Recommendation R4.e**
Request the Legislature allocate funds to purchase or lease this saved water (from R4.d).¹

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.

¹ Note: The WIT interprets this recommendation as: “Request the Legislature allocate funds to purchase or lease saved water”.
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Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- Ecology will brief the WIT on water trusts and water banking.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- After the briefing by Ecology on water trusts and water banking, the WIT may prepare a specific request to the Legislature to provide funding to acquire water rights to be preserved from future allocation.

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:
- An Ecology briefing on water trusts and water banking.

Potential Funding Sources
- None.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R4.f
The potential to utilize the Conservation Futures Program for purchasing water rights should be explored.

Benefits and Practicality
The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-high 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)
- Spokane County, in cooperation with the City of Spokane, will bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures Program can be used for purchasing water rights.
- The WIT will identify funding sources that could be used to match Conservation Futures funds.
Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- Depending on the potential of utilizing the Conservation Futures Program for purchasing water rights, the WIT will develop an implementation strategy for purchase of specific water rights.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the near-term actions.

Implementation Considerations
- Several aspects of this recommendation need to be determined: whether Conservation Futures funds can legally be used to purchase water rights; whether the cost to purchase water rights is feasible; whether a specific geographic area should be identified for the program; and whether the Conservation Futures Program is open to adding water rights purchasing to their program.
- State law, local ordinances, and local implementation activities should also be considered.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Feasibility assessment and recommendations by Spokane County and the City of Spokane.
- Response from the Conservation Futures program on the acceptability of this concept.
- Identification of specific matching funds.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane.
- Matching funds need to be identified (see immediate actions).

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None, unless the legal review identifies required legislative changes.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R4.g**
*A coordinated water conservation education/information program should be developed and implemented. This program may be coordinated with a larger regional effort.*

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)
- Ecology, Spokane County, the City of Spokane, and the SAJB have conducted public awareness and education activities, both individually and through cooperative regional programs.
Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- Local stakeholders will continue participation in a water conservation education/information program, as necessary.
- ★ The RWCC should continue to coordinate a regional water conservation education program.
- ★ The RWCC should set up and manage a listserv or other Internet based communication method to communicate conservation projects and messages to a broad community of interested parties.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations

- The program should involve small purveyors.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

- Continuation of coordinated regional water conservation education programs.

Potential Funding Sources

- None needed.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- The RWCC will provide coordination.

Recommendation R4.h

Encourage the use of water conserving programs, actions, and technology (i.e. xeriscaping, low flow toilets and shower heads) for domestic (group, domestic exempt), light industrial, heavy industrial, commercial, agriculture, irrigation, and municipal uses.

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)

- Wastewater utilities are currently implementing indoor water conservation actions.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- This recommendation will be implemented by conservation actions taken under Recommendations R4.a – R4.g.
Water purveyors, wastewater utilities, and others implementing conservation programs should keep the WIT informed of their efforts.

The RWCC should conduct an Irrigation Efficiency Education Program for public space irrigators and / or homeowners.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations
- Water purveyors will be implementing water conservation actions consistent with the water conservation plan required by state law. These may include indoor and/or outdoor uses, but it is anticipated that it will primarily focus on outdoor use because that is where the greatest volume of water is used during periods of high demand.
- The WIT merely needs to remain informed of these actions; no specific WIT actions are required.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Ongoing communication between water purveyors, wastewater utilities, and WIT agencies on their conservation programs.

Potential Funding Sources
- None required.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- The RWCC will provide coordination.

Recommendation R4.i
A watershed drought management plan should be developed. This plan will initiate specific actions to be taken to conserve and preserve water in the basin.

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 provide the WIT with examples of other basins’ drought management plans.
- The WIT will discuss the goals of a drought management plan and prepare an outline of plan components.
- The WIT will prepare an outline of a scope of work, a preliminary budget, and a list of potential funding sources to prepare a drought management plan.
- The SCCD will hire a contractor to develop a watershed drought management plan. The plan will include specific actions to be taken to conserve and preserve water in the basin.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- Near-term actions will depend on the result of the immediate actions.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Long-term actions will depend on the result of the near-term actions.

Implementation Considerations
- The WIT will need to develop its definition of a drought.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A drought management plan outline.
- A final drought management plan.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.
- The WIT has allocated $30,000 - $40,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Funding sources may also include other Ecology grants.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None needed.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
Issue 5: Ground Water – Surface Water Interactions. Groundwater withdrawals from the deep basalt aquifer system in the upper basin do not have an immediate, direct impact on stream flows in the upper basin (Buchanan 2003). However, groundwater withdrawal in the upper basin may indeed have an impact on surface water flows in the lower basin, but it may be delayed by many years or decades. Furthermore, the impact may be so small that it would not be measurable in the lower basin.

**Recommendation R5.a**
The ground water connections between sub-basins should be studied and better defined.

**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)**
- The WIT (with staff support from the SCCD) will identify priority areas, prepare a detailed Scope of Work outline, develop a budget, and identify potential funding sources to study ground water connections between sub-basins.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**
- The WIT (with staff support from the SCCD) will pursue funding and identify a lead agency to develop and issue the RFP for a study of ground water connections between sub-basins.
- The lead agency identified by the WIT will issue an RFP and negotiate a signed contract.

**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:
- An outline of a Scope of Work, including specific sites and proposed budget.
- A specific funding source or multiple sources.
- An RFP and signed contract.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- The USGS may provide funding.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R5.b**

*Groundwater levels need to be monitored to determine if aquifer mining is occurring within the basin.*

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 has applied for a grant to monitor ground water; in late 2007, this grant had not been funded.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The WIT, with SCCD as lead, will identify priority areas, prepare a detailed Scope of Work outline, and develop a budget for monitoring of ground water levels to identify aquifer mining.
- The SCCD will negotiate a contract for drilling three monitoring wells and instrumenting up to six wells with water level loggers to monitor ground water levels for indications of ground water mining in the upper watershed.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- The WIT will identify potential funding sources, pursue funding, and identify a lead to develop and issue the RFP for monitoring of ground water levels to identify aquifer mining.
- The lead agency will issue an RFP and negotiate a signed contract to begin ground water monitoring.
- The WIT, in collaboration with Spokane County, SCCD, Ecology, DOH, water purveyors, and others, will oversee ground water monitoring efforts and make this information publicly available.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

- The WIT will oversee ground water monitoring efforts and make this information publicly available.

Implementation Considerations

- None.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- An outline of a Scope of Work, including specific sites and proposed budget.
- A specific funding source or multiple sources.
- An RFP and signed contract.
- The number of wells identified for monitoring.
- The number of wells where monitoring is being conducted.

Potential Funding Sources

- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.
- Funding will be identified for the contract in 2009.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R5.c**

A study should be conducted to evaluate whether ground water from adjoining watersheds is being utilized by municipalities on the edge of watershed (Tekoa, Cheney, Spangle). The addition of a dedicated monitoring station (well) should be established.

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)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- None.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- None.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- None.

Implementation Considerations
- Specific problems related to utilization of ground water from adjoining watersheds, such as water rights disputes, may lead to the development of action items. No WIT actions are needed at this time.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
- None.

Potential Funding Sources
- None needed.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Not required.

**Recommendation R5.d**

*A new permanent gauging station should be developed between the upper and lower watershed. This will help determine water interchange rates and provide better recreational information on water levels.*

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT, with the SCCD as the lead, in consultation with Ecology, will identify potential locations for a gauging station between the upper and lower watershed.
- The WIT, with the SCCD as the lead, will discuss available resources for a new gauging station with Ecology and USGS.
- The SCCD will install a gauge between the upper and lower watershed, if appropriate resources are identified, and will continuously collect and maintain data from the gauge.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- The final implementer will continuously collect and maintain data from the gauge.

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:
- A list of desired locations and designation of a final implementer.
- Gauge installation.
- Ongoing data collection.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies and the SCCD.
- The WIT has allocated $16,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants, SCCD Assessment funds, TMDL funding, Spokane County and wastewater treatment plants.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- JARPA (Joint Aquatic Resources Permits Application).
- HPA (Hydraulic Project Approval).
- Shoreline Permits.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Coordination and oversight will provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R5.e**
*Encourage the establishment of a new permanent gauging station near the state line.*

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- The gauge was installed in June of 2007 with supplemental funds from Ecology. The USGS is funded to maintain the gauge until September 2008.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The SCCD will identify ongoing funding to maintain the gauging station near the state line.
- The SCCD will monitor the data from the gauging station near the state line, and will operate and maintain the gauge.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- The SCCD will monitor the data from the gauging station near the state line.

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:
- Ongoing data collection.
- Ongoing funding.

Potential Funding Sources
- Funding is secure through September 2008. Thereafter, funding needs to be identified.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Coordination and oversight will provided by the WIT.

Issue 6: Actual Water Use / Allocation in the Basin. The total certified water rights in the basin are approximately 48 cfs. However, the actual use in the basin is not known.

**Recommendation R6.a**

*Develop a strategy to address compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims. Required resources should be identified.*

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The WIT will coordinate a regional meeting with Ecology and other WRIAs to identify the necessary actions and resources required to address compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims.
- Following the meeting, the WIT, in coordination with other regional WRIAs, will write a letter to Ecology regarding appropriate compliance activities. The letter will be copied to appropriate state legislators.

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:

- A meeting or series of meetings with Ecology.
- A letter requesting funding.

Potential Funding Sources

- Funding will need to be provided to Ecology through the state budgeting process.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- Legislative action may be needed to supply adequate funding.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- The WIT will provide oversight and coordination.

**Recommendation R6.b**

Determine the need and support for adjudication in the watershed. If supported, the appropriate sub-basins should be prioritized for adjudication.

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)
- The SCCD will send a questionnaire to water-rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- Near-term actions will depend on the result of the immediate action.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Long-term actions will depend on the result of the near-term and immediate actions.

Implementation Considerations
- It may be best to wait for a process that encompasses all of northeastern Washington.
- Public meetings may be needed to explain adjudication.
- Ecology is unlikely to take action on adjudication without support of local watershed planning units.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Distribution of a questionnaire.

Potential Funding Sources
- The WIT has allocated $10,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant funds.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R6.c**

_If appropriate, a petition should be filed with the State of Washington for general adjudication of water rights in the basin._

Benefits and Practicality

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)

- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- No action should be taken on this action until the level of support is determined (Recommendation R6.b).

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Near-term actions will depend on the results of the Recommendation R6.b actions.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

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

Implementation Considerations

- None.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

- None at this time.

Potential Funding Sources

- None.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- None at this time.
**Issue 7: Streamflow Augmentation and Storage.** The Hangman Creek Watershed is routinely impacted by low flows during the critical summer months of July through September. Improvements in storage and augmentation may prove to be beneficial to communities and stream flow levels.

**Recommendation R7.a**

*The cities and towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah should evaluate and investigate the causes for unaccounted water in their Public Water Systems.*

**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 WIT will encourage the towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah, along with other applicable water systems, to request grant funding in order to evaluate and investigate the causes for unaccounted water in their Public Water Systems. The WIT will also assist in identifying funding sources.
- Spokane County will investigate whether block grant funding is available to cover multiple jurisdictions’ investigations of unaccounted water in their Public Water Systems.

**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**

- The Municipal Water Law requires this investigation under the water efficiency rule; it could be addressed when the water system plans are updated.
- Although funding is limited, the Rural Water Association may be able to provide technical assistance.
- Other jurisdictions may have unaccounted water and should be included under this recommendation.

**Performance Indicators / Milestones**

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

- Funding is obtained to investigate unaccounted water in public water systems.
- Municipalities and other water systems investigate and evaluate causes of unaccounted water.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Individual towns will request grant funding.
- Spokane County will investigate block grant funding.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None needed.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R7.b**

*A stream flow augmentation program should be developed and implemented for Hangman Creek.*

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 low to high and varies by strategy.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- The SCCD builds catchment basins throughout the watershed consistent with NRCS design standards, builds living and constructed snow fences in appropriate locations in the watershed, and assists and encourages the development of vegetated buffer strips throughout the watershed.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The SCCD and WIT members will continue to involve landowners in building catchment basins, living and constructed snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips throughout the watershed.
- The SCCD will coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights.
- The WIT will include education components in projects and in newsletters to inform watershed residents about the stream augmentation efforts in the watershed and their importance.
- ★ The SCCD will develop a mentoring program for producers interested in learning about direct seed technology.
- ★ The SCCD will develop a direct seed cost-share program, and will organize direct seed demonstration projects.
- The SCCD will explore funding and cost-sharing options for landowners to build living snow fences and will explore potential cost savings from road plowing.
- The SCCD will identify landowners in the Rock Creek sub-watershed who may be willing to reforest lands. The SCCD will also explore funding options with the Conservation Reserve Program. Stream flow changes will be monitored by the existing SCCD gauge on Rock Creek.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- ★ The SCCD and the City of Tekoa will investigate the benefits of purchasing or leasing water rights from the City of Tekoa to augment stream flows. This investigation will quantify the amount of water that can be pumped, benefits to downstream stream flows, discharge requirements from Ecology, and water quality impacts.
- The SCCD will prepare a simple feasibility study of balancing basins, including identifying potential stream flow benefits, desired locations, costs and potential funding sources.
- The SCCD and WDFW, in coordination with other WRIAs, will design a landowner education program to encourage landowners not to interfere with beaver dams in non-developed portions of the watershed.
- The SCCD and WIT members will continue to involve landowners in building catchment basins, living and constructed snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips throughout the watershed.
The SCCD will coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- The SCCD and WIT members will continue to involve landowners in building catchment basins, living and constructed snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips throughout the watershed.
- The SCCD will coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights.

