

# **NLFCZD Advisory Board Meeting Minutes**

**September 12, 2007**

**Spokane County Public Works Building 3pm-5pm**

## **Present:**

Board Members: Warren Heylman, Lorne Burley, Wendy Burley, Laretta Block,  
Judy Gibbs-Foy  
Alternate Members: Jane Takai, Sharon Cusic  
Staff: Marianne Barrentine, Barry Moore, Jacob McCann, Jane Anderson  
Absent: Mary Weller Souza

## **Items Discussed:**

### Lake Level –

- As of Monday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, the lake level at the outlet gate was 2124.24. This is about a quarter inch lower than the goal elevation and the gates have been closed since 4/18/07.

### Milfoil Update –

- The milfoil was treated on August 8<sup>th</sup> and August 14<sup>th</sup>.
- Smaller plants have been spotted since the treatment.
- A quick milfoil survey was done, but not much change in the milfoil was seen.
- Boat problems and water clarity have hindered a more thorough survey.
- 2,4D concentrations were not as high as we would have liked. Concentrations never hit the drinking water threshold.
- Prevailing winds, hot liquid in addition to a hot day, and low concentrations are all possible conditions that the treatment may not have been as effective as we would have liked.
- There were several issues with the contractor this year.
  - o Postings done incorrectly
  - o Ran short on granular material on August 8<sup>th</sup>. Needed to finish on August 14<sup>th</sup>.
  - o Once awarded the contract, communication lacked.
  - o Bid proposal described better technology than actually used.
- DOE has been notified of similar problems with milfoil applicators across the state.
- For future liquid applications, an option may be to have the contractor provide liquid samples or sample data to ensure concentration and quality control.
- Will not be treating any more this year unless a large amount is found.
- Milfoil costs:
  - o Treatment costs are computed by acre. 32.19 acres treated this year.
  - o \$255/acre for liquid 2,4D – 21.76 acres treated = \$5,548.80
  - o \$449/acre for granular 2,4D – 10.43 acres treated = \$4,683.07
  - o Total of \$11,050.42 has been spent to date on milfoil 2,4D treatment (including tax)
  - o 3 water samples taken to verify 2,4D concentrations have been collected at a price of \$175 each = \$525 total

### TMDL –

- A rough draft comment letter was e-mailed to the advisory board prior to this meeting.
- Comments and concerns regarding the TMDL from Board members include:
  - o Didn't like that NLFCZD staff complimented DOE in the first paragraph of the NLFCZD draft comment letter.
  - o Feel the data available was not used accurately and was selective.
  - o Asked during the previous comment period that Barry's data and information be included in the appendix. This comment has not been addressed.
  - o The data and comments addressed in this Final Draft TMDL were selective.

- Many parcels are not buildable around the lake and in the watershed due to zoning regulations. However, the TMDL accounts for several of these parcels as buildable.
- Several Board members have no confidence in the study and believe the TMDL is driven by a personal agenda.
- Asked for, but have not received a 3<sup>rd</sup> party peer review.
- Barry noted if DOE wants to review his data, he will have them come down to his lab and review the data at his office.
- Prior to the first TMDL draft, Tony Whiley met with Barry, Marianne, and Ken Merrill and discussed his thoughts that the aerator system is warming the lake because he was seeing a warmer hypolimnion. Barry and Marianne feel this is not true as there is not enough energy in the system to cause this large of a heat increase.
- In a meeting with Tony, Ken, Dave, Jim, Barry, and NLFCZD staff in December 2006, Ken said rather explicitly that he has a personal agenda.
- According to Barry, Chlorophyll levels are a 20<sup>th</sup> of what they were and the blue greens have dropped. Over the last 5-6 years, phosphorous levels have been decreasing and oxygen levels increasing.
- Warren made a motion to **not support** the July 2007 Final Rough Draft TMDL. The Board unanimously agreed.
- Discussion to ask for removal of DOE staff members involved in the TMDL was mentioned. The Board decided to wait on this.
- The Board feels the TMDL process can be beneficial based on an accurate study to include all the data.

#### Funding Options –

- A four page handout describing the options to improve funding fairness for the Newman Lake Community was discussed by Marianne.
- This handout will be provided to the Commissioners and those who attend the October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and will include a key to which each Flood/Rehab number represents.
- Any changes to the current system will go through a public hearing and review process.
- Board member discussion included:
  - Spreading out the charges to include more properties
  - Implementing a positive approach to the watershed owners
  - A proposal to implement a flat charge based on property value
  - Updating the current benefit assessment
  - Dismiss the current benefit system and implement an Ad Valorem tax
- When evaluating the options, the County will need to look to the future and plan accordingly.

#### Reminder-

Meeting to discuss funding options with the County Commissioners  
 October 8, 2007 1:30pm – 3:00pm  
 Commissioners Office – Spokane County Courthouse

Respectively Submitted by,

Jane Anderson  
 NLFCZD Staff