

From: Short, Jaime (ECY) <JSHO461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 2:41 PM
To: Hermanson, Mike
Subject: Comments on WRIA 55 draft Technical memos

Hi Mike,

I was under the impression that we'd be discussing the draft Tech memos at the WRIA 55 meeting next week but the agenda indicates that you're looking for a vote. In that case, I'd like to pass along some questions/comments (primarily John's) for your consideration. Let me know if you need any clarification. - Jaime

Evaluation of Future Exempt Well Demand memo:

- Page 1, strike "watershed restoration and enhancement plans" in 2nd paragraph. They don't apply to this effort.
- Define "domestic use" as it pertains to this effort. You can reference Ecology's *Initial Policy Interpretations* document.
- The draft appears to be missing Figure 1 which is referenced on the bottom of Page 3.
- It isn't clear how Spokane County decided how many new homes could be served by water purveyors versus new exempt uses when projected new homes fall within water service areas. Some purveyors can't physically serve every new home that falls within their boundary. Please explain how you accounted for that in the methodology.
- In Spokane County, when they were looking at irrigated lawn size of existing new homes, it says they used aerial photos from 2006, 2009, 2014, 2016, and 2018. It doesn't say if they saw any trends for changes in irrigated acreage over time at individual sample sites. Can you speak to that?
- Did you include garden areas in the analysis ("size of apparent area of lawn irrigation" is what it says)?
- Tables 4 and 6: Include a column converting lawn size into acres.
- Table 9: Include columns for number samples and a conversion into acres.
- Tables 10 and 11: under the Pend Oreille columns, I'm sure the header "SUF" should be SFU.
- Table 11: In the Dragoon Creek subbasin, lawn size on the Spokane side was estimated at 0.34 acres. On the Stevens side, it came out at 0.09 acres. I didn't see an explanation for difference. I understand that they looked at different parcels, but am wondering if there is a reason for the discrepancy? The same thing happens in the Dragoon Creek subbasin: 0.35 versus 0.16 acres. In the West Branch subbasin, its 0.21 acres on the Spokane side and 0.12 acres on the Pend Oreille side. Only the Otter Creek subbasin saw comparable results: 0.33 acres versus 0.29 acres.
- Table 12: The cfs conversion for total Projected Use in WRIA 55, I got 2.275, not their listed 2.273. I use 365 days per year. Perhaps they use something else?

Review of Existing Watershed Plan memo:

- Page 1, 1st paragraph: Ecology adopts the plans, local governments approve them.
- Page 2, last paragraph: Please spell out the MIKE SHE acronym.
- Page 3, 3rd bullet: There is mention of recommendations that came out of the Water Availability Advisory Group. Please include a summary of the recommendations.