Implementation Considerations
- None.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Stream gauge measurements to quantify benefits to stream flows.
- The number of wetland acres acquired or restored.
- The number of new catchment basins in the watershed.
- The number of feet of new living or constructed snow fences in the watershed.
- The number of acres of new vegetative buffers in the watershed.
- The number of farms and the number of acres using no-till/direct seeding operations.

Potential Funding Sources
- The Wetland Reserve Program and Conservation Reserve Program, administered by the FSA and NRCS.
- The Terry Husseman account at Ecology, which may allow property acquisition.
- Spokane County Conservation Futures funds may be used for any matching funds required by the above sources.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- Permits may be required to change water rights from surface water to ground water and to discharge water into the stream.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R7.c
Encourage change of source for water rights from surface to ground water where feasible. Additional incentives may help involvement.

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 provide a briefing to the WIT explaining the required water rights source change process.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- The WIT will prepare a long-term strategy for water rights source changes and explore funding needs and options, based on feasibility and lessons learned. As part of this strategy, the WIT will explore increased communication and encouragement of the Water Conservancy Board involving water rights source changes.
- The WIT will identify potential water rights source changes that could benefit the watershed.

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:

- Presentation from Ecology and provision of policy guidance explaining the water rights change process.
- A strategy for water rights source changes that includes recommended surface water rights, an explanation of the process required to change existing water rights, and a recommendation on the role of the Water Conservancy Board.

Potential Funding Sources

- Staff time to complete the immediate actions will be donated by WIT member agencies.
- Future funding needs and sources need to be identified.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None for the immediate actions.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- The WIT will provide oversight and coordination.
Issue 8: Water Quality (Flow-Related) Parameters. Hangman Creek is listed on the 1998 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for four flow-related parameters (fecal coliform, pH, dissolved oxygen and temperature).

**Recommendation R8.a**

*Participate in Lake Spokane D.O. TMDL process related to point- and non-point sources in the Hangman Creek watershed.*

**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)**

- Ecology, the SCCD, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane are participating in the development and implementation of the dissolved oxygen (D.O.) TMDL.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**

- Ecology, the SCCD, Spokane County, and the City of Spokane will continue to participate in the development and implementation of the Lake Spokane and Spokane River TMDL and will provide periodic briefings and updates to the WIT.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

**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:

- Briefings and updates to the WIT on the status of the Lake Spokane and Spokane River TMDL.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- None needed.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.b**
*Participate in the Hangman Creek TMDL project.*

**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)**
- Ecology, the SCCD, Spokane County, the City of Spokane, and the CDA Tribe are participating in the development and implementation of the Hangman (Latah) Creek TMDL.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- Ecology, the SCCD, Spokane County, the City of Spokane, and the CDA Tribe will continue to participate in the development and implementation of the Hangman (Latah) Creek TMDL and will provide periodic briefings and updates to the WIT.
- The SCCD and the WIT will assist and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) Creek watershed.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

**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:
- Briefings and updates to the WIT on the status of the Hangman (Latah) TMDL.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- The SCCD receives grant funding to facilitate the TMDL public involvement activities.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.c**
The information (data) gaps for short and long-term water quality needs should be evaluated.

**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)**
- Hangman (Latah) TMDL is addressing these gaps (e.g. temperature data).
- Spokane County has a grant funded by the EPA to identify and evaluate existing scientific data in order to quantify non-point source phosphorus loads in the Spokane River / Lake Spokane Watershed, which includes Hangman Creek.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The WIT will review the water quality data needs listed in the Hangman (Latah) TMDL and prioritize the data gaps.
- If identified high-priority data gaps in the Hangman (Latah) TMDL are not already addressed in this DIP, the WIT will develop implementation strategies to address those gaps and to seek funding.

**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**
- The focus should be on data gaps for TMDL– listed attributes.

**Performance Indicators / Milestones**
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A prioritized list of data gaps identified in the Hangman (Latah) TMDL.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- None needed for prioritization. Additional funds may be needed if implementation strategies are identified.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.d**

*The long-term trends of sediment loads should be evaluated.*

**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)**
- The SCCD previously conducted monitoring but is no longer doing so.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The SCCD, in coordination with WIT members and the USGS, will create a work plan through the TMDL process to collect and analyze sediment loading data.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**
- The SCCD, in coordination with WIT members and the USGS, will use the work plan to analyze sediment loading data gathered under the TMDL process. This will be done in coordination with the TMDL working group.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**
- Immediate actions 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:
- Sediment load data is collected and analyzed.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Staff time will be donated by the SCCD.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.e**

The stream gauging operation throughout the watershed should be maintained to assist with the TMDL study. The stations will assist in the determination of pollutant load allocations.

**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 USGS has two gauges, while the SCCD has five, on Hangman (Latah) Creek and its tributaries.
- The CDA Tribe monitors temperature, water quality parameters, and flow at approximately 30 sites within the upper portion of the Hangman (Latah) Creek Watershed.
- A USGS gauge was installed at the state line in 2007.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**

- The WIT will brainstorm potential funding sources to maintain stream monitoring operations.
- The SCCD will prepare grant applications or otherwise obtain funding for stream monitoring.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- The SCCD will prepare grant applications or otherwise obtain funding for stream monitoring.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

- Long-term actions will depend on the results of the 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:

- Data gathered from stream monitoring throughout the watershed are adequate to inform the determination of pollutant load allocations.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Funding sources will be identified during the immediate actions.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None needed.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.f**

The installation of additional gauging stations to monitor the effects of BMP implementation should be supported. These BMPs should be recommended through the TMDL process.

**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)**

- None.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- The WIT will review BMPs identified as part of the Hangman (Latah) TMDL process.
- Participating WIT members will periodically brief the WIT on BMP implementation progress.
- If necessary, the WIT will recommend specific sites for new gauging stations, and the SCCD will use the collected data to evaluate the effects of BMP implementation.
- Based on the SCCD’s summary of relevant data, the WIT may make recommendations through the TMDL process on changes in BMP 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:

- A WIT meeting to review BMPs from the TMDL.
- A data summary to evaluate BMP implementation.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Funding will be provided to SCCD and other agencies through the TMDL process.
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- Certain BMPs may be recommended as part of the TMDL package.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R8.g**

*Stock watering impacts to surface waters should be minimized throughout the 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)**

- The SCCD has submitted grant applications for livestock management improvements.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**

- The SCCD will write grant applications to fund programs for fencing, off-creek livestock watering systems, and other means to minimize stock water impacts to surface waters.
- The SCCD, in cooperation and coordination with the WIT, will offer technical assistance to landowners to address stock watering impacts to surface waters.
- Spokane County should consider amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.
- WIT members and the WIT as a whole will provide comments to Spokane County on suggested amendments to the CAO.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010 -2012)**

- The SCCD will write grant applications for fencing, off-creek livestock watering systems, and other means to minimize stock water impacts to surface waters.
- The SCCD, in cooperation and coordination with the WIT, will offer technical assistance to landowners to address stock watering impacts to surface waters.
- When applicable, Whitman County should consider amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

- Immediate actions 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:

- Data from gauging stations indicate a reduction in sediment, nitrates, and other stock watering impacts.
- Visual inspections of areas previously damaged by stock watering show signs of recovery.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Centennial Clean Water Fund, supplemental watershed planning funds.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- Spokane County may amend its CAO and SMP.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R8.h**
_*Incentives should be developed to encourage off creek watering systems for livestock._*

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 SCCD will apply its available cost-share monies for BMP implementation towards off-creek livestock watering systems.
- The SCCD will apply for grants for additional funding for off-creek livestock watering systems, including long-term cost share projects with more stable funding.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- The SCCD will apply for grants for additional funding for off-creek livestock watering systems, including long-term cost share projects with more stable funding.

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:

- Grants and/or cost-share monies to fund off-creek livestock watering systems.
- The number of new off-creek livestock watering systems.
- A list of incentives to encourage off-creek livestock watering.

Potential Funding Sources

- Currently available cost-share monies from the SCCD.
- Sources to which SCCD is applying for grants.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None needed.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R8.i**

**Incentives should be developed to improve riparian zones.**

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)

- The SCCD has a riparian cost-share program with many options for landowners, such as a streamside landowner packet of educational materials and free shoreline assessments of the property.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will develop an action plan that identifies priority riparian areas and incentives for landowners to improve such areas.
- ★ The SCCD will begin implementing incentives to improve riparian zones, as funding allows.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations

- Incentives should be either long-lasting or continuous, such as use easements or tax incentives, and should have a formal infrastructure to operate over the long term.

Performance Indicators/ Milestones

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

- Development of an action plan that includes a list of viable incentives.

Potential Funding Sources

- The SCCD will donate staff time.
- The WIT has allocated $50,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants and SCCD Assessment funds.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- Legislative actions or permits may be necessary to implement incentives.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
Issue 9: Septic Systems. Septic systems that are failing, improperly maintained or non-functioning can provide contaminants to surface and ground water.

**Recommendation R9.a**
*An education/information program should be initiated for septic system construction, care, and maintenance.*

**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)**
- Local and state regulations require inspection every three years for standard gravity systems, with annual inspections required for other types of systems.
- Septic system pumping is not currently required at any specific frequency.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The WIT will facilitate a meeting with the Spokane Regional Health District staff to discuss optimal education programs for septic owners.
- The WIT will encourage the Spokane Regional Health District to develop and conduct an annual mailing of educational materials to all septic owners, which would inform septic owners of inspection regulations.

**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**
- Spokane Regional Health District has a modest database of septic system permit holders and relevant educational information; however, it does not have mechanisms to distribute the information to the public.

**Performance Indicators/Milestones**
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Meeting between the WIT and the Spokane Regional Health District.
- The number of educational materials distributed to septic owners.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Funding will be necessary for the Health District to do the mailing. Some funds may be provided by the state DOH.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R9.b**

*A septic maintenance program should be established. Inspections should take place every three years. Septic system pumping should occur every six years.*

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 proposed inspection schedule is already required by current rules.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The WIT will meet with staff from the Spokane Regional Health District to discuss compliance with septic system inspection requirements and means for improving compliance.
- The WIT may develop specific implementation actions for a septic system maintenance program, based on discussions with the Health District.

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

- Requirements should be risk-based, based on factors such as distance to surface water or location in the aquifer protection area.
- Requirements for risers on septic systems may be necessary to make access easier.

Performance Indicators/ Milestones

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

- Meeting with Spokane Regional Health Board.

Potential Funding Sources

- None needed during immediate period. Specific implementation actions developed may require funding.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None needed at this time.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R9.c**
*Incentives should be developed for replacement and/or upgrades of substandard septic systems.*

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 low.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The WIT will meet with the Spokane Regional Health District to develop a list of possible incentives for septic system replacements and upgrades and to identify potential funding sources.

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:

- Meeting with Spokane Regional Health District staff.
- List of possible incentives and funding actions.

Potential Funding Sources

- No funding is needed initially. Funding sources will need to be identified for specific incentives.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Issue 10: Wellhead Protection.** Wellhead protection is lacking in the smaller communities throughout the watershed.

---

**Recommendation R10.a**

The needs for wellhead protection in smaller communities should be identified.

**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-high.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**

- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**

- The WIT will invite small towns to participate in identifying and addressing wellhead protection needs.
- The WIT will facilitate a meeting of interested representatives of small communities to discuss options for wellhead protection.
- A subcommittee of the WIT will review new and updated Water System Plans for wellhead protection strategies as part of the ongoing review of Water System Plans’ consistency with the Watershed Management Plan.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

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

**Implementation Considerations**

- Water system plans submitted to DOH currently must include wellhead protection.
- Small communities that need to revise their plans will probably need to address wellhead protection, so collaboration with the WIT could be useful.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**

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

- Invitation to small communities to participate in identifying and addressing wellhead protection needs.
- Meeting with small communities’ representatives.
- A list of wellhead protection strategies from the water system plans.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R10.b**
Potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities should be identified.

**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-high.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**
- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- Ecology, in collaboration with DOH, will contact the Rural Community Assistance Corporation to prepare a list of potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**
- None.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**
- None.

