
PRESIDENT'S NOTES

by Teresa J. Platin, CH2M Hill, President, AWRA Washington Section

As autumn begins, it is time to consider the changes ahead. The weather forecasters are promising us a wet and chilly winter. More precipitation than usual will keep us on our toes in this profession. From widespread riverine flooding to localized problems, people, infrastructure, wildlife, natural resources and agriculture will be impacted. It is staggering to think of the federal funding that goes into emergency management to help disaster areas, the money that goes towards reversing destruction (such as the loss of valuable salmon habitat), and the local monetary and human resources applied to these issues. It is also fascinating to see the attempts to mitigate or better yet, flat out avoid these problems. The signs of change are many. The Corps of Engineers, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Department of Ecology, and other permitting agencies have tightened up their stormwater permitting processes. King County issued its revised Surface Water Design Manual last fall, and now the Department of Ecology has released Volumes I, II and IV of its Stormwater Manual for public review. The agencies are working hard to address ESA concerns and the usual flooding, erosion and sedimentation issues, especially in the face of numerous projects in the works or being planned. The King County Surface Water Design Manual is far-reaching in its goals, and certainly something the County can be proud of. I have yet to review the Ecology Draft, but I'm sure it also strives for excellence. It's evident though, from the tremendous backlog in the permitting agencies, and the early comments expressing skepticism about the sufficiency of either new manual to protect our resources, that we may not be there yet. And it is worth wondering if it ever will be possible to get "there." And while we're at it, where is "there" anyway?

Another, less dramatic and decidedly less philosophical change that is afoot is the annual change within AWRA. The Board will be up for re-election soon, and it is time to seize the opportunity to add one or more new members to the Board. We have had many volunteers helping on the various committees this year - all have contributed generously of their time and are much appreciated. The membership in general has been very active, whether attending dinner meetings, the annual conference, or contributing articles for the newsletter, it is a vibrant group. Nominations for the Year 2000 Washington Section AWRA Board can be sent to the Secretary, Fran Solomon (fran.solomon@metrokc.gov). Please be sure to vote in October when the ballots are made available. And as always, if you have suggestions for how to make this organization better meet your needs, please let us know. ☺

WASHINGTON SECTION WINS AWRA OUTSTANDING STATE SECTION FOR 1999!

It's my pleasure to pass on some fantastic news. We have been officially selected as the AWRA Outstanding State Section for 1999!

"...The Washington State Section has shown particular innovation in its programs, membership growth and establishing AWRA as a significant water resources professional organization throughout the entire state of Washington..." – excerpt from letter of notification from John Warwick, President of National AWRA.

Important Notices:

- Deadline for student fellowship applications is October 30. Applications can be obtained from our web site.
- This is the last newsletter for 1999 Members. **Please renew your membership now.** If you attended the June 1999 conference, you are a member for the year 2000.

<http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>

I-695 Is Anti-“Little Guy”

Brian Thomas, Freelance contributor

I-695 is an initiative on the November 2nd ballot (also known as the \$30 License Tab Initiative) that has two primary points: 1) It lowers all motor vehicle registration fees to \$30 and 2) It requires all future tax or fee increase by any local or state governmental entity to be approved by the voters. The backers of I-695 claim it's time to provide tax relief to all Washingtonians because we have a state surplus in excess of \$1 billion. In fact, passage of I-695 cuts more than \$1 billion from our state over the next two years. So it is safe to say our state's surplus won't last very long if this initiative passes.

To better understand why this initiative is detrimental to the state economy and the little guy, we need to explore the major problem with, and misconception of, I-695. The problem: I-695 is a poorly-crafted, short-sighted initiative that has been sold as “an initiative for the little guy” when, in fact, nothing could be further from the truth. The misconception: that this initiative will provide tax relief without impacting public services for Washingtonians. This is simply not true. Let's look at the facts and assess the real impacts to the “little guy.”

If you remove \$1 billion of income and replace it with your state savings, what happens when your savings reach \$0 in less than 2 years and you still need to provide public health, fire and police services, air and water quality, and transportation improvements? To compensate, we will get taxed through utility hikes or some other tax or fee, but it's clear that the little guy is not getting tax relief.

One year ago 58 percent of this state's voters endorsed Referendum 49 which uses this same motor vehicle tax to generate \$2 billion worth of transportation improvements. Passing Initiative 695 reverses the vote on Referendum 49 funding and will guarantee that all of us “little guys” will be sitting in traffic snarls for extra hours every week. This initiative will destroy the momentum voted in last year with Referendum 49.

I-695 stops future transportation improvements and current improvements already underway. Due to the uncertainty of cuts in their planned revenue, the Washington State Department of Transportation, cities, and counties have either slowed down or stopped progress on improvements that would benefit us right now. I-695 will effect more than a 25 percent cut in transit in total, and up to 60% for some systems, as well as severely cutting services in the Washington State Ferries program. Our current traffic congestion is about to get much worse.

