

NLFCZD Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday June 8th, 2011
Spokane County Public Works Building 3:00pm-5:00pm

Present

Board Members: Craig Aldworth, Ruedi Schuler, Jane Takai,
Via telephone: Laurie Keaton, Kim Jones
Alternate Members: Wendy Burley, Quincy Edmonds
Absent: Lauretta Block
Staff: Jane Anderson, Marianne Barrentine, Jacob McCann

News

Lake Level: Lake level as of the meeting date was 2125.40ft with the gates open 2ft each. Thompson Creek was still running about bank full. As of noon today, there is 10.4" of snow water equivalent at 4700ft and 23" of snow. The sump is continuing to fill. We anticipate scraping the west cell and the scarifying the east cell.

Facilities: Alum deliveries have been constant since mid-April. We have the 9th delivery of the year scheduled for Friday which we will hold in the tank and use as needed over the summer. This will leave 4 deliveries for the fall.

Milfoil: Treated 20 acres with liquid 2, 4-D/Diquat mix on June 2nd. This was the earliest herbicide has been applied at Newman, and the first use of a tank mix. These strategies (early treatments, synergistic combos) were outlined in the conclusion of the recently approved Final Report for the milfoil eradication grant covering the previous 5 years.

- Laurie mentioned that large "Invasive Species" signage could be produced for placement at boat launches to increase awareness among lake visitors using launch facilities.
- Kim spoke of the need for a lake-wide moratorium on boats during treatments to help combat boat wave impacts upon herbicide contact time.

Boat wake/Lake Level

The issue of shoreline erosion mitigation/prevention has largely been focused on high boat wakes and the potential for lowering the lake level to offset impacts. In particular, a lake level proposal was voted on by the AB at the last meeting, and staff proceeded with preparing an Environmental Checklist for SEPA. However, upon a staff briefing to the BOCC, it was decided that such a proposal will not be currently undertaken, and the SEPA process was thus stopped. This was explained by Jacob, as there was some confusion as to the process and why it was discontinued. In short, the Board did not approve staff to proceed with Environmental Review at this stage. Jacob incorrectly assumed that the public process should/could be initiated first, with the resulting comments compiled and forming the basis for future hearings and decision. As the lake level is set forth in the Policy and Procedures, any changes will need to undergo environmental review and also be approved by the BOCC via resolution. The BOCC, as District Supervisors, have the final say on operations.

Kim spoke of the liability that individual boat owners could face for resulting property damage from negligent operation and that license numbers can be compiled to identify repeat offenders.

Ruedi spoke of creating a handbook for homeowners for erosion protection and repair to help combat the problem.

The group also spoke of holding a lake tour where AB members and others could see first hand both the extent of erosion damages around the lake and other issues, such as the shallowness on the south end.

2012 Budget

2011 Expenses

Salaries will likely be a little high on the Flood Control side due to the constant monitoring of the lake level and sump because of the wet winter and spring.

Equipment maintenance should be close with the 8,000 hr service of the compressors.

Sump cleaning is expected to be high.

2012 Budget

Two scenarios were presented: a 2% increase and a 5% increase. A few highlights to note:

1. Reimbursement from milfoil grants is unlikely for 2012. The current milfoil grant has \$15,187 remaining as reimbursement which will likely be used this year on treatment and the final report documents. Staff does plan to apply for funding again, but award is not expected. Line Item #4 in the attached budgets shows \$0 for this.
2. The in-lake oxygenation pump is scheduled for preventative maintenance which involves pulling the pump from the lake using a diving service and taking it to a repair facility. This was last done over the winter of 2006/2007 at a cost of approximately \$19,000. We schedule this preventative maintenance every 5-6 years. \$20,000 is allotted for this service in line item #24 of the budgets.
3. NLFCZD Staff is seeking coverage under the general permit for alum injection, rather than the individual permit that covers current operations. The general permit fee is much less than the individual permit fee which can be noticed in line item #14.
4. 2012 will be the second year (of three years) for the \$2,250 increase for WSU hydroacoustic analysis and lake monitoring increase. This is noted in line item #11.
5. Both cells of the sump where the outlet channel flow and infiltrates into the aquifer have been infiltrating water for several months now and we will likely need to scrape and remove the top layer of soil in the west cell of the sump (approx. 3.5 acres) and scarify the east cell (approx. 3 acres) this fall. Funds will be from flood control reserves and estimated to be about \$15,000.

Differences between the two different proposed budgets:

- Scenario #1 is increasing the NLFCZD assessments by 2% while Scenario #2 is increasing the assessments by 5%.
- Scenario #1 is pulling \$0 from flood control reserves and \$36,962 from the water quality reserves, while Scenario #2 is pulling \$0 from flood control reserves and \$30,862 from the water quality reserves which would allow more money to remain in the reserves. \$ 20, 000 of the WQ reserve pull is for scheduled maintenance (pump). The thought behind not pulling any from flood control is to keep the flood control reserves at a level to account for another sump scraping if needed in 2012 and to help cover the dike repair costs.

Feedback-

- Drawing from reserves is not a sustainable method to offset budget shortfalls.
- Include a scenario with no milfoil treatment

- Include a scenario with current level of service, no extra reserve drawdown
- Present these scenarios in newsletter and at summer meeting for community input and then discuss at the next AB meeting.
- No vote took place on the submitted budget scenarios.

Other

Lake Cleanup Day

A dock cleanup day was discussed, where residents can float derelict docks to a collection point for demolition and removal. Considerations include: backhoe or other such equipment may be needed to lift heavy docks for demo. Disposal location and cost needs to be established. Transportation to disposal site also needs to be established. Possible use of Geiger inmate crew to help. This will be discussed further in the future.

The next Advisory Board meeting date will be arranged via e-mail.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jacob McCann
NLFCZD Staff