**Implementation Considerations**
- None.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A list of potential funding sources.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- To be identified as an immediate action.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R10.c**

The impacts of storm water handling in smaller communities should be identified.

**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)**

- The WIT will have a briefing by Ecology and/or other stormwater experts on options to improve stormwater management in small communities. Representatives of small communities will be invited to participate.

**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:

- A briefing from stormwater experts on options to improve stormwater management in small communities.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies and stormwater experts.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R10.d**

Identify potential funding sources for stormwater system plans due to their potential impacts on wellhead protection programs.

**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)**

- Ecology, in collaboration with DOH, will contact the Rural Community Assistance Corporation to prepare a list of potential funding sources for stormwater system plans in smaller communities.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- None.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

- None.

**Implementation Considerations**

- None.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**

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

- A list of funding sources.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- None needed.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
Issue 11: Land Use Planning, Shorelines, and Development. The types and extents of land uses appropriate for the watershed should be compatible with the Watershed Management Plan’s goals. These plans include both water quantity and water quality issues (future TMDL Plan). Riparian area and flood plain encroachment continues to occur throughout the basin (rural and urban).

**Recommendation R11.a**

*All development and construction proposals within the watershed should have a SEPA review and be reviewed by the Watershed Implementation Team for compatibility with the watershed management plan.*

**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 low-medium.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**

- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**

- The SCCD will serve as the single point of contact responsible for distributing appropriate development / construction proposals within the watershed to the rest of the WIT and scheduling relevant agenda items at WIT meetings.
- The SCCD will determine which specific development/construction documents the WIT wants to review and will identify a process to obtain those documents.
- The WIT will meet with appropriate Spokane and Whitman County planning personnel to develop a process for WIT input and comment on development proposals.
- The WIT will review all appropriate development /construction proposals during SEPA review and provide comments on proposals’ consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.
- Spokane County will identify all small cities within Spokane County that do not have an agreement with the county for SEPA review. The WIT will work with these cities to develop a process for SEPA review that ensures consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.
- The WIT will work with small cities within the Whitman County portion of WRIA 56 to develop a process for SEPA review that ensures consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

**Implementation Considerations**

- The Spokane County and Whitman County Planning Departments may have additional comments.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**

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

- List of specific types of documents the WIT would like to review and process identified to obtain them.
Meeting with Spokane County planning personnel and identification of timely review process.
List of small cities that do not have a SEPA agreement with Spokane County.
An agreement or process with small cities to ensure SEPA reviews consider compliance with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies and the SCCD.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- Counties and cities may need to amend their SEPA ordinances to incorporate consistency with the Watershed Management Plan.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.b**
*All County and City land use planning intended for WRIA 56 should be reviewed/coordinated with the Watershed Implementation Team for compatibility with the watershed management plan.*

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 low-medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- Changes in land use regulations are currently published in the local paper.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The SCCD, with support from WIT members, will prepare a list of scheduled updates or revisions to local comprehensive plans, development regulations, CAOs, SMPs, and other land use regulations. The first step will be to establish a process to receive notice and copies of these planning documents.
- WIT members from local governments will notify the WIT of upcoming land use changes.
- The SCCD will prepare comment letters on behalf of the WIT regarding County and City land use planning.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- WIT members from local governments will notify the WIT of upcoming land use changes.
- The SCCD will prepare comment letters on behalf of the WIT regarding County and City land use planning.
- The WIT will prepare a simple model ordinance for the cities and counties in WRIA 56 which would ensure consistency between local land use planning and the Watershed Management Plan.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)
- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.
Implementation Considerations

- City and county planners could be invited to WIT meetings.
- Under state law, “[w]atershed planning developed and approved under this chapter shall not change existing local ordinances or existing state rules or permits, but may contain recommendations for changing such ordinances or rules” (RCW 90.82.120 (2)).
- The Spokane County and Whitman County Planning Departments may have additional comments.

Performance Indicators/ Milestones

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

- List of scheduled updates to local Comprehensive Plans or land use ordinances.
- Percentage of revisions to Comprehensive Plans or ordinances on which the WIT provides comments.
- Model ordinance for ensuring that local Comprehensive Plans and land use ordinances are consistent with the Watershed Management Plan.

Potential Funding Sources

- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None at this time.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.c**

_The local Shoreline Management Plan and/or Critical Areas Ordinance should include a restriction on commercial, residential, and industrial development along streams within the 100-year floodplain and the associated channel migration belts._

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)

- The revised SMP and the updated CAO in Spokane County address heightened shoreline protection.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The SCCD, with support from WIT members, will prepare a list of scheduled updates or revisions to SMPs and CAOs in the WRIA.
- WIT members, with coordination by the SCCD, will note any SMPs or CAOs that are inconsistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.
- The WIT will schedule briefings on current updates to SMPs or CAOs at WIT meetings as appropriate.
- WIT members will send letters to elected officials commenting on whether proposed SMP or CAO revisions are consistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.
If applicable, cities and counties will consider WIT-proposed changes to the SMP and/or CAO.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**
- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

**Implementation Considerations**
- The Spokane County and Whitman County Planning Departments may have additional comments.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A list of all SMPs and CAOs in the WRIA with dates of scheduled updates or revisions.
- The number of WIT briefings on current updates to SMPs or CAOs.
- The number of comment letters by WIT members on SMPs and CAOs.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies and the SCCD.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- Changes may be recommended to the SMP or CAO.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.d**
*If new commercial, residential, and industrial development within the 100-year floodplain occurs, then mitigation should be required for fish and wildlife impacts.*

**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 low-medium.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**
- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The WIT will review Spokane County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP and will coordinate with the Spokane County Planning Department.
- The WIT will review Whitman County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP and will coordinate with staff of the Whitman County Planning Department.
As proposals for development within the 100-year floodplain arise in the WRIA, WIT members will request that the issue be placed on the WIT agenda. After review and discussion, the WIT will then decide whether to suggest specific mitigation measures for the project.

**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**
- The updated CAO and revised SMP will control or prohibit these uses.
- The Spokane County and Whitman County Planning Departments may have additional comments.

**Performance Indicators/ Milestones**
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Completion of a WIT review of Spokane County’s revised CAO and SMP.
- Relevant development proposals discussed by the WIT.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.e**
All streamside/shoreline land uses (e.g. agricultural, urban, residential) subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations should implement Best Management Practices and establish appropriate riparian buffers to protect streamside habitat and water quality.

**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 low-medium.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**
- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The City of Spokane and Spokane County will inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in their SMPs and CAOs.
The SCCD will develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals that are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations. The WIT and WIT members will provide comment and input on proposed streamside/shoreline land uses and suggest riparian buffers and other BMPs that should be required.

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
- Hangman (Latah) and Rock Creeks are subject to local shoreline management regulations. The smaller tributaries are subject to local CAOs.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- A summary of the relevant requirements in the City of Spokane’s and Spokane County’s SMPs and CAOs.
- A checklist of BMPs for development proposals.
- Increased number of river miles with appropriate riparian buffers in the WRIA.

Potential Funding Sources
- WIT members and City of Spokane, Spokane County, and SCCD staff will donate time.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.f**
*Technical assistance should be available for landowner consultation.*

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)
- The SCCD has current programs including newsletters, streamside landowner packets, farm plans, plant sales, workshops, etc.
- Section 12 of the draft SMP provides for public education efforts, which would be provided by the SCCD and WSU Cooperative Extension.
Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The SCCD will continue current technical assistance programs for streamside landowners, increase individual contacts as funding allows, and inform streamside landowners of technical assistance programs such as NRCS, WSU Cooperative Extension, FSA, etc. The SCCD will continue to work with the Pend Oreille Conservation District when necessary to coordinate or inform about activities.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

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:
- Number of programs available.
- Number of technical assistance activities offered by the SCCD.

Potential Funding Sources
- NRCS, WSU Cooperative Extension, FSA.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R11.g
Shoreline Management Plan regulations and Critical Area Ordinances should be enforced to the extent possible.

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 low.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- None.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT, with the SCCD as lead, will review the number and type of waivers, exemptions, and other exceptions granted to the SMP and CAO requirements. The WIT will also consider submitting
comments opposing exceptions it considers to be detrimental to the watershed. The first step in this process will be to establish a process to receive notice and copies of waivers, exemptions, etc.

- The WIT will request that Spokane County hire staff with technical background (e.g. a wetlands specialist) to review development applications and apply SMP and CAO regulations.

**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:

- An annual list of the number and type of waivers, exemptions, and other exceptions to the SMP and CAO requirements.
- WIT comments opposing waivers or exemptions on specific development applications.
- Request that Spokane County hire a technical specialist to review development applications.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.h**

*Greenbelts or conservancy corridors should be established to improve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat.*

**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)**

- The SCCD will research and define the terms “greenbelts” and “corridors”.
The SCCD will identify locations where property owners may sell or lease land for greenbelts or conservancy corridors and will summarize agreement options such as local ordinances, easements, leases, and purchases.

The WIT will prioritize locations for greenbelts or conservancy corridors and begin working with landowners.

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
- The Conservation Futures Program accepts nominations for preservation based on their own criteria.
- Conservation easements are donated, in a free market approach, either as temporary leases or permanent easements.
- Small towns should be included.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Recommended definitions for “greenbelts” and “corridors” in WRIA 56.
- List of prioritized locations for potentially feasible greenbelts or conservancy corridors.

Potential Funding Sources
- The WIT has allocated $10,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.i**

A complete channel migration zone delineation project should be funded within the watershed and should be considered in future land use regulations.

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)
- The SCCD contracted a consultant to designate a channel migration zone up to Rock Creek and completed the rest of Hangman Creek themselves. Therefore, this recommendation has been partially completed.
Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- Local governments should incorporate the delineated channel migration zone into their floodplain, stormwater, shoreline, and critical area codes and should add it to local SEPA checklists.
- The SCCD will conduct education and outreach with public and elected officials regarding the importance and economic value of protecting channel migration zones.

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:
- Completed channel migration zone delineation.
- The percentage of local ordinances and SEPA checklists that incorporate channel migration zone delineations.
- Decreased rate of development within the channel migration zone.

Potential Funding Sources
- SCCD staff will donate time.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- Local governments will consider the channel migration zone when developing future land use regulations or modifying the SEPA checklist.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.j**
The current delineation of the 100-year FEMA floodplain designations should be reassessed. New boundaries should be determined by a professional engineer.

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, upon request of the WIT, will coordinate with the Spokane County Engineering office, FEMA, the SCCD, and the WIT to pursue resources to reassess the boundaries of the FEMA 100-year floodplain.
- If necessary, the WIT will prioritize river sections to be reassessed for floodplain extent.
- The WIT will support funding requests for the 100-year floodplain delineation.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- The WIT will support any funding requests by Ecology to fund 100-year floodplain delineation.
- Ecology and the Spokane County Engineering office will collaborate with FEMA to reassess the boundaries of the 100-year floodplain.
- Ecology will regularly update the WIT on the status of the FEMA 100-year floodplain review.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

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

Implementation Considerations

- This recommendation may be expensive and difficult to implement.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- Report assessing boundaries of the FEMA 100-year floodplain.
- Briefings from Ecology on the status of the reassessment.
- A list of funding options for the reassessment.

Potential Funding Sources

- FCAAP and FEMA funds.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R11.k

Conduct a feasibility study of a land acquisition/relocation program for structures within the 100-year floodplain.

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)

- The SCCD will apply for FCAAP or other funding to study hazards within the 100-year floodplain and will identify other monies for a match of up to 50 percent.
- SCCD will apply for FCAAP or other funding to purchase or otherwise acquire land or structures within the 100-year floodplain or to relocate hazardous structures.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued.
- ★ The SCCD will issue an RFP and sign a contract with a consultant to conduct a feasibility study of the 100-year floodplain to identify which structures are a hazard and which should be considered for relocation, and identify undeveloped floodplain areas where development would be a hazard.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

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

Implementation Considerations

- The WIT should consider King County’s model of purchasing undeveloped land for such purposes.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- Application for funding.
- Secure matching funds.
- RFP and contract with consultant.
- Feasibility study completed.
- Funding for purchase of properties or relocation of structures.

Potential Funding Sources

- The SCCD will seek FCAAP funding for this effort.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R11.l

Develop and maintain public awareness and education programs for riparian area function, benefits, and floodplain encroachment. (This should be inclusive of residents, developers, and a broad range of stakeholders).

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 is developing a comprehensive, multi-pronged approach to education.
- The SCCD offers education and awareness programs, including the streamside-living packet.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The SCCD, Ecology, Spokane County, Whitman County, and other local governments will meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.

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
- Programs should be focused on what can and should be done.
- An entire shoreline management program needs to be established in Spokane County to protect shorelines and wetlands.