This initiative adversely impacts more than just roads, transit and ferries. Air and water quality pro-

grams and services are also cut by I-695 and backers of this initiative have no plans for replacing these vital services.

I-695 will save the driver of a 1988 Honda Civic about \$75.00. This initiative will save the average luxury car owner \$500 to \$600 a year. Again, I'm struggling to find the benefits for us little guys. It's important to ask supporters of I-695 how they think they will make up the difference in state revenue without adding more taxes on us little guys.

If transportation and infrastructure improvements are not of great concern to you, how about public safety? I-695 will take more than \$360 million a year from local cities and counties and will severely impact fire and police services across the state. It gets worse. I-695 also guts public health and valuable programs including, but clearly not limited to, family counseling, elderly and handicapped transportation, air pollution control, school and public safety and mental health programs. The services listed above are essential for a civilized society. Should I-695 pass, these essential programs will be stripped to the bare minimum.

I-695 will really help the little guy in another area. Currently, nearly every other state that has a motor vehicle tax as low as I-695 proposes also has a state income tax. In many of these states, your vehicle is taxed as part of your property. In fact, language in I-695 supports making your vehicle part of your property tax. This doesn't sound like a tax break for the little guy. With cities already raising their utility taxes to soften the damaging impacts should this initiative pass, one can only wonder what the backers of I-695 mean by providing tax relief. It's time for the supporters of I-695 to understand how crippling passage of this initiative could be. There are no free lunches.

On a final note, I-695 will have us heading to the polls every month to vote on issues now decided by the legislature, city and county councils, school boards, fire districts and park boards. I-695 will now force us to waste time and money waiting for voters to approve the smallest tax and fee increases for necessary services. For example, if a park wants to increase a pavilion rental user fee, this becomes a vote of the people. If schools want to raise the price of school lunches by a nickel, another vote of the people is required. Instead of less government, I-695 creates more government and government gridlock that will eventually cost more than supporters of I-695 understand. It will choke the life right out of working governments. VOTE NO on I-695. Let's improve our traffic, transit and public services, not wreak havoc on them. ☹

Enhancement of Salmon Recovery Decision-Making Processes

by Keith Wolf – Senior Biologist, Golder Associates Inc.

Management of the fishery resources in the Pacific Northwest has one of the most complex set of variables and uncertainties anywhere in the world. Resource wars, stock complexities, overfishing, harvest allocation, the Endangered Species Act (ESA), urbanization, land-use, and the interests of citizens, sovereign governments and regional economies, all combine to make this true.

We are all aware that the Columbia River system, as one example, has been altered in ways detrimental to salmon and other fishes. However, values change with time. Where once we consciously traded fish for power and harvest-based economies, the return of healthy salmon runs is now priority, while retaining a high value on stable economies. The effort and commitment to be successful will be nothing short of monumental.

Currently, the Columbia River Basin, Puget Sound, and the Northwest in general, are arguably the epicenter for natural resource management and salmon recovery issues. The backdrop includes:

- Historical and ongoing conflicts over resource allocation;
- Fish life-history complexities;
- Harvest, hatcheries, habitat and hydropower issues;
- Endangered Species Act (ESA);
- Urbanization and land-use;
- Interests of citizens, sovereign governments and regional economies; and
- Regional decision-making processes.

Additionally, there are many factors driving the salmon recovery process, including:

- The ESA requires that species not be driven to extinction and obligates state/federal entities to ensure species survival and recovery;
- The Magnuson Act requiring that governments manage fish populations for sustainable fisheries;
- The return of healthy salmon populations being essential to the economic viability of many resource-based industries;
- Treaties, court-rulings, and the US constitution, require sound and effective stewardship of our natural resources, including salmon; and,
- Cultural and traditional resource use, and other societal values, requiring actions that ensure salmon and other wildlife survive and thrive.

Although the ESA mandates actions, proposed actions and plans must be scientifically credible and also sensitive to economic, social, and political realities. So, in the face of these complex issues and competing interests, how can decision-makers develop successful recovery strategies?

Management Philosophy and Decision Making

Currently, fish and wildlife managers are often faced with conflicting or contradictory analyses and with competing political and economic interests. Additionally, the responsibility for natural resource management frequently falls into a large number of jurisdictions having differing needs and values. It is therefore difficult to agree on the most fundamental aspects of the decision-making approach, e.g.: who should make decisions, and how should the process work.

Confounding the politics is biology, sometimes called a “soft science.” Because biologists and managers cannot always rely upon universal laws, as does physics and chemistry, they fall upon the next best thing: calculated risk. Using mathematics, and aided by computers, scientists have created an increasingly complex set of predictive approaches to make better decisions about salmon recovery. Since computers can think faster than scientists – not better, just faster - the computer programs can calculate the best possible approaches. Computer models are one of our best tools for determining how fish will respond to management decisions and recovery approaches.