Performance Indicators / Milestones
Progress toward completion of this recommendation will be measured by achieving the following tasks or outcomes:
- Education activities in a variety of locations and focused on a variety of riparian area users.
- Workshops for a wide variety of riparian area users.

Potential Funding Sources
- Staff time for the meeting will be donated by the SCCD, Ecology, Spokane County, Whitman County, and other local governments.
- Additional funding may need to be identified to develop and implement specific programs.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

Recommendation R11.m
The local jurisdictions should develop a coordinated flood response plan in conjunction with a flood warning system.

Benefits and Practicality
The WIT believes this recommendation offers a low-high benefit to the watershed. The WIT also believes that the practicality of implementing this recommendation is low.
Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- No flood warning system currently exists. Downstream residents call the town of Rockford to get a warning from upstream.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The WIT will facilitate a meeting with Spokane and Whitman County Departments of Emergency Management Service to discuss options for a coordinated flood response plan.

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

- The gauge at the state line will be helpful in this effort. However, gauge readings would need to be turned into warnings in time to be useful.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- A meeting among the WIT and key personnel from Whitman and Spokane Counties.
- A coordinated flood response plan is in place for Hangman (Latah) Creek.
- A flood warning system is in place for Hangman (Latah) Creek.

Potential Funding Sources

- Staff time for the meeting will be donated by WIT member agencies and Spokane and Whitman County staff.
- Based on the outcome of the meeting, additional funding sources will be identified.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R11.n**

*Establish a riparian restoration program for the watershed.*

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 is responsible for studying non-point sources for the Spokane River TMDL. The SCCD is conducting modeling and soil studies for the Hangman TMDL. These two studies will be used to identify streambank erosion and riparian restoration needs.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- Spokane County will begin the non-point source study for the Spokane River TMDL.
- The SCCD will complete the modeling and soil studies for the Hangman TMDL.
- The WIT will develop specific riparian restoration needs for WRIA 56 based on TMDL-related modeling and studies of soils and non-point sources.
- WIT member agencies will seek funding to implement priority restoration projects.
- The SCCD, or whoever is specifically identified in the TMDL studies, will conduct riparian restoration activities.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- WIT member agencies will seek funding to implement priority restoration projects.
- The SCCD, or whoever is specifically identified in the TMDL studies, will conduct riparian restoration activities.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations

- Spokane County has federal grant money to study non-point pollution sources and identify needs in the watershed. The Spokane River TMDL oversight committee will be involved in implementation.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- Restoration projects are ongoing.
- Completion of non-point pollution study.
- Completion of riparian restoration modeling and soil studies.
- A list of specific implementation needs for WRIA 56.
- The number of priority projects implemented.
- The number of acres of land being restored.

Potential Funding Sources

- Funding has been secured for the non-point pollution study and the riparian modeling and soil studies.
- Grants and other funding sources need to be secured for implementation.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R11.o**

*Pursue the reservation of a portion of the Conservation Futures Program to fund the acquisition of high priority riparian shorelines.*

**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 low-medium.

**Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)**
- None.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The SCCD will identify high priority shorelines and willing landowners as model funding recipients for the Conservation Futures Program.
- The SCCD, with support from the WIT, will determine the steps necessary to revise the policies of the Conservation Futures Program and will initiate dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy towards reserving funds for acquisition of high priority shorelines.

**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:
- Amount of CFP designated to be targeted to WRIA 56 shorelines/WIT-identified shorelines.
- List of sites and willing landowners for the program.
- List of who is involved in making policy decisions for the Conservation Futures Program and a list of steps needed to revise the policies.
- Meetings or other dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Staff time will be donated by the WIT member agencies and the SCCD.
- Conservation Futures Program.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R11.p**

*Identify high priority riparian habitat to submit for consideration in the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program.*

**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 use the SCCD riparian assessment tool to identify high priority shorelines.
- The SCCD will seek willing landowners along high priority shorelines to be considered for the Conservation Futures Program.

**Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)**

- The SCCD will re-submit high priority shoreline areas to the Conservation Futures Program for consideration, if necessary.

**Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)**

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

**Implementation Considerations**

- Criteria should be discussed with Spokane County and Spokane City Parks and Recreation Department.

**Performance Indicators / Milestones**

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

- High priority areas identified.
- List of high priority shorelines.
- List of willing landowners.
- Submittal of funding requests to the Conservation Futures Program.

**Potential Funding Sources**

- Staff time to identify shorelines and landowners will be donated by the WIT member agencies and the SCCD.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**

- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
**Recommendation R11.g**
*Coordinate and continue Riparian Buffer Cost-Share and/or loan 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)**
- The SCCD has an existing cost-share program with landowners, but no loan program.

**Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)**
- The SCCD will apply for continued funding for its riparian buffer cost-share program.

**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:
- Riparian Buffer Cost-Share program continues to be available to landowners, and new cost-share programs are initiated.
- Applications for additional funds for the program.

**Potential Funding Sources**
- Funding sources to be pursued by the SCCD.

**Permits or Legislative Actions Required**
- None.

**Oversight and Coordination Roles**
- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
Issue 12: Fisheries Habitat. Fisheries within the Hangman watershed are stressed due to poor habitat, water quality and low water quantity issues.

**Recommendation R12.a**

Fish barriers should be identified and mapped within the mainstem and tributaries. A feasibility plan to identify the benefits of removal of these barriers and an action plan to remove identified barriers should be developed.

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)

- A list of barriers exists but is not comprehensive.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will identify and map all fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries.
- If funding is secured for identifying and mapping fish barriers, the SCCD, with participation from Ecology, WDFW, the CDA Tribe, and the WIT, will assess the benefits and impacts of removal of fish barriers and will develop an action plan for barrier removal where it is expected to have a high benefit.

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

- Native fish populations should also be examined to ensure that invasive species are not allowed to impair natives.
- The key action is the feasibility/benefit of removal.
- The politics of barrier removal may be more difficult than the technical issues. These will have to be addressed in the action plan.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- List and map of fish barriers.
- An assessment of the benefits and impacts of fish barrier removals.
- An action plan for removal of selected barriers.

Potential Funding Sources

- The WIT has allocated $12,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant. Other funding sources may include other Ecology grants and SCCD Assessment funds.
Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R12.b**

*Conduct a Proper Functioning Condition assessment (PFC) on the remaining tributaries in the Hangman Creek 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 medium.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)

- The SCCD has completed PFC assessments on Marshall Creek, California Creek, and Rock Creek.

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)

- The SCCD will complete PFC assessments on Spangle Creek, Cove Creek, Little Hangman Creek, and Rattler Run as funding and staff resources allow.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

Long-Term Actions Required (2013 and Beyond)

- Near-term actions will be continued as appropriate.

Implementation Considerations

- PFC is a rapid assessment protocol used to assess the hydrological condition of a stream, such as whether it is stable enough to handle a 20-year flood. It produces a hydrologic function score and is time consuming to conduct.
- The SCCD may conduct or coordinate additional PFC assessments in the Idaho portions of the mainstem and tributaries of Hangman Creek.

Performance Indicators / Milestones

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

- The number of completed PFC assessments.

Potential Funding Sources

- The WIT has allocated $20,000 from the Phase IV Implementation grant.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.
Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.

**Recommendation R12.c**

*Evaluate whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows required for returning migratory salmonids.*

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)

- Avista will evaluate their dams to determine whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows for returning salmonids, supported by a technical team including the CDA Tribe and WDFW.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)

- Immediate actions will be continued as appropriate.

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:

- A written evaluation of dams’ capability to support flows for returning salmonids.

Potential Funding Sources

- This will be completed as part of the ongoing re-licensing process, so no additional funding is required.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required

- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles

- Oversight and coordination will be provided by the WIT.
Issue 13: Implementation Process. The success of the Hangman Creek Watershed Plan depends upon the formation of a Watershed Implementation Team, local acceptance of the plan, participation of local stakeholders, and coordination of regional efforts.

**Recommendation R13.a**
An Implementation Plan MOA shall be developed between local governmental agencies and other required stakeholders.

This recommendation has been fully implemented.

**Recommendation R13.b**
At such time as a Memorandum of Agreement between the Initiating Agencies is complete, a lead agency should be identified to develop the Phase IV grant application and assume administrative responsibility for the grant.

This recommendation has been fully implemented.

**Recommendation R13.c**
The current planning unit shall continue for no longer than one year under the current Operating Procedures or until such time as a completed MOA for Phase IV specifies otherwise.

This recommendation has been fully implemented.

**Recommendation R13.d**
A Detailed Implementation Plan should be developed.

By adoption of this plan, this recommendation has been fully implemented.

**Recommendation R13.e**
The Watershed Implementation Team will work to develop and recommend a Minimum Instream Flow(s) for the Hangman (Latah) Creek Basin.

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 low to high.

Current Implementation Actions (through 2007)
- The WIT completed an instream flow study in 2003. The WIT also conducted lengthy negotiations and failed to reach consensus on a recommended minimum instream flow.

---

Immediate Actions Required (2008-2009)
- The WIT will hold up to three additional meetings to attempt to reach consensus on a recommended minimum instream flow.
- If the WIT reaches consensus on a recommended minimum instream flow, Ecology will initiate rule-making procedures to adopt this recommended minimum instream flow.

Near-Term Actions Required (2010-2012)
- If the WIT fails to reach consensus on a recommended minimum instream flow, Ecology may initiate rule-making procedures to adopt a minimum instream flow. The WIT will cooperate with Ecology in this effort.

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 decision by the WIT on whether or not to submit a recommended minimum instream flow to Ecology.
- WIT cooperation with Ecology on instream flow rule-making.

Funding Sources
- None.

Permits or Legislative Actions Required
- None.

Oversight and Coordination Roles
- None.
Part 3: Implementation Matrices

This section provides the reader with a summary of who will do what, by when, and with what funding. Actions are summarized by:

- Responsibilities for each implementing agency, including the WIT as a whole, and
- A timeline for implementation of the immediate actions.