Process Integration

The Northwest has examples of successful attempts to build consensus and work credibly towards salmon recovery. The “4-H’s”: habitat, hydro, hatcheries, and harvest are key components to salmon survival and recovery. This is something every scientist, economist, stakeholder, and citizen can agree on. However, the details often fragment this unanimity, and prevent these basics from being integrated into effective decisions. All parties must understand and concur with proposed salmon recovery strategies if they are ultimately to be successful. This will require that the decision-making processes be transparent to the public-at-large, and that all the affected parties are given the opportunity to participate.

In the end, it is human judgement that provides the input to the computer model and evaluates the results. Consensus, based on the best science and economic evaluation, is necessary to legitimize the two key components of decision making: the inputs (data and relative influence) used and the interpretation of the output. Working towards consensus and understanding combined with integration of all the best information and analysis, should be the focus of our progression towards successfully addressing this monumental task. ☞

Salmon and Watershed Democracy

by Martin Baker, City of Seattle ESA Facilitator

(excerpts from a presentation to the Washington Water Law Conference, Law Seminars International, May 1999)

To begin let me repeat a statement, which the Mayor of Seattle made several months ago. It was a comment repeated in a New York Time's editorial, thus indicating that the comment struck an eloquent and deep chord with the public. He said, "Perhaps by saving the salmon, we can save ourselves." This simple statement implies a lot, so let me see if I can scratch the eloquence and dig a little deeper into the statement's full implications.

The Chinook's declining population signals a warning that all is not well with our natural environment. Chinook need clean water, cool water, the right bugs and micro-organisms for food, the correct gravel size for spawning, and complex river shapes – meanders, pools, rapids, and riffles -- to hide in, feed in, and ultimately dodge and weave through, on their way to the sea.

The aquatic environment - that zone of the river, where it naturally meanders, is a complex system by itself. But it is also nurtured from the upland ecosystem where human beings live, and live not so lightly on the land. As water falls on the land, it gathers and percolates through land conditions that humans have affected, and then flows downhill to the river, and on to the sea. Through this process, what we as human beings do well, or badly, ends up in the salmon's home.

The need for clean water is obvious, and our common cause with salmon survival is pretty obvious. On the other hand, our common cause with the complexity of river systems is not so obvious. Not too long ago, as my daughter and I drove along a river shoreline straightened, rip-rapped, and lined with houses, she asked me whether there would be any undeveloped shoreline left when she raises a family. This question was at heart a spiritual question. If I am not connected, if I have no access to this river's life force, how can I be happy?

Our current paradigm reflects a western mind that is purposeful and usually seeks the shortest distance between two points. It is not surprising that it cannot grasp the connectivity of natural systems. The western mind has been trained in single-minded focus, and has produced some of the greatest advances in science. But such a mind can be, and usually is, blind to the subtleties on either side of a straight line, let alone the forces that act and react to the straight line, and cause future consequences.

In biology, there are no straight lines; there are only circles, and incredibly complicated interactions that lead to organic wholes, and trails that wind back on each other, and which make sense only when viewed in their totality – every force in biology is connected to every other. Biologists approach the challenge of salmon extinction with this fundamen-

tally complex, and holistic view – that the actions of men and women and their institutions have an influence - usually detrimental - on the salmon's home - and must therefore be controlled, corrected and better connected.

This view applies not just to what we will do in the future to keep from doing further harm, but to what we've done, which continues to do harm. In terms of the past, the answers may not be to simply reverse what has occurred, but instead to assess what is needed and integrate correct action with political pragmatism and feasibility on a regional scale, across urban, suburban, rural and forested landscapes.

No one, biologists included, can afford straight line thinking alone. Just as we must account for the complexity of biological systems, we must all account for complex political and social systems. The science of connectivity truly must be the politics of connectivity.

The National Marine Fisheries Service is asking us to assess the status of habitat functions, critical to salmon spawning, rearing, and migration, and commit to actions that will achieve the proper function of habitat over time. These include improved regulations, increased infrastructure investments, and an intelligent habitat investment strategy.

To succeed as a region in determining and implementing this mix of actions, we must address three major issues. I'll mention two briefly, spending the most time on the third -- watershed planning.

One issue is whether ESA, under section 9 and 11, can hold any person or institution accountable for past actions that has or is still causing harm to habitat, or only current and future actions that cause harm. Since the effects of past actions don't always have a clear end, this issue of accountability for the past is likely to be legally frustrating.

Second, we will need to address the variation in landscapes that exist between the forested headwaters and the developed estuary – scientifically and pragmatically. It would be nice to believe that we could apply the same standards throughout all landscapes, but it is simply impossible. And we need to agree on regulatory and restorative standards that address differences of the urban, suburban, rural and forested landscapes, and the salmon life stages dependent on these landscapes, and still achieve a fair allocation of costs for a scientifically sound recovery plan.

Finally, recovery plans need to be constructed based on the geography of the watershed. This represents a fundamental challenge to our 20th century political democracy. Counties, cities, and

land ownership patterns were established in the 19th century in the West.

Successful watershed planning groups will make recommendations that will require local, state, federal and tribal jurisdictions to act together, if the greatest benefit is to accrue to the salmon. Let me suggest a few principles that might help.

First, forget inventing a new government. At least for another 5-10 years, we are stuck with counties and cities as they are currently formed. It would take us more time and more controversy to develop the political intelligence and agreement to create some regional authority that might intellectually make more sense, than to do the hard work of figuring out how to collaborate across the current political boundaries and authorities. It can be done.

Second, saying it can be done means we can collaborate successfully. We must develop and support effective watershed planning institutions that are representative of our diverse stakeholders. Their focus must be on assembling the biological assessment for the watershed, identifying limiting factors, and prioritizing actions for salmon conservation throughout a given watershed. The NMFS 4(d) rule may be an opportunity for governments to agree on the scope and participants for watershed planning, and the deadlines by which governments must enact, change, or resolve recommendations that result from watershed planning. But even if it is not, governments must seek to invest in watershed processes and implement their recommendations.

Keep in mind that the state models aren't adequate. HB 2514 didn't respect tribal sovereignty rights, and HB 2496 didn't provide funding for organizing and planning. To enable watershed institutions (whatever form they take) to develop a recovery plan, we must fund them adequately. Scientific watershed assessments could easily cost \$500,000 and the collaborative planning process, another \$500,000, not including the costs for required long term monitoring.

Third, we need a respected institution to allocate whatever federal, state, and regional dollars are made available to fund a set of action priorities. This institution doesn't currently exist, though there are reasonable models to pursue. One might be a tri-county or Puget Sound nonprofit organization. The board of directors could consist of leaders from the tribes, environmental community, business, and government. It could be associated with a broad pool of scientists who would provide a service of advising the board on the project priorities set by the watersheds, and assist in establishing a set of regional or cross basin priorities.

Another model is a single purpose government agency for the implementation of priority actions, similar to the Puget Sound Air Quality Authority.

Yet another comes from the development of the President's forest plan several years ago. The White House could establish a coordinating body to integrate policy, science and watershed planning across a whole ESU, such as Puget Sound. Such a group could develop a Puget Sound-wide "Expectations for Watershed Planning" document supported by the NMFS, Puget Sound Tribes, the state and local governments. This document would identify required elements of a recovery plan, including "watershed resource compacts" that spell out the roles and relationships between underlying jurisdictions and the watershed group. It could further define the scope, planning boundaries, funding, accountability, monitoring, and work schedule of the watershed.

Finally, the water supply institutional problem must be solved. At least within Central Puget Sound, we do not have an absolute water quantity problem for fish or people - we have a failure to develop the institutional and legal solutions that would allow us to make water available where it is needed, when it is need, whether for people or fish.

One solution to this problem would allow water utilities to collaborate on achieving aggressive conservation standards, assist with watershed assessments, and establish and enhance instream flows over time, responsive to changes in long-term hydrologic cycles.

Utilities, the tribes, and other stakeholders need to create a negotiation table, with clear principles of collaboration, and work until there is agreement to implement good solutions. Through disciplined collaborative effort, the interests could agree on the means to pool water rights and combine utility service areas in order to make water available in ways that strengthen our urban growth boundaries, preserve senior water rights, and solve instream flow problems. We can develop watershed compacts, thereby providing practical and effective agreements to address land use, water quality and water quantity issues as they relate to salmon conservation.

I began with Paul Schell's comment that, "Perhaps by saving the salmon, we can save ourselves." Truly this challenge before us is a spiritual and cultural one. But on a day to day basis, it is also about making our democracy work where the salmon live - in the watersheds. Bill Ruckelshaus described the salmon challenge recently in these terms - it is a test of our ability to create and implement a civil, democratic society. If we cannot do it here, it cannot be done.

Thank You! ☺

Government in Water

by Joshua Ford, Golder Associates Inc

Frederick Remington's "Defending the Waterhole" left a spectral trace in my mind of prints I thumbed at an art dealership downtown last weekend. The print, originally an oil on canvas, portrayed two cowboys bivouacked beneath the bank of a small pond; rifles drawn in defense of the water hole against horse-mounted Native Americans. The print seemed precariously appropriate to me in light of many recent water resources disputes in Washington State-- but, on a more fundamental level, it depicts a struggle that has lasted millennia.

"The crisis of our diminishing water resources is just as severe (if less obviously immediate) as any wartime crisis we have ever faced. Our survival is just as much at stake as it was at the time of Pearl Harbor, or the Argonne, or Gettysburg, or Saratoga.