In each case, funding sources are noted. In many cases, the identified funding source is donated staff time, while in others, the action cannot be implemented without additional secured funding.
# Implementation Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team</th>
<th>Funding1</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Review water conservation requirements under the Municipal Water Law.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.c</td>
<td>Send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting a change in the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>Identify potential locations for a permanent gauge between the upper and lower watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>Discuss available resources for a permanent gauge; identify a final implementer to install and maintain the gauge and collect data.</td>
<td>IVGAO</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.a</td>
<td>Coordinate a regional meeting with Ecology and other WRIAs on compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims; write Ecology a follow-up letter, copied to appropriate state legislators, regarding appropriate compliance activities.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.e</td>
<td>Brainstorm potential funding sources to maintain stream gauging operations</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Provide comments to Spokane County on suggested amendments to the CAO.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.c</td>
<td>Hold a briefing by Ecology and/or other stormwater experts on stormwater management in small communities; invite representatives of small communities to participate.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.d</td>
<td>Review Spokane County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP, and coordinate with the Spokane County Planning Department.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.g</td>
<td>Request that Spokane County hire staff with technical background (e.g. a wetlands specialist) to review development applications and apply SMP and CAO regulations; support coordination between Spokane and Whitman Counties and the City of Spokane to contract for this expertise on a regional basis.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Invite representatives of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss watershed-based negotiation on cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>If requested, assist municipalities in applying for funding for water infrastructure updates.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>Investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates to improve water management and conservation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Coordinate an education effort to inform watershed residents about stream augmentation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Work with small cities to develop a process for SEPA review that is consistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b, .c</td>
<td>Support the SCCD in establishing a process to receive notice and copies of scheduled updates or revisions to land-use regulations, and developing a list of these changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.h</td>
<td>Prioritize locations for greenbelts or conservancy corridors, and begin working with landowners.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Discuss the goals of a drought management plan, and prepare an outline of plan components, in cooperation with the Spokane County Department of Emergency Management.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Prepare an outline of a scope of work, a preliminary budget, and a list of potential funding sources to prepare a drought management plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Meet with appropriate Spokane County planning personnel to develop a process for WIT input and comment on development proposals.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued</th>
<th>Funding(^1)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R8.b</td>
<td>Assist and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.d</td>
<td>Assist in creating a work plan through the TMDL process to collect and analyze sediment loading data.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q4, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>Identify water available for acquisition and recommend that it be allocated according to specific priorities detailed in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Identify funding sources to match Conservation Futures funds.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>Identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget to study groundwater connections between sub-basins and identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget for ground water monitoring, and identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.c</td>
<td>Review the water quality data needs listed in the Hangman/Latah TMDL, and prioritize data gaps.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.c</td>
<td>If applicable, develop implementation strategies to address priority data gaps in the TMDL and seek funding.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.a</td>
<td>Facilitate a meeting with Health District staff to discuss optimal education programs for septic system owners.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.b</td>
<td>Meet with staff from the Health Board to discuss septic system inspection compliance and means to improve compliance.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.c</td>
<td>Meet with the Health District to develop a list of possible incentives for septic system replacements and upgrades, and to identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Prioritize river sections to be reassessed for flood plain extent, if necessary.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.m</td>
<td>Facilitate a meeting with Spokane and Whitman County departments of Emergency Management Service to discuss options for a coordinated flood response plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.o</td>
<td>Provide support to the SCCD in determining the steps necessary to revise the policies of the Conservation Futures Program, and initiating dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy towards acquisition of high priority shorelines.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.b</td>
<td>Encourage the Spokane Regional Health District to develop and conduct an annual mailing to all septic system owners, and if necessary, develop specific implementation actions for a septic system maintenance program.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Assist the SCCD in assessing the benefits and impacts of fish barrier removal, and develop an action plan for targeted barrier removal.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Develop an implementation strategy for purchase of specific water rights (depending on the potential of utilizing the Conservation Futures program).</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>Invite small towns to participate in identifying and addressing wellhead protection needs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>Facilitate a meeting of interested representatives of small communities to discuss wellhead protection.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Develop specific riparian restoration needs based on TMDL-related modeling and studies of soils and non-point sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.p</td>
<td>Use the SCCD riparian assessment tool to identify high priority shorelines.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.b</td>
<td>Identify upcoming GMA Comprehensive Plan updates and review and comment on updates with respect to water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Review and comment, if necessary, on conservation goals developed by water purveyors.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
### Actions to Be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by the Watershed Implementation Team, continued</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R7.a</td>
<td>Encourage and work with the towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa and Latah, and other applicable entities, to request grant funding to investigate unaccounted water in their public water systems; assist in identifying funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Assist the SCCD in offering technical assistance to landowners to address stock watering impacts to surface waters.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>When reviewing Water System Plans’ consistency with the Watershed Management Plan, identify wellhead protection strategies.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Review all appropriate development /construction proposals during SEPA review and provide comments on the proposals’ consistency with the WRISA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Schedule briefings on current updates to SMPs or CAOs at WIT meetings as appropriate.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.d</td>
<td>Request that the issue of proposals for development within the 100-year flood plain be placed on the WIT agenda; decide whether to suggest specific mitigation measures for relevant projects.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Provide comment and input on proposed streamside/shoreline land uses and suggest specific BMPs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.g</td>
<td>Establish a process to review notice and copies of exceptions granted to the SMP and CAO requirements. After review, consider submitting comments opposing specific exceptions.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Support funding requests for the 100-year flood plain delineation.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>Identify funding and a lead agency to issue an RFP and negotiate a signed contract for a study of groundwater connections between sub-basins.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Identify funding and a lead agency to issue an RFP and negotiate a signed contract to monitor ground water levels.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Overseer groundwater monitoring and make the information publicly available.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>Prepare a long-term strategy for water rights source changes and explore funding needs and options; explore increased communication and encouragement of the Water Conservancy Board involving water rights source changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>Identify potential water rights source changes which could benefit the watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.d</td>
<td>Assist the SCCD in analyzing sediment loading data gathered under the TMDL process.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.f</td>
<td>Review BMPs identified as part of the Hangman/Latah TMDL process.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.f</td>
<td>Recommend, if necessary, specific sites for new gauging stations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.f</td>
<td>Make recommendations, if needed, through the TMDL process on changes in BMP implementation.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>If appropriate, provide comments to Whitman County and the City of Spokane on suggested amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Prepare a model ordinance for cities and counties in WRISA 56 which would ensure consistency between local land use planning and the Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to be Implemented by Watershed Implementation Team members</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.c</td>
<td>Send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting a change in the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>With the SCCD, involve landowners in building catchment basins, snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Provide comment and input on proposed streamside/shoreline land uses and suggest specific BMPs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Notify the WIT of upcoming land-use changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Send letters to elected officials commenting on proposed SMP or CAO revisions’ consistency with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Note any SMPs or CAOs that are inconsistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Seek funding to implement priority restoration projects.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.f</td>
<td>Periodically brief the WIT on BMP implementation progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to be Implemented by Spokane County</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R7.a</td>
<td>Investigate whether block grant funding is available to cover multiple jurisdictions' investigations of unaccounted water in their public water systems.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Consider amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Identify all small cities that do not have an agreement with the county for SEPA review.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in SMPs and CAOs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Work with the WIT in discussing the goals of a drought management plan and preparing an outline of plan components.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.l</td>
<td>Meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures program can be used for purchasing water rights.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Begin the non-point source study for the Spokane River TMDL.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue water conservation programs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a</td>
<td>Continue to participate in the TMDL processes, and periodically update the WIT on the progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Consider WIT-proposed changes to the SMP and/or CAO, if applicable.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Oversee groundwater monitoring and make this information publicly available.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by the Spokane County Conservation District</th>
<th>Funding(^1)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Invite water purveyors to collaborate with the WIT in developing and implementing DOH-required conservation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>Identify potential locations for a permanent gauge between the upper and lower watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>Identify ongoing funding to maintain the gauging station near the state line.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>Develop programs to assist and encourage no-till/direct seed tillage operations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>Identify available resources for a permanent gauge and identify a final implementer to install and maintain the gauge and collect data.</td>
<td>IV, GAO</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>Develop an action plan that identifies priority riparian areas and landowner incentives.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Check the status of purveyors’ water system plans and conservation program updates with DOH.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals which are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b, c</td>
<td>Establish a process to receive notice and copies of scheduled changes to land-use regulations, and develop a list of these changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals which are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Identify cooperative landowners and explore CRP funding options for reforestation in the Rock Creek basin.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Explore funding and cost sharing options for landowners to build living snow fences; identify potential cost savings from road plowing.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Assist the WIT in identifying priority areas and funding sources, prepare a Scope of Work, and develop a budget to study groundwater connections between sub-basins.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Determine which specific development/construction documents the WIT wants to review; identify a process to obtain those documents.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Establish a process to receive notice and copies of scheduled changes to land-use regulations, and develop a list of these changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals which are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals which are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.b</td>
<td>Provide assistance and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.d</td>
<td>Send a questionnaire to water rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q4, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Develop a work plan through the TMDL process to collect and analyze sediment loading data.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q4, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Identify and map all fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries.</td>
<td>IV, GA</td>
<td>Q4, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>Provide assistance and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hangman (Latah) watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Send a questionnaire to water rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.b</td>
<td>Determine the steps necessary to revise the policies of the Conservation Futures Program, and initiate dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy towards acquisition of high priority shorelines.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Conduct education and outreach with public and elected officials regarding the importance and economic value of protecting channel migration zones.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Funding sources are coded as follows: \(D\) denotes donated staff time, \(IV\) denotes Phase IV funding, \(G\) denotes other grants, \(A\) denotes SCCD Assessment funding, \(O\) denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by the Spokane County Conservation District, continued</th>
<th>Funding¹</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R11.o, p</td>
<td>Identify high priority shorelines and willing landowners as funding recipients for the Conservation Futures program.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Hire a contractor to develop a watershed drought management plan.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Assess the benefits and impacts of fish barrier removal, and develop an action plan for targeted barrier removal.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Complete the modeling and soil studies for the Hangman TMDL.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.b</td>
<td>Complete PFC assessments on Spangle, Cove, Little Hangman, and Rattler Creeks as funding and staff resources allow.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Q3, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Conduct riparian restoration activities.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q4, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>Monitor the data from the gauging station near the state line.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a, b</td>
<td>Continue to participate in the TMDL processes, and periodically update the WIT on the progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.e</td>
<td>Prepare grant applications or otherwise obtain funding for stream gauging.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Offer technical assistance to landowners to address stock watering impacts to surface waters.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Serve as the point of contact responsible for distributing appropriate development/construction proposals to the rest of the WIT and scheduling relevant agenda items at WIT meetings.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>Prepare comment letters on behalf of the WIT regarding County and City land use planning.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Note any SMPs or CAOs that are inconsistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.f</td>
<td>Continue technical assistance programs for streamside landowners, increase individual contacts as funding allows, and inform streamside landowners of existing technical assistance programs; coordinate with the Pend Oreille Conservation District as applicable.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.g</td>
<td>Establish a process to review notice and copies of exceptions granted to the SMP and CAO requirements. After review, consider submitting comments opposing specific exceptions.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.k</td>
<td>Apply for FCAAP or other funding to study hazards in the 100-year floodplain, and to purchase or otherwise acquire land or structures within the 100-year floodplain, or to relocate structures; identify monies for a match of up to 50%.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.q</td>
<td>Apply for continued funding for the riparian buffer cost-share program.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>Identify funding &amp; a lead agency to issue an RFP and negotiate a contract for a study of groundwater connections between sub-basins.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Oversee groundwater monitoring and make this information publicly available.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Investigate the benefits of purchasing or leasing water rights from Tekoa to augment streamflows.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.k</td>
<td>Issue an RFP and sign a contract with a consultant to study the 100-year floodplain and identify hazardous structures as well as floodplain areas where development would be a hazard.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to be Implemented by the State Caucus</th>
<th>Funding(^1)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from others</th>
<th>Specific implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Identify existing cross-state regional groups as models for addressing cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>Discuss available resources for a permanent gauge and identify a final implementer to install and maintain the gauge and collect data.</td>
<td>IV, GAO</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>Provide a presentation and written policy guidance on the required water rights source change process.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.b,d</td>
<td>Contact the Rural Community Assistance Corporation to prepare a list of potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology, DOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>Investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates to improve water management and conservation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Provide the WIT with examples of other basins’ drought management plans.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.e</td>
<td>Brief the WIT on water trusts and water banking.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Pursue the appropriate resources and coordinate with the Spokane County Engineering office, FEMA, and the WIT to reassess the boundaries of the FEMA 100-year flood plain.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.l</td>
<td>Meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Assess benefits and impacts of fish barrier removal; develop an action plan for targeted barrier removal.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology, WDFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue water conservation programs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>Include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.d</td>
<td>Notify the WIT about water right requests for out-of-basin transfers.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Regularly update the WIT on the status of the FEMA 100-year flood plain review.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a,b</td>
<td>Continue to participate in the TMDL processes, and periodically update the WIT on the progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.c</td>
<td>Support the evaluation of dams to determine whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows for returning salmonids.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>WDFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Design, and coordinate with other WRIAs, a landowner education program on beaver dams.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>WDFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Oversee groundwater monitoring and make this information publicly available.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ecology, DOH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
### Actions to Be Implemented by the City of Spokane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by the City of Spokane</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in SMPs and CAOs.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures program can be used for purchasing water rights.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q1, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue water conservation programs, as necessary.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options, as necessary.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a, b</td>
<td>Continue to participate in the TMDL processes, and periodically update the WIT on the progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Consider WIT-proposed changes to the SMP and/or CAO, if applicable.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actions to Be Implemented by the Coeur d’Alene Tribe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by the Coeur d’Alene Tribe</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Invite representatives of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss watershed-based negotiation on cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Assess the benefits and impacts of fish barrier removal, and develop an action plan for targeted barrier removal.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q2, 2009</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a, b</td>
<td>Continue to participate in the TMDL processes, and periodically update the WIT on the progress.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.c</td>
<td>Support Avista in evaluating dams to determine whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows for returning salmonids.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actions to Be Implemented by Whitman County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Actions to Be Implemented by Whitman County</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Assistance from Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R11.l</td>
<td>Meet to coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q3, 2008</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>Consider WIT-proposed changes to the SMP and/or CAO, if applicable.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Consider amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
## Timeline of Immediate Implementation Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Summarized Action</th>
<th>Funding¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The WIT will review water conservation requirements under the Municipal Water Law.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.c</td>
<td>The WIT and WIT members will send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting a change in the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>The WIT and the SCCD will identify potential locations for a permanent gauge between the upper and lower watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>The WIT, the SCCD, Ecology and the USGS will discuss available resources for a permanent gauge and identify a final implementer to install and maintain the gauge and collect data.</td>
<td>IV, GAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.a</td>
<td>The WIT will coordinate a regional meeting with Ecology and other WRIAs on compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims; write Ecology a follow-up letter, copied to appropriate legislators, requesting appropriate funding for compliance activities.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.e</td>
<td>The WIT will brainstorm potential funding sources to maintain stream gauging operations.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>The WIT will review Spokane County’s proposed revisions to the CAO and SMP, and coordinate with the Spokane County Planning Department.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.d</td>
<td>The WIT will request that Spokane County hire staff with technical background (e.g. a wetlands specialist) to review development applications and apply SMP and CAO regulations, and will support coordination between Spokane and Whitman Counties and the City of Spokane to contract for this expertise on a regional basis.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will invite water purveyors to collaborate with the WIT in developing and implementing DOH-required conservation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify potential locations for a permanent gauge between the upper and lower watershed, and with Ecology, will discuss available resources for a permanent gauge, and identify a final implementer to install and maintain the gauge and collect data.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify on-going funding to maintain the gauging station near the state line.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will develop programs to assist and encourage no-till/direct seed tillage operations.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.h</td>
<td>The SCCD will apply available cost-share monies for BMP implementation towards off-creek livestock watering systems.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.i</td>
<td>The SCCD will develop an action plan that identifies priority riparian areas and landowner incentives.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.a</td>
<td>Spokane County will investigate whether block grant funding is available to cover multiple jurisdictions’ investigations of unaccounted water in their public water systems.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g</td>
<td>Spokane County will consider amendments to the CAO and SMP to minimize the impacts of stock watering on surface water.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Ecology will identify existing cross-state regional groups as models for addressing cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Ecology will provide a presentation and written policy guidance on the required water rights source change process.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.b,</td>
<td>Ecology, in collaboration with DOH, will contact the Rural Community Assistance Corporation to prepare a list of potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 2, 2008</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>The WIT, in close coordination with the CDA tribe, will invite representatives of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss watershed-based negotiation on cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>The WIT will assist municipalities in applying for funding for water infrastructure updates.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The WIT will coordinate an education effort to inform watershed residents about stream augmentation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>The WIT will work with small cities to develop a process for SEPA review that is consistent with the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.h</td>
<td>The WIT will prioritize locations for greenbelts or conservancy corridors, and begin working with landowners.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b, c</td>
<td>WIT members and the SCCD will establish a process to receive notice and copies of scheduled updates or revisions to land-use regulations, and develop a list of these changes.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will check the status of purveyors’ water system plans and conservation program updates with DOH.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify cooperative landowners &amp; explore CRP funding options for reforestation in the Rock Creek basin.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>The SCCD will develop a checklist of BMPs that WIT members can use to review development proposals which are subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.h</td>
<td>The SCCD will research and define the terms “greenbelts” and “corridors”.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>Spokane County will identify all small cities that do not have an agreement with the county for SEPA review.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>Cities and counties will inform the WIT of the buffer requirements and other BMPs included in SMPs and CAOs.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Ecology will provide the WIT with examples of other basins’ drought management plans.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>Ecology and the WIT will investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates for water management and conservation.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.c</td>
<td>The WIT will hold a briefing by Ecology and/or other stormwater experts on stormwater management in small communities and invite representatives of small communities to participate.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 3, 2008</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>The WIT and Spokane County will discuss the goals of a drought management plan, and prepare a plan outline.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>The WIT will prepare an outline of a scope of work, a preliminary budget, and potential funding sources to prepare a drought management plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>The WIT will meet with appropriate Spokane County planning personnel to develop a process for WIT input and comment on development proposals.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will explore funding and cost sharing options for landowners to build living snow fences; identify potential cost savings from road plowing.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.i</td>
<td>The SCCD will implement incentives to improve riparian zones, as funding allows.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will determine which specific development/construction documents the WIT wants to review and identify a process to obtain those documents.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.h</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify locations where property owners may sell or lease land for greenbelts or conservancy corridors and summarize agreement options such as easements or purchases.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>The SCCD will obtain information on funding options to reassess 100-year flood plain delineation under FCAAP.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.l</td>
<td>The SCCD, Spokane County, Whitman County and Ecology will coordinate a public riparian education program, including a series of workshops.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.b</td>
<td>The SCCD and the WIT will assist and coordinate in the development of a cross-state group of stakeholders to organize and implement efforts to protect and improve water quality in the Hanaman (Latah) Creek watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.e</td>
<td>Ecology will brief the WIT on water trusts and water banking.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>Ecology will coordinate with the Spokane County Engineering office, FEMA and the WIT to identify resources to reassess the boundaries of the FEMA 100-year flood plain.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 4, 2008</th>
<th>Funding¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R8.d</td>
<td>The SCCD, in coordination with USGS and WIT members, will create a work plan through the TMDL process to collect and analyze sediment loading data.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify and map all fish barriers within the mainstem and tributaries.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 1, 2009</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>The WIT will identify water available for acquisition and recommend that it be allocated according to specific priorities detailed in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>The WIT will identify funding sources to match Conservation Futures funds.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>The WIT and the SCCD will identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget to study groundwater connections between sub-basins and identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>The WIT and the SCCD will identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget for groundwater monitoring, and identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.c</td>
<td>The WIT will review the water quality data needs listed in the Hangman/Latah TMDL, and prioritize data gaps.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.c</td>
<td>If applicable, the WIT will develop implementation strategies to address priority data gaps in the TMDL and seek funding.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.a</td>
<td>The WIT will facilitate a meeting with Health District staff to discuss education programs for septic owners.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.b</td>
<td>The WIT will meet with staff from the Health Board to discuss septic system inspection compliance and means to improve compliance.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.c</td>
<td>The WIT will meet with the Health District to develop a list of possible incentives for septic system replacements and upgrades, and to identify potential funding sources.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will send a questionnaire to water rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.i</td>
<td>The SCCD will conduct education and outreach with public and elected officials regarding the importance and economic value of protecting channel migration zones.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.o</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify high priority shorelines and willing landowners as model funding recipients for the Conservation Futures program.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.p</td>
<td>The SCCD will seek willing landowners along high priority shorelines for the Conservation Futures program.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>The City of Spokane and Spokane County will bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures program can be used for purchasing water rights.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Spokane County will begin the non-point source study for the Spokane River TMDL.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
| Rec. # | Quarter 2, 2009                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Funding
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----
| R9.b  | The WIT will develop specific implementation actions for a septic system maintenance program.                                                                                                                     | D   |
| R11.j | The WIT will prioritize river sections to be reassessed for flood plain extent, if necessary.                                                                                                                | D   |
| R11.m | The WIT will facilitate a meeting with Spokane and Whitman County departments of Emergency Management Service to discuss options for a coordinated flood response plan.                                         | D   |
| R11.o | The WIT and the SCCD will determine the steps necessary to revise the policies of the Conservation Futures Program, and initiate dialogue with key entities to encourage a change in policy towards acquisition of high priority shorelines. | D   |
| R12.a | The WIT, the SCCD, Ecology, WDFW and the CDA Tribe will assess the benefits and impacts of fish barrier removal, and develop an action plan for targeted barrier removal.                                          | D   |
| R4.i  | The SCCD will hire a contractor to develop a watershed drought management plan.                                                                                                                           | G   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 3, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>The WIT will develop an implementation strategy for purchase of specific water rights (depending on the potential of utilizing the Conservation Futures program).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>The WIT will invite small towns to participate in identifying and addressing wellhead protection needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>The WIT will facilitate a meeting of interested representatives of small communities to discuss wellhead protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>The WIT will identify riparian restoration needs based on TMDL-related modeling and studies of soils and non-point sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.p</td>
<td>The WIT will use the SCCD riparian assessment tool to identify high priority shorelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>The SCCD will complete the modeling and soil studies for the Hangman TMDL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will complete PFC assessments on Spangle, Cove, Little Hangman, and Rattler creeks as funding and staff resources allow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Quarter 4, 2009</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>The SCCD will conduct riparian restoration activities.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Funding sources are coded as follows: D denotes donated staff time, IV denotes Phase IV funding, G denotes other grants, A denotes SCCD Assessment funding, O denotes other funding.
Part 4: 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 56 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 watershed 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 watershed hold inchoate water rights was made by assessing water rights and water use data for each system in the watershed, as available. The WIT’s consultants, Cascadia Consulting Group, gathered that information as follows:

1. Using the Department of Health’s on-line Sentry database, Cascadia created a list of all Group A water purveyors in WRIA 56 which appear to be municipal water rights holders as defined in RCW 90.03.015. This process resulted in a list of 22 water purveyors.

2. Cascadia obtained a list of all active water rights in WRIA 56 from Ecology’s Water Right Tracking System (WRTS) database, which was used to identify water rights for 14 of the 22 water purveyors.

3. Cascadia obtained information about ten of the purveyors’ water use, and additional water right information for three of the purveyors, from the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan (Cities of Waverly, Rockford, Spangle, Latah, Tekoa, Fairfield, and Cheney), Water System Plans held at the regional DOH office in Spokane (Ridge Water Association and Mullen Hill Terrace MHP), and Spokane County Utilities (Eastern Washington University).

4. To collect more complete data, and to confirm the accuracy of collected data, the WIT conducted a water rights survey. Each purveyor was initially contacted by phone. A follow-up letter and survey form were sent, describing the inchoate water rights inventory process, and listing any available data on the system’s water rights and water use. Purveyors were invited to correct or complete the data as applicable. As of November 5, 2007, owners or operators of 17 systems had responded to this survey (77% response rate). A sample form and summarized answers are provided in Appendix 2.
**Estimated Inchoate Water Rights Summary**

The following table summarizes estimated inchoate water rights in the Hangman (Latah) Creek Watershed. Systems are grouped by sub-basins. Instantaneous rights and use are reported in gallons per minute (gpm); annual rights and use are reported in acre-feet per year (AF/YR). Sources of information are indicated through footnotes. If information was obtained from multiple sources including the water rights survey, the water rights survey is listed as the only source. Details on water right and water use data are found in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Name</th>
<th>Inchoate water right?</th>
<th>Size of inchoate right</th>
<th>Portion of right which is inchoate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gpm</td>
<td>AF/YR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Hangman Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Express Inn, Inc.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lakes Water District 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangman Hills Water District 15</td>
<td>no (gpm), yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hideaway Trailer Park</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop MHP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullen Hill Terrace MHP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Addition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Water Association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Apartments</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marshall Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>4126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hills Estates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Community Water Assn.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Acres MHP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley of the Horses Water District 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock Creek Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Hangman Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekoa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Columbia Academy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 'nca' indicates not currently available (purveyor has not returned survey)
* 'u' indicates unknown (purveyor returned survey, but left relevant field(s) blank)

---

1. Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor
2. Water System Plan
3. Spokane County Utilities
4. WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan
5. Washington Department of Ecology’s WRTS database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Name</th>
<th>Water Right</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
<th>Inchoate Water Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gpm</td>
<td>AF/YR</td>
<td>gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Hangman Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRWAY EXPRESS INN 31</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*04896CWRIS</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR LAKES WATER DISTRICT 10</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-25465ALCWRIS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-20333CWRIS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANGMAN HILLS WATER DIST 15</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-27829C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-20195C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDEAWAY TRAILER PARK</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLTOP MOBILE HOME PARK</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLEN HILL TERRACE MHP 3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-27012</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERSON ADDITION</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
<td>nca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDGE WATER ASSOCIATION 2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-28767</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLEEPY HOLLOW APTS</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marshall Sub-Basin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHENEY, CITY OF2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6114</td>
<td>2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*05472C</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*07939C</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*00720C</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*00358S</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*00359S</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-25859CWRIS</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-22439CWRIS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN WASHINGTON U. 2, 4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-09810C, Cert # 7218-A</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-25018C</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-27882C</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN HILLS ESTATES 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-27834CWRIS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-25954CWRIS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL COMMUNITY WATER ASSN. 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-*10736CWRIS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINE ACRES MOBILE HOME PARK 2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-25979C</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY OF THE HORSES WATER DIST 12 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3-00883CWRIS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Nca' indicates not currently available (purveyor has not returned survey)
'u' indicates unknown (purveyor returned survey, but left relevant field(s) blank)

1 Washington Department of Ecology WRTS database
2 Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor
3 Water System Plan
4 Spokane County Utilities
**Planned Future Use of Inchoate Water Rights**

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, owners of inchoate water rights may find that the stream or aquifer does not have sufficient water. Furthermore, inchoate water rights do not indicate if 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.

While surveys were received for 77% of the 22 municipal water systems in WRIA 56, these 17 systems likely hold between 92% and 97% of the total annual allocations under municipal water rights. Water right quantities for four small municipal systems in WRIA 56 are unknown. Thus the 92% estimate is based on an

---

1 Water Rights Survey Form filled out by purveyor  
2 WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan  
3 Washington Department of Ecology WRTS database  
4 Note: The Town of Latah indicated a higher annual water right allocation in their survey (166 AF/YR) than that listed in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan (100 AF/YR).
assumption that each of these four systems is allocated 100 AF/YR (based on allocations for similarly-sized systems), while the 97% estimate is based on the assumption that these systems hold no water rights at all.

The analysis of inchoate water rights shows that most municipal water users in WRIA 56 have inchoate water rights for both instantaneous and annual amounts. The size of these inchoate portions range from 13% of current water use to 14 times larger than current use. On average, inchoate water rights represented roughly 52% of purveyors’ annual allocations and 45% of instantaneous allocations. However, in the survey provided to municipal water users, roughly one-third of the respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient water rights to meet future demand, one-third indicated that they did have sufficient water rights, and one-third replied that they weren’t sure (See Appendix 2). Nearly all respondents stated that they intend to use their entire municipal water right. These responses were not verified by analyzing projected growth or estimating future demand.