Jim Wright, U.S. Representative, 1966

Water resources have been "the future" throughout history. Civilizations have flourished and disappeared because of water resources. Old news? My point exactly-- but what can we learn from our history? Remington showed the two rifling settlers and Native Americans fighting not only for their lives, but for their futures. In Washington State, we have our political rifles drawn in a similar manner-- though the situation may not be as immediately life threatening as Remington's depiction.

A flight from Missoula to Seattle painted for me fingernail-sized towns huddled amidst river-wrinkled hills. I saw the northwest pour out in front of me. Where there was a river, there was a town. Where there were checkerboard crops, there were irrigation ditches slanting across the fields. I saw history unfold as we flew westward. The settlements grew in population, the cropped fields grew in size. Rivers became dammed and pooled. The towns began to light with the setting sun: powered by these dams. Towns grew to cities, and the rivers disappeared beneath them -- culverted, channeled. The water was there, but it was in the wrong place.

Historically, the water resources policy in the west has been oriented to promote development. Development was encouraged by the availability of inexpensive quality water for industrial and developmental use. This policy is now changing, and the battles over water have begun anew with the ESA, GMA, SMA, and many other acronymically described regulatory documents that leave corporations, municipalities, and developers 'redd' in the face. The fury of 'Defending the Waterhole'

has thus been refreshed. Water has become scarce, and regulatory action has by default become necessary.

"As concerns the draft of water by private consumers, it is to be noted: No one shall draw water without an authorization from Caesar, that is, no one shall draw water from the public supply without a license, and no one shall draw more than has been granted."

Sextus Julius Frontinus, 96 CE

Government regulation of water resources dates from pre-history. The vehemence of water battles throughout history have required government intervention, which ideally allows disputing parties to co-exist within the same society. One thing I've observed during my involvement in water resources allocation is that often battling parties are unwilling to even sit at the same table, much less discuss reasonable solutions to their problems. This to me seems like the Persians and Athenians showing up at Marathon on different days, each snobbishly claiming an impalpable victory and walking away. In order for disputes to be resolved, the battling parties must come face to face. Only then, may the dispute be resolved: else swords will be sharpened for another day.

Salmon vs Development vs Industry vs Municipalities vs Joe Smith's water right. The State, unwittingly, finds itself in a unique position to get all involved parties at the same table; and they should require it. It is understood that the State is under extreme pressure in these times of dispute, but I think we all hope it will rise to the challenge. Even Camus respected a fair judge.

"The shining water that moves in the streams and rivers is not just water, but the blood of our ancestors.

Chief Seattle, Chief of the Suquamish

Never before in history has there been such a movement to rebuild the hydrologic cycle to allow all species of life to thrive. As scientists and engineers, we best understand the technical components of water and the life it contains. People will look to us for the answers regarding how to manage this water. But if we can't sit at the same table and share our knowledge, nothing will be resolved. The water hole will run dry before a victor is found. It's time to turn our swords into plowshares: there's work to be done. ☸

Meetings/Conferences

[Editor's note: Announcements of other organizations are included here. To include your announcement, contact cpitre@golder.com. Links to these organizations are provided through our web page at <http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>.

October Dinner Meeting: "Biological Assessments – Do's & Don't"

presented by Keith Macdonald (CH2M-Hill) & Ben Brown (WSDOT)

Wednesday, October 27, 1999 5:30 Social & 6:15 Dinner and Program at the Rocksalt Steakhouse (formerly Latitude 47 Restaurant: see web site for map)

The application of the Endangered Species Act to everyday activities is becoming more of a reality in Western Washington. When the National Marine Fisheries Services proposes the recovery strategy, the take prohibition will go into effect. For some parts of the state with endangered species listed, the take prohibition is in effect now. Whether or not your proposed project will result in a take of a listed species, in part depends on the biological assessments conducted for the proposed project. The biological assessments are the "science foundation" to the biological opinion issued by the service agencies.

Come and learn more about biological assessments and their use from two practitioners, Mr. Keith Macdonald is with CH2M-Hill and has conducted biological assessments for specific project development. Mr. Ben Brown (invited) works with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Northwest Office, within the Environmental Affairs section. WSDOT has been involved in many road construction projects for which biological assessments have been required. The experiences of WSDOT in the development of the biological assessments and working with the resource agencies is a current model for others.

For more information Contact Steve Hirschey, Water Resources Program, Department of Ecology, 3190 160th Avenue SE, Bellevue, WA 98008-5452. Please direct any phone inquiries to Steve at 425.649.7066.

October 27-29, 1999. Confronting Uncertainty: Managing Change in Water Resources and the Environment. British Columbia Branch of the Canadian Water Resources Association. Vancouver, BC. Call for papers. ☞

December 5-9, 1999. "Watershed Management to Protect Declining Species" AWRA National Annual Conference. Seattle, WA. Sponsored by the WA Section of AWRA. ☞

Ecology Goes to Court for 6-Pack Clarification

OLYMPIA (October 13, 1999) – Within the next couple of weeks Ecology will seek a decision from Yakima County Superior Court on whether a subdivision in Yakima County needs a water-right permit to drill wells for water.

Campbell & Gwinn is the developer who purchased the property from E.A. and Beverly White, with the intention of building and selling 20 homes. The developer and the Whites have agreed to join Ecology in seeking a court decision interpreting an exemption that allows property owners to withdraw up to 5,000 gallons of water a day from a well without a water-right permit.

Ecology, the developer and the property seller are interested in getting a clear answer on whether a development, which will cumulatively withdraw more than 5,000 gallons of well water, needs a water right permit.

"This is a significant water-use case focused on exempt withdrawals -- a long-standing challenge for water management in Washington state," said Keith Phillips, Ecology's manager for water resources. "As interpreted by the Office of the Attorney Gen-

eral, the exemption appears to be intended for individual homes and small developments – not large housing developments."

(The use of multiple exempt wells to service larger developments has been called the "6-pack" approach since compliance with Department of Health regulations are simpler with six or less connections per single well. See the Attorney-General's opinion: <http://www.wa.gov/ecology/biblio/971801wr.html>.)

Phillips said the request for a court opinion is likely to be filed the week of Oct. 18th.

As a separate action, Ecology recently issued an order to stop the S.D.S. Company in Bingen, from drilling wells for a housing development in Klickitat County. The company did not appeal the order.

Well drillers put in approximately 8,000 water wells each year that are exempt from water right permitting. State law requires people to get a water-right permit for all surface-water withdrawals and withdrawals of ground water of more than 5,000 gallons of water per day.

Annual General Section Meeting

Election of Board of Directors

The Washington Section's annual general membership/business meeting will be held at the offices of Jones & Stokes Associates (2820 Northup Way, Bellevue, WA), November 17th 1999 at 5:30 (open to all members). A slate of nominees has been prepared by the Nominating Committee; however, please add to this list as appropriate. Self-nominations are acceptable. Short biographical sketches of each candidate will be available at the annual meeting. Members current at the time of the meeting are invited to attend and participate in the election.

2000 AWARA Washington Section Board of Directors – Nomination Ballot

Please nominate one person for each position. Write-in candidates (current 1999 members only) will be considered.

- President:** Peter Sturtevant, *CH2M HILL*
Other: _____
- Vice-President:** Fran Solomon, *King County Dept. of Natural Resources*
Other: _____
- Secretary:** Steve Hirshey, *Department of Ecology*
Other: _____
- Treasurer:** Ingrid Wertz, *Taylor Associates*
Other: _____
- Editor:** Chris Pitre, *Golder Associates*
Other: _____
- Director-East:** Stan Miller, *Spokane County Planning & Engineering*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Grant Bailey, *Jones & Stokes Associates*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Naomi Chechowitz, *WA Department of Transportation*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Chris Cleveland, *Brown & Caldwell*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Adam Gravley, *Preston Gates & Ellis*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Logan Harris, *Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Erin Nelson, *King County*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Ann Root, *Consultant*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Rod Sakrison, *Department of Ecology*
Other: _____
- Director-West** Mike Wert, *Shapiro & Associates*
Other: _____

WA Section AWRA Board Members

President: Teresa J. Platin
(425) 453-5005, x5235
tplatin@ch2m.com

Vice President: Peter Sturtevant
(425) 453-5005, x5284
psturtev@ch2m.com

Treasurer: Mike Wert
(206) 624-9190
mwert@shap.com

Newsletter Editor: Chris V. Pitre
(425) 883-0777
cpitre@golder.com

Secretary: Fran Solomon
(206) 296-1924
fran.solomon@metrokc.gov

Past-President: Adam Gravley
(425) 623-7580
adamg@prestongates.com

Director: Stan Miller
(509) 456-6024
smiller@spokanecounty.org

Director: Grant Bailey
(425) 893-6429
grantb@jsa.com

Director: Chris Cleveland
(360) 943-7525
ccleveland@brwncald.com

Director: Logan Harris
(360) 424-8226
lharris@nwifc.wa.gov

Director: Stephen Hirschey
(425) 649-7066
shir461@ecy.wa.gov

Director: Erin Nelson
(206) 543-6272
ejnelson@u.washington.edu

Director: Rodney Sakrison
(425) 649-4447
rsak461@ecy.wa.gov

Director: Ingrid Wertz
(206) 784-3132
ingridw@nwlink.com

Student Chapter President:
Kurt Marx
(206) 616-9145
marx@u.washington.edu

Faculty Advisor:
Derek Booth
(206) 543-7923
dbooth@u.washington.edu

This newsletter is a publication of the Washington Section of the American Water Resources Association. It is published bi-monthly or quarterly. This is a forum for members to share ideas and opinions; opinions expressed in the AWRA Newsletter are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the WA Section of AWRA.