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 the Department of 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.
Under RCW 90.82.043(2), “[e]ach implementation plan must contain strategies to provide sufficient water for: (a) Production agriculture; (b) commercial, industrial, and residential use; and (c) instream flows.” The WRIA 56 Watershed Implementation Team cannot state with certainty that any specific strategy or combination of strategies will provide “sufficient” water for a particular purpose. Therefore, the WIT has identified recommended actions in the Detailed Implementation Plan that may, directly or indirectly, provide additional water for production agriculture; commercial, industrial and residential use; and/or stream augmentation. These recommendations include specific conservation strategies, investigations of ground water – surface water interactions, stream augmentation efforts, and improvements in the accounting and allocation of water rights. The matrix below outlines each relevant action under these recommendations and denotes which of the three uses (agriculture, commercial/industrial/residential, or stream augmentation) benefit by the action. As many of the actions are basin-wide, they are expected to benefit all three uses. Timelines and interim milestones for each strategy are discussed in the detailed recommendation section (Part 2, beginning page 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Summarized Action</th>
<th>Action benefits ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Spokane, Spokane County and Ecology will continue water conservation programs.</td>
<td>I² I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Spokane and Ecology will continue evaluating reclamation and reuse options.</td>
<td>I I I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b, R4.g</td>
<td>The RWCC will continue to develop and coordinate regional water conservation efforts.</td>
<td>I I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>The WIT will identify water available for acquisition and recommend that it be allocated according to specific priorities detailed in the WRIA 56 Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>Ecology will include recommended priorities for future water rights allocations for any reservations in instream rules adopted for WRIA 56.</td>
<td>D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>The WIT and the CDA Tribe will invite representatives of the Idaho Dept. of Water Resources and Benewah and Kootenai Counties to discuss negotiation on cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>I I I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Ecology will identify existing cross-state regional groups as models for addressing cross-state water availability.</td>
<td>I I I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The WIT will review water conservation requirements under the Municipal Water Law.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Because instream flows are a water right and not a specific use, the WRIA 56 WIT has interpreted the statutory requirement of 90.82.043(2) as intending to provide additional water for streams through stream augmentation.

2 D = direct impact, I = indirect impact

3 Any water conserved under the Municipal Water Law continues to be inchoate to the water right holder until otherwise committed by the water right holder.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Summarized Action</th>
<th>Action benefits ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The WIT will review and comment, if necessary, on conservation goals developed by water purveyors.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will invite water purveyors to collaborate with the WIT in developing and implementing DOH-required conservation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The SCCD will check the status of purveyors’ water system plans and conservation program updates with DOH.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>The RWCC will coordinate a conservation e-mail list and invite purveyors to participate.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>DOH and Ecology will investigate and summarize funding sources for small town infrastructure updates and present findings to the WIT.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>The WIT will assist municipalities in applying for funding for water infrastructure updates.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.c</td>
<td>The WIT and member agencies will send letters to legislative leaders and the Governor requesting a change in the “use it or lose it” requirement of state water law.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Spokane County and Spokane will bring recommendations to the WIT on how the Conservation Futures program can be used for purchasing water rights.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>Depending on feasibility, the WIT will develop an implementation strategy for purchase of specific water rights, utilizing the Conservation Futures program.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.h</td>
<td>Water utilities will keep the WIT informed of the status of implementing conservation programs.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>The SCCD will hire a contractor to develop a watershed drought management plan.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>The WIT will discuss the goals of a drought management plan, and prepare a plan outline.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>Ecology will provide the WIT with examples of other basins’ drought management plans.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>The WIT and the SCCD will identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget, and identify funding and a lead agency to issue an RFP and hire a consultant to study groundwater connections between sub-basins.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>The WIT will identify priority areas, prepare a Scope of Work outline, develop a budget, and identify funding and a lead agency to issue an RFP and hire a consultant to monitor ground water levels.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>The WIT will oversee groundwater monitoring and make this information publicly available.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>The WIT and the SCCD will identify potential locations, discuss available resources, and identify a final implementer to install, maintain, and collect data from a permanent gauge between the upper and lower watershed.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify on-going funding for, and monitor the data from, the gauging station near the state line.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. #</td>
<td>Summarized Action</td>
<td>Action benefits ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.a</td>
<td>The WIT will coordinate a regional meeting with Ecology and other WRIAs on compliance and enforcement of water rights and claims, and write Ecology a follow-up letter, copied to appropriate legislators, requesting appropriate funding for compliance activities.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will send a questionnaire to water rights holders to determine the need and level of support for adjudication in the watershed.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.a</td>
<td>The WIT will encourage and work with the towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa and Latah, and other applicable entities, to request grant funding to investigate unaccounted water in their public water systems.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.a</td>
<td>Spokane County will investigate whether block grant funding is available to cover multiple jurisdictions' investigations of unaccounted water in their public water systems.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The WIT will coordinate an education effort to inform watershed residents about stream augmentation efforts.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will develop programs to assist and encourage no-till/direct seed tillage operations.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>Ecology will provide a written explanation of the required process to change water rights from surface water to ground water sources.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will identify cooperative landowners and explore CRP funding options for reforestation in the Rock Creek basin.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will explore funding and cost sharing options for landowners to build living snow fences; identify potential cost savings from road plowing.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will involve landowners in building catchment basins, snow fences, and vegetated buffer strips.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will coordinate regional grant requests to fund acquisition or restoration of historic and current wetland sites, including purchasing conservation easements or development rights.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will investigate the benefits of purchasing or leasing water rights from Tekoa to augment streamflows.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD will prepare a simple feasibility study of balancing basins.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b</td>
<td>The SCCD and WDFW will design, and coordinate with other WRIAs, a landowner education program on beaver dams.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>The WIT will prepare a long-term strategy for water rights source changes and explore funding needs and options.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>The WIT will explore increased communication and encouragement of the Water Conservancy Board involving water rights source changes.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c</td>
<td>The WIT will identify potential water rights source changes which could benefit the watershed.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.c</td>
<td>Avista will evaluate dams to determine whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows for returning salmonids, supported by a technical team.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Benefit (high, medium, low)</th>
<th>Practicality (high, medium, low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.a</td>
<td>Evaluate the potential to purchase or lease, valid current water rights for municipal supply.</td>
<td>3, 3, 1</td>
<td>0, 5, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.b</td>
<td>Reclamation, conservation and reuse strategies shall be encouraged to increase water available for beneficial uses in the watershed.</td>
<td>0, 6, 1</td>
<td>0, 6, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.a</td>
<td>The watershed should be divided into two main sub-basins for management of water rights.</td>
<td>0, 3, 5</td>
<td>0, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.b</td>
<td>All proposed changes in the County Comprehensive Plan, that affect housing density, should be strongly dependent on water availability. The availability should be based on the sub-basin estimates as described in the Watershed Management Plan.</td>
<td>6, 1, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.c</td>
<td>Land use regulators should utilize water availability estimates described in the Watershed Management Plan. Minimum parcel size should be based on sub-basin estimates in areas where exempt wells will be the main source of domestic water.</td>
<td>5, 2, 0</td>
<td>0, 5, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.a</td>
<td>Future allocation of water rights should be apportioned accordingly: (see R3.a)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.b</td>
<td>Initiate a watershed based negotiation to achieve a cooperative agreement to address cross state line availability of water (both surface and groundwater).</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
<td>0, 5, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.a</td>
<td>Work with water purveyors to implement conservation programs required by the new Municipal Water Law.</td>
<td>5, 0, 0</td>
<td>2, 4, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.b</td>
<td>Identify funding sources for small town infrastructure upgrades (i.e. leak detection, repair, storage, metering).</td>
<td>4, 1, 0</td>
<td>3, 0, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.c</td>
<td>Develop new legislation to prevent water saved by improved irrigation efficiency or conservation from being subject to relinquishment (systems who are not municipal water suppliers).</td>
<td>0, 2, 4</td>
<td>1, 0, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.d</td>
<td>Options for keeping water rights and place of use in the watershed should be explored.</td>
<td>0, 0, 6</td>
<td>0, 0, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.e</td>
<td>Funding should be requested from the Legislature to purchase or lease saved water (from R4.d.).</td>
<td>0, 4, 2</td>
<td>0, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.f</td>
<td>The potential to utilize the Conservation Futures Program for purchasing water rights should be explored.</td>
<td>2, 2, 2</td>
<td>0, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.g</td>
<td>A coordinated water conservation education/information program should be developed and implemented. This program may be coordinated with a larger regional effort.</td>
<td>6, 0, 0</td>
<td>5, 1, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.h</td>
<td>Encourage the use of water conserving programs, actions, and technology (i.e. xeriscaping, low flow toilets and shower heads) for domestic (group, domestic exempt), light industrial, heavy industrial, commercial, agriculture, irrigation, and municipal uses.</td>
<td>4, 1, 0</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.i</td>
<td>A watershed drought management plan should be developed. This plan will initiate specific actions to be taken to conserve and preserve water in the basin.</td>
<td>0, 6, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.a</td>
<td>The groundwater connections between sub-basins should be studied and better defined.</td>
<td>0, 6, 0</td>
<td>0, 0, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.b</td>
<td>Groundwater levels need to be monitored to determine if aquifer mining is occurring within the basin.</td>
<td>4, 2, 0</td>
<td>3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.c</td>
<td>A study should be conducted to evaluate whether groundwater from adjoining watersheds is being utilized by municipalities on the edge of watershed (Tekoa, Cheney, Spangle). The addition of a dedicated monitoring station (well) should be established.</td>
<td>0, 3, 3</td>
<td>0, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.d</td>
<td>A new permanent gauging station should be developed between the upper and lower watershed. This will help determine water interchange rates and provide better recreational information on water levels.</td>
<td>2, 3, 1</td>
<td>0, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. #</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Benefit (high, medium, low)</td>
<td>Practicality (high, medium, low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.e.</td>
<td>Encourage the establishment of a new permanent gauging station near the state line.</td>
<td>5, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.a.</td>
<td>Develop a strategy to address compliance and enforcement of water rights and changes. Regulatory resources should be identified.</td>
<td>4, 3, 0</td>
<td>0, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.b.</td>
<td>Determine the need and support for adjudication in the watershed. If supported, the appropriate sub-basins should be prioritized for adjudication.</td>
<td>0, 5, 2</td>
<td>0, 1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6.c.</td>
<td>If appropriate, a petition should be filed with the State of Washington for general adjudication of water rights in the basin.</td>
<td>0, 3, 3</td>
<td>0, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.a.</td>
<td>The Cities and Towns of Spangle, Rockford, Tekoa, and Latah should evaluate and investigate the causes for unaccounted water in their Public Water Systems.</td>
<td>4, 3, 0</td>
<td>0, 5, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.b.</td>
<td>A streamflow augmentation program should be developed and implemented for Hangman Creek.</td>
<td>6, 0, 0</td>
<td>varies by strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7.c.</td>
<td>Encourage change of source for water rights from surface to ground water where feasible. Additional incentives may help involvement.</td>
<td>0, 6, 1</td>
<td>0, 4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.a.</td>
<td>Participate in Lake Spokane D.O. TMDL process related to point and non-point sources in the Hangman Creek watershed.</td>
<td>6, 1, 0</td>
<td>8, 2, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.b.</td>
<td>Participate in the Hangman Creek TMDL project</td>
<td>7, 0, 0</td>
<td>7, 0, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.c.</td>
<td>The information (data) gaps for short and long-term water quality needs should be evaluated.</td>
<td>0, 7, 0</td>
<td>1, 6, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.d.</td>
<td>The long-term trends of sediment loads should be evaluated. The stream gauging operation throughout watershed should be maintained to assist with the TMDL study. The stations will assist in the determination of pollutant load allocations.</td>
<td>7, 0, 0</td>
<td>0, 7, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.e.</td>
<td>The installation of additional gauging stations to monitor the effects of BMP implementation should be supported. These BMPs should be recommended through the TMDL process.</td>
<td>1, 5, 1</td>
<td>5, 2, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.f.</td>
<td>Stock watering impacts to surface waters should be minimized throughout the watershed.</td>
<td>2, 4, 1</td>
<td>0, 6, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.g.</td>
<td>Incentives should be developed to encourage off creek watering systems for livestock.</td>
<td>5, 2, 0</td>
<td>2, 5, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8.h.</td>
<td>An education/information program should be initiated for septic system construction, care and maintenance.</td>
<td>1, 6, 0</td>
<td>1, 6, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.a.</td>
<td>A septic maintenance program should be established. Inspections should take place every three years. Septic system pumping should occur every six years.</td>
<td>0, 7, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.b.</td>
<td>Incentives should be developed for replacement and/or upgrades of substandard septic systems.</td>
<td>3, 4, 0</td>
<td>0, 0, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.a</td>
<td>The needs for wellhead protection in smaller communities should be identified.</td>
<td>0, 5, 1</td>
<td>2, 0, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.b</td>
<td>Potential funding sources for wellhead protection in smaller communities should be identified.</td>
<td>0, 6, 0</td>
<td>2, 2, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.c</td>
<td>The impacts of storm water handling in smaller communities should be identified.</td>
<td>0, 6, 0</td>
<td>0, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10.d</td>
<td>Identify potential funding sources for storm water system plans due to their potential impacts on wellhead protection programs.</td>
<td>0, 4, 3</td>
<td>0, 4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. #</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Practicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.a</td>
<td>All development and construction proposals within the watershed should have a SEPA review and be reviewed by the Watershed Planning Team for compatibility with the watershed management plan.</td>
<td>4, 3, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.b</td>
<td>All County and City Land Use Planning intended for WRICA 56 should be reviewed/coordinated with the Watershed Implementation Team for compatibility with the watershed management plan.</td>
<td>4, 3, 1</td>
<td>0, 4, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.c</td>
<td>The local Shoreline Management Plans and Critical Areas Ordinances should include a restriction on commercial, residential, and industrial development along streams, within the 100-year flood plain, and the associated channel migration belts.</td>
<td>9, 0, 0</td>
<td>0, 7, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.d</td>
<td>If new commercial, residential, and industrial development within the 100-year flood plain occurs, then mitigation should be required for fish and wildlife impacts.</td>
<td>5, 4, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.e</td>
<td>All streamside/shoreline land uses (e.g. agricultural, urban, residential) subject to the jurisdiction of local shoreline management regulations shall implement Best Management Practices and establish appropriate riparian buffers to protect streamside habitat and water quality.</td>
<td>9, 0, 0</td>
<td>0, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.f</td>
<td>Technical assistance should be available for landowner consultation.</td>
<td>5, 4, 0</td>
<td>3, 6, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.g</td>
<td>Shoreline Management Plan regulations and Critical Area Ordinances should be enforced to the extent possible.</td>
<td>6, 2, 0</td>
<td>0, 0, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.h</td>
<td>Greenbelts or conservancy corridors should be established to improve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat.</td>
<td>0, 5, 1</td>
<td>0, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.i</td>
<td>A complete channel migration zone delineation project should be funded within the watershed and should be considered in future land use regulations.</td>
<td>2, 4, 0</td>
<td>2, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.j</td>
<td>The current delineation of the 100-year FEMA flood plain designations should be reassessed. New boundaries should be determined by a professional engineer.</td>
<td>2, 4, 0</td>
<td>0, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.k</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study of a land acquisition/relocation program for structures within the 100-year flood plain.</td>
<td>1, 5, 1</td>
<td>0, 0, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.l</td>
<td>Develop and maintain public awareness and education programs for riparian area function, benefits, and flood plain encroachment (This should be inclusive of residents, developers, and a broad range of stakeholders).</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.m</td>
<td>The local jurisdictions should develop a coordinated flood response plan in conjunction with a flood warning system.</td>
<td>2, 2, 3</td>
<td>0, 1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.n</td>
<td>Establish a riparian restoration program for the watershed.</td>
<td>3, 2, 0</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.o</td>
<td>Pursue the reservation of a portion of the Conservation Futures program to fund the acquisition of high priority riparian shorelines.</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
<td>0, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.p</td>
<td>Identify high priority riparian habitat to submit for consideration in the Spokane County Conservation Futures Program.</td>
<td>3, 3, 0</td>
<td>4, 2, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.q</td>
<td>Coordinate and continue Riparian Buffer Cost-Share/and or loan programs.</td>
<td>4, 2, 0</td>
<td>4, 2, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.a</td>
<td>Fish barriers should be identified and mapped within the mainstem and tributaries. A feasibility plan to identify the benefits of removal of these barriers and an action plan to remove identified barriers should be developed.</td>
<td>0, 5, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.b</td>
<td>Conduct Proper Function Condition Assessment (PFC) on the remaining tributaries in the Hangman Creek Watershed.</td>
<td>0, 6, 0</td>
<td>0, 6, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12.c</td>
<td>Evaluate whether the current hydrology is capable of supporting flows required for returning migratory salmonids.</td>
<td>1, 0, 5</td>
<td>0, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13.a</td>
<td>An Implementation Plan MOA shall be developed between local governmental agencies and other required stakeholders.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13.b</td>
<td>A lead entity shall be identified to develop the Phase IV grant application and assume administrative responsibility for the grant.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13.c</td>
<td>At such time as a Memorandum of Understanding between the initiating governments is complete, an interim body (Watershed Implementation Team) shall be organized for the initial year of Phase IV watershed planning.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13.d</td>
<td>A Detailed Implementation Plan shall be developed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Sample Water Rights Survey Form