Reprints and circulation for non-profit purposes are allowed without additional permission if proper credit is given to both the source and the author.

Submissions are welcome for the January/February, 2000 newsletter. The submittal due date is January 7, 1999. The editor reserves the right to make changes for reasons of length, grammar, legality or clarity. Contact Chris Pitre at (425) 883-0777, or send submittals directly via:

Internet Mail: cpitre@golder.com (most document/graphic formats are acceptable). Recent newsletters are available on: <http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>

What this State Section is All About!

The WA State Chapter of the AWRA fosters educational and professional development.

Student support is provided in the form of two annual student fellowships, sponsorship of a student chapter at the University of Washington, underwriting of a special meeting in the late spring hosted by the student chapter, and other subsidies.

Interorganizational support is fostered with local, interstate and international organizations.

A **bimonthly newsletter** is published containing in-depth analysis and editorials on current issues.

Several **dinner meetings** are held throughout the year providing good food and good company followed by a presentation by featured guests. **Brownbags** are organized on special issues as they arise.

The annual climax is the **Annual Section Fall Conference**, the next one which will be held in November, 2000. The Conference is the principal funding vehicle for many Section activities, including providing financial support to the Section's Student Fellowship program.

A **dedicated board** of 15 members meets regularly to plan, organize and facilitate events.

The Washington Chapter has been selected to host the **1999 National AWRA Conference** in Seattle.

If you wish to learn more about your Section and/or wish to participate more in Section activities, you will be warmly welcomed. Please contact any of the board members listed in the side board to the left.

AWRA'S ANNUAL WATER RESOURCES CONFERENCE

***“WATERSHED MANAGEMENT TO PROTECT DECLINING SPECIES” and
“SYMPOSIUM ON WATER RESOURCES ON THE WORLD WIDE WEB”***

December 5-9, 1999 at the Seattle Sheraton Hotel

This is a reminder that the Washington State Section is hosting AWRA's national conference this year. We have been telling you about this event, kept you informed during its planning stages and sought your assistance in its preparation. With lots of support from our state section membership, the conference is now quickly approaching. We are pleased with how it has developed. Here are some of the highlights of what to expect:

- Over 150 professional papers will be presented. The papers will be published in Proceedings, which will be given to registered attendees at the beginning of the conference.
- Three significant tracts will be discussed at the conference: **Endangered Species Act, Watershed Management and Ecosystem Restoration.**
- The Symposium on Water Resources and the World Wide Web promises to be informative, stimulating and a great opportunity to broaden your awareness of cutting-edge technology.

While stressing the technical value of the conference, it should be underscored that this will be a great opportunity to meet our peers in the field of water resources management. Both firms and individuals will benefit from interacting and exchanging ideas with water management technical experts and key political leaders.

REGISTER EARLY. Super-Saver fees must be post-marked by October 29. Early Bird registration fees cut off at November 19, after which full registration fees are charged. If you would like to receive a Preliminary Program please call Rod Sakrison (425) 649-4447 or Pete Sturtevant (425) 453-5005.

Pre-Conference Educational Workshops

The Washington State Section will be conducting three pre-conference workshops at the Seattle Sheraton Hotel. Registration of the Workshops is through the Washington State Section. Registration for the Workshops must be received by November 19.

Saturday/December 4 & Sunday/December 5 - 8:30 am-5:00 pm

#1 - WATER FROM NATURAL AND MANAGED WATERSHED / Cost: \$120.00 (no lunches included)

Peter E. Black, Ph.D., SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, New York.

This workshop presents the tools to better understand the science to control nonpoint sources of pollution in watersheds. Case studies, including New York City's drinking water system, will be presented to understand the principles, functions and relationships in watershed management.

Sunday/December 5 - 9:00 am -1:00 pm

#2 - WATERSHED CHARACTERIZATION AND MONITORING / Cost: \$45.00 (no lunches included)

Paul J. Pickett, Washington State Dept. of Ecology, Olympia, Washington

This workshop will provide an overview of watershed characterization and monitoring programs by the Department of Ecology. It will provide a better understanding of the variety of watershed characterization and monitoring projects, the importance of objectives and an appreciation of the complexities of each kind of monitoring.

Sunday/December 5 - 9:00 am - 5:00 pm

#3 - WATERWAYS RESTORATION / Cost: \$90.00 (no lunches included)

Tentative Speakers: Dan Billman, HDR, Inc.; Greg Koone, Inter-Fluve; Steve Foster, HDR, Inc.

This workshop will develop participant's understanding of waterway restoration projects from planning, through analysis, engineering, and construction, and monitoring and adaptive management approaches.