Water Rights Survey Form

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 56 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 at the following address by August 8, 2007:
1109 First Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98101

If you have any questions, please contact Laila at laila@cascadiaconsulting.com or (206) 343-9759, x143.

Please Confirm/Clarify the Information on your Water Facilities Inventory Report:

Residential Connections: ________________
Total Connections: ________________
Approved Connections: ________________

Based on this information, we infer you have a total of _____ connections available for future growth.

Purveyor Name: ________________
Water System ID Number: ________________
Contact Name: ________________
Phone Number: ________________
Email Address: ________________

Please see reverse side.

Please fill out the matrix below for each of your water rights. Please use the highest annual totals your system has used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Right Control Number</th>
<th>Total Water Right Qi $^{35}$ (AF/YR)</th>
<th>Qa $^{36}$</th>
<th>2006 Water System Use $^{37}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qi (max GPM/CFS) Qa (annual total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are your existing water rights adequate to support future growth for the next 20 years and beyond?

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!

$^{35}$ In GPM (gallons per minute) for groundwater rights, CFS (cubic feet per second) for surface water rights

$^{36}$ Acre-feet per year

$^{37}$ Master meter total or highest annual volume ever used
### Summary of Responses to Survey Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Rights adequate for future growth*</th>
<th>Plan to meet future demand</th>
<th>Expect to use entire right*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hangman</td>
<td>Ridge Water Association</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four Lakes Water District 10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intertie with City of Spokane</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Apartments</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mullen Hill Terrace MHP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hangman Hills Water District 15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Pine Acres Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hidden Hills Estates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Residents will conserve water</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Community Water Assoc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley of the Horses Water District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increased number of water sources</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Cheney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek</td>
<td>Town of Rockford</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Additional water rights</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hangman</td>
<td>Town of Spangle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tekoa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Latah</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Additional water rights</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Fairfield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Waverly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Additional water rights</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These responses were not analyzed or verified for accuracy.
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT:
TOWARDS DEVELOPING A DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR WRIA 56
HANGMAN (LATAH) CREEK WATERSHED

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 Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) 56; 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 Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resources Management Plan (ver. 05/19/2005) has been adopted in joint session on September 26, 2005 by the Spokane County Board of Commissioners and the Whitman 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: Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resources Management Plan (ver. 05/19/2005). 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 of the signatories to this MOA.

“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 Hangman Creek Water Resources Management Plan below.]

“Greater Hangman Creek Watershed” is the watershed identified in United States Geological Survey (USGS) as cataloging unit 17010306, and is the drainage basin for Hangman Creek, not considering political boundaries. This term is not to be confused with that portion of the Greater Hangman Creek Watershed lying solely within Washington State and identified as the Hangman Creek Watershed and as WRIA 56.

“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 having a role in Plan implementation as described in the DIP, including Indian Tribes, with legislative and regulatory authority, whose jurisdiction lies wholly or partly within the boundary of WRIA 56, and who are signatories to this MOA. For the purposes of implementing the Plan, Ecology represents only itself. Implementation activities on the part of other state agencies shall be conducted by other documents, where needed.

Implementing NGMs, are those persons or entities entering into contractual relationships to implement elements as identified in the Plan.

“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 WRIA 56, also known as the Hangman (Latah) Creek Basin. They continue as Implementing Governments and signatories to this MOA, to wit: Spokane County, Hangman Hills Water District #15, the City of Spokane, and Whitman County.
“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 Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resource Management Plan (the Plan). For the purpose of developing the Detailed Implementation Plan, to implement the Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resource Management Plan (ver. 05/19/2005), the Planning Unit will be replaced by the Watershed Implementation Team (WIT) as further described below.

“The Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resources Management Plan (ver. 05/19/2005)”, sometimes also referenced as the “Plan” is defined in RCW 90.82.020 (6) with respect to WRIA 56. 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 Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resource Management Plan (ver. 05/19/2005). 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 WRIA 56, but may also, by agreement with Idaho participants, be expanded to include related watershed areas in Idaho.

**3.0 Governments Scope:** Watershed Planning for WRIA 56 includes an opportunity to receive state grant funding, when local match funding can be met, for Phase Four, detailed implementation plan 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 Conservation District (SCCD) 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 those members of the WRIA 56 Planning Unit, at the time that the Planning Unit approved the Hangman (Latah) Creek Water Resources Management Plan during the Planning Unit meeting on May 19, 2005, 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)]

5.3.1 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.

5.3.2 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.

5.3.3 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 common consent, 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 common consent 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, Recommendations, and Strategies for implementation steps. 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 WRIA 56, 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 B to meet the “matching” portion of the grant for Phase Four. Such execution also satisfies the requirement of written consent of said signatory under this MOA as regards Attachment B.

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 and activities outside the State of Washington within the Greater Hangman Creek Watershed. 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 Not withstanding 8.1, by written Consensus of the signatories 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 MOA 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 representatives of all signatories.

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 (eg. 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 of the MOA by all the parties as listed hereinafter. In the event the Lead Agency determines, after a reasonable effort, that it is not possible to obtain the signatories 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 given by the chief executive of a participant, it gives written notice to all 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.

SPOKANE COUNTY:

By: ______________________________________  Date:  ________________
    Phillip D. Harris, Chair

HANGMAN HILLS WATER DISTRICT #15:

By: ______________________________________  Date:  ________________
    Melissa Cloninger, Board President

CITY OF SPOKANE:

By: ______________________________________  Date:  ________________
    Dennis Hession, Mayor

WHITMAN COUNTY:

By: ______________________________________  Date:  ________________
    Chair

(signatories continue on next page)
SPOKANE COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT:

By: ______________________________ Date: __________________

Gerald Scheele, Chair

COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE:

By: ______________________________ Date: __________________

Chief J. Allan, Tribal Chairman

WASHINGTON STATE DEPT. OF ECOLOGY:

By: ______________________________ Date: __________________

Grant Pfeifer, Regional Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved as to form:</th>
<th>Approved as to form:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert G. Beaumier, Jr.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant City Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Arkills,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attest:</th>
<th>Attest:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terri Pfister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Erickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ATTACHMENT A**

**WRIA 56**

**LIST OF WIT REPRESENTATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Agency Represented</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiating Governments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Rickard</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brickard@spokanecity.org">brickard@spokanecity.org</a></td>
<td>509-625-6533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reanette Boese</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rboese@spokanecounty.org">rboese@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td>509-477-7678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Wigen</td>
<td>Whitman County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Commissioners@co.whitman.wa.us">Commissioners@co.whitman.wa.us</a></td>
<td>509-397-6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bortfeld</td>
<td>Hangman Hills Water District #15</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sb2165@earthlink.net">sb2165@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>509-448-5327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing Governments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Bailey</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene Tribe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dabailey@cdatribe.org">dabailey@cdatribe.org</a></td>
<td>208-686-1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Edelen</td>
<td>Spokane County Conservation District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:walt-edelen@sccd.org">walt-edelen@sccd.org</a></td>
<td>509-535-7274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Holliday</td>
<td>Washington Dept. of Ecology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khol461@ecy.wa.gov">khol461@ecy.wa.gov</a></td>
<td>509-329-3431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Carmack</td>
<td>Landowner (agriculture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>509-291-4062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Grunte</td>
<td>Landowner (rural resident)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>509-448-1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Ostheller</td>
<td>Fairfield Triangle Grange</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>509-283-4259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Implementing Governments agree to provide no less than the following resources each year for the duration of this MOA to meet the requirement that the Hangman Creek (WRIA 56) WIT provide up to $10,000 to match Phase Four Grant funding. (cross reference RCW 90.82.040 & 90.82.040 (2)(e))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Government</th>
<th>Resource description</th>
<th>Resource value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane (s)</td>
<td>41 * $ 44.52</td>
<td>1825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane (c)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County (s)</td>
<td>36 * $50</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County (c)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman County (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman County (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangman Hills Water District #15 (s)</td>
<td>36 * $30</td>
<td>1080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangman Hills Water District #15 (c)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County Conservation District (s)</td>
<td>50 * $50</td>
<td>2500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County Conservation District (c)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene Tribe (s)</td>
<td>48 * $60</td>
<td>2880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene Tribe (c)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash. Dept. of Ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* state funding not eligible for grant matching