To Register for the Workshops please complete this form and return to Rod Sakrison, Department of Ecology, 3190 160th Ave., SE, Bellevue, WA 98008 (Phone: 424-649-4447)

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone # _____ E-mail Address _____

Please Register Me For (Please Circle Your Choice) #1 Workshop #2 Workshop #3 Workshop

Enclosed is my check in the amount of _____ (Please make payable AWRA, WA State Section)

(Each workshop is subject to cancellation if a minimum number of registrations are not received by November 19, 1999. In the event of cancellation, checks will be returned.)

**OTHER EVENTS OF INTERST OCCURING IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE
AWRA'S ANNUAL WATER RESOURCES CONFERENCE**

The Washington State Section invites our membership to attend several evening events accompanying the Annual Conference. These events are for the enjoyment of current members of the AWRA Washington State Section, Washington Student Chapter, and all conference registrants. You don't need to be attending the Conference to come to these events. Admittance at these events is COMPLEMENTARY.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7TH AWRA's WATER KNOWLEDGE BOWL 6:30 pm - 8:00 pm

Several AWRA Student Chapters will play host to a 'Water Knowledge Bowl.' The student chapters will be joining together to pose difficult questions for opposing panels of water resources professionals. One panel will represent AWRA's Washington State Section, and the other panel will be comprised of water professionals from throughout the country. The students are expected to be uncompromising in their pursuit of knowledge. It promises to be a real test, pitting the Washington State Section against all comers.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7TH AWRA's MILLENNIAL BALL 8:00 pm - 11:00 pm

Following the 'Knowledge Bowl' you are all welcome to shift gears and get down to some real partying. The Washington State Section is host to an evening of entertainment, socializing and dancing. The 'AWRA All-Stars' will be playing some straight-ahead rock'n'roll, R&B, Motown and other styles. The 'All Stars' are anchored by bookend State Section Past-Presidents, Paul Korsmo and Rod Sakrison, long-time semi-pro band mates and water professionals. Sitting-in on drums for some songs will be current national AWRA President, Prof. John Warwick from the University of Florida. Early commitments to join-in on guitar have come from Bill Derry, CH2MHILL-Bellevue, a leader in stormwater management, and Prof. David Montgomery, University of Washington, noted fluvial geomorphologist and weekend rocker. In addition to the music and dancing, there is promise of other entertainment and awards to usher in the new Millennium. There will be snacks and hors devours, along with complementary beverages and a cash bar. State Section Members, Student Chapter members, and all conference registrants are welcome to attend with their spouses or a guest.

MILLENNIAL BALL RSVP

Yes, I plan on attending the evening of Tuesday, December 7th (open to members and non-members).

Name _____ Spouse or Guest _____

I am a current member (though October 2000) of the AWRA Washington State Section or Student Chapter: Yes _____. No, but this will be a good time to join or renew my membership _____.

(Please include a check for \$25.00 membership fee made out to AWRA Washington Section.)

Name _____ Position _____ Affilia-
tion _____

Street Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone () _____ Fax () _____ E-mail _____ @ _____

Yes, I would like to be actively involved on a committee _____.

Mail to: AWRA Washington State Section,
c/o Mike Wert, Shapiro & Associates
101 Yesler Way, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104.

Wednesday - December 8 STUDENT CAREER NIGHT 5:30 pm - 7:00 pm

Student Career Night is a special event aimed at providing career information to students and those new to the water resources field. A panel of representatives from federal, state, and local government, academia, and consulting firms will be assembled. Each will give a brief presentation on the opportunities in various fields. The discussion will include educational background and skills best suited for a successful career. After the presentation, the panel will answer questions. Individual members will be available for one-on-one discussions.

2000 Membership Application / Change of Address Form

(⅄ please circle, as appropriate ⌈)

Annual membership in the state chapter costs \$25.

(If you attended the 1999 June Conference, you are already a member for 2000 – Welcome!)

Name _____ Position _____ Affiliation _____

Street Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone(_____) _____ Fax(_____) _____ E-mail _____ @ _____

Check if you would like to be actively involved on a committee.
You will be contacted to determine what committee involvement you would like.

2000 Membership Dues (through October 2000): \$25.00. **Checks only.** Please make check payable to **AWRA Washington Section.**

Mail to: AWRA, Washington Section
c/o Mike Wert, Shapiro & Associates
101 Yesler Way, Ste. 400
Seattle, WA 98104

The American Water Resources Association is a scientific and educational non-profit organization established to encourage and foster interdisciplinary communication among persons of diverse backgrounds working on any aspect of water resources disciplines. Individuals interested in water resources are encouraged to participate in the activities of the Washington Section.

Special thanks to Golder Associates Inc. for word processing and graphics support on this newsletter.

American Water Resources Association, Washington Section
101 Yesler Way, Ste. 400
Seattle, WA 98104

Non Profit
U.S. Postage PAID
Seattle, WA
Permit #1399

A Membership Benefit

<http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>

Please Post & Circulate