

---

## PRESIDENT'S NOTES

### Global Warming, Water Resources, and Salmon Recovery

by Fran Solomon, President, AWRA Washington Section

During the past few months, I was fortunate to hear three outstanding presentations on the topic of global warming by speakers from the University of Washington and the Northwest Council on Climate Change. Each speaker presented persuasive evidence about this very real problem. I want to share the main points of their presentations and explain the linkages with the issues of concern to AWRA.

Global warming refers to an increase in the average temperature in the Earth's air and water. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the Earth's atmosphere causes the atmosphere to retain heat from the sun. Increasing the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere increases the amount of heat that is retained. Combustion of fossil fuels such as coal and oil is one of the major sources of additional atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> above and beyond the amount that is normally present as a byproduct of respiration in all organisms.

Over at least the past 600,000 years, the amount of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has fluctuated between 190 and 280 parts per million (ppm) by volume in 140,000-year cycles. Near the year 1800, CO<sub>2</sub> levels would normally have been in the downward part of the cycle. However, this didn't happen; CO<sub>2</sub> levels started to increase and continued to increase throughout the Industrial Revolution as combustion of fossil fuels increased. During the past two centuries, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels have increased 30% from their normal high of 280 ppm to 360 ppm, with 50% of this increase (40 ppm) occurring since 1970.

Staying at the 1X level (atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> level in 1800) or the 1X + 30% level (atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> level now) is not possible because there is a large time lag in the effects of burning fossil fuels. This means that if everyone were to stop burning all fossil fuels today, the effects of the last 200 years would still heat up the planet. If we get our act together within the next 40 years, we might get off at a stabilized 2X (CO<sub>2</sub> levels that are twice as high as they were in 1800) in 2050. If we miss this opportunity, then the Earth will rapidly be hitting 3X (2125) and 4X (2150). The current average summer temperature in Washington, D.C. is 85 degrees F; 2X conditions would mean an average summer temperature of 95 degrees and 4X would mean an average summer temperature of 110 degrees.

What would 2X conditions mean for water resources in the Pacific Northwest? For starters, the average annual temperature increase would be 5 Fahrenheit degrees. There would be more rain in the fall, winter, and spring, less snow in the mountains in the winter (even lower snowpacks than occurred this past winter!), and drier summers. These climate changes would result in decreased summer flows in rivers and streams (e.g. there would be a 20 to 30 % decrease in the flow of the Columbia River), and therefore less water for salmon, forests, hydroelectric power, and irrigation. Increased water temperatures in streams, rivers, estuaries, and oceans could impact the survival and health of salmon populations and could nullify the beneficial effects of the salmon conservation and recovery efforts that are currently underway. Other impacts of 2X conditions include rising sea levels, flooding, coastal erosion, and landslides. Several Washington cities including Everett, Olympia, Hoquiam, and Aberdeen would likely be underwater.

In the Pacific Northwest, we rely less on fossil fuels to heat our homes than in other parts of the U.S. However, I am sure that you have all noticed an increase in automobile density on our roads in the past 10 to 20 years. Over 60 % of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in Washington State is emitted from transportation-related sources. The majority of all new vehicles purchased are sport utility vehicles (SUVs); each tank of gas in the average SUV discharges 466 pounds of carbon dioxide into the air. Each of us can make a difference and be part of the solution to the global warming crisis by carpooling in energy-efficient cars and using alternative forms of transportation (bus, bicycle, walking) as much as possible.

For more information on global warming, its impacts, and actions that you can take to prevent CO<sub>2</sub> levels from rising above 2X, I highly recommend the web site of the Northwest Council on Climate Change ([www.nwclimate.org](http://www.nwclimate.org)).

---

The Washington Chapter of the AWRA Would like to acknowledge **Brown and Caldwell's** support of the 2000 Annual Conference and their continuing support.

BROWN AND  
CALDWELL

---

---

# Comprehensive Water System Plans – The Road Ahead

By Thomas M. Pors, Foster Pepper & Shefelman PLLC

**For reprinting permission, questions or comments please contact the author at (206) 447-2916.**

Recent legal disputes regarding municipal water rights have entered the arena of comprehensive water system planning, threatening to derail a process designed to assure the safety and adequacy of drinking water supplies, rather than through the adjudication of water rights. This article explores the dilemma of determining the validity and scope of municipal water rights after “George T” and concludes that the Comprehensive Water System Plan reviews are not the appropriate forum for resolving municipal water right issues.

**Background:** The Department of Health (DOH) Drinking Water Program regulates the development of new drinking water sources and the design, operation and construction of water treatment, storage and transmission infrastructure pursuant to the Drinking Water Regulations at Chapter 246-290 WAC. Among the requirements for new or expanding public water systems or those existing public water systems with over 1,000 service connections is the adoption and review of a Water System Plan (WSP) which identifies present and future water needs and the means for meeting them. WSPs must be updated and approved by DOH at least once every six years. WAC 246-290-100(5). One of the functions of the WSP is to determine whether the public water supplier has adequate capacity to meet expected water demands in the community (growth), including both physical capacity and the adequacy of water rights. Municipal suppliers initially assess their own water right adequacy in their WSPs, but these assessments are subject to DOH review and approval.

The method for determining whether a water supplier’s water rights are adequate to meet future demands has evolved from a cursory review of delivery system capacity for the peak demand (most plan approvals prior to 1996) to the current inter-departmental review that affords little to no due process protection to the water supplier and its customers. In June of 1999, DOH and the Department of Ecology (Ecology) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) relating to coordination of the agencies’ review of WSPs and public water system water right applications. This MOU confirmed an existing procedure whereby DOH sent proposed WSPs to Ecology for review of the adequacy of water rights, among other factors. The WSP update review process has occasionally fleshed out serious over-appropriations of water and left communities such as North Bend in a virtual building moratorium. As Ecology has questioned more aspects of municipal water rights, the number of WSPs questioned by Ecology has risen, prompting attempts at legislative fixes, threats of lawsuits, and proposed rule-making by Ecology. The relationship between Ecology and municipal water purveyors, and even between Ecology and DOH has been strained in the process, resulting in

a lack of trust that threatens the resolution of municipal water policy issues state-wide.

The stakes involved in WSP approvals, including the protection of municipal water rights, are very high for growing communities and their customers, who have a right to expect that their water supplies will not be curtailed without adequate legal protections. The stakes are also high for instream flow protection and salmon recovery, which could be impacted if water rights are exercised beyond their legal entitlement, and if water rights issues remain unresolved.

**George T and the Certificated Rights Controversy:** In *Dept. of Ecology v. Theodoratus*, 135 Wn.2d 582 (1998) the Washington Supreme Court held that a privately-owned water supplier could not perfect a water right by building system capacity alone – beneficial use of water by homes connected to the system is necessary prior to the issuance of a water right certificate. The Court specifically declined to address municipal water systems in the opinion, or whether they would be treated differently than other water rights because of differences in the statutory scheme. (See discussion of “Growing Communities Doctrine” below). However, this has not stopped Ecology from concluding that thousands of municipal water right certificates issued by Ecology and its predecessor agencies, based on the construction of delivery capacity (“pipes and pumps”) rather than metered water usage, were erroneously issued and are subject to rescission. Ecology has also questioned whether municipal purveyors can expand their service areas (“place of use” in water rights parlance) without amending their water rights, rather than relying on WSPs and approval of service area adjustments by DOH and the counties. Carrying its opinions into action, Ecology has questioned the scope and validity of municipal water right certificates in its review of WSPs, and requested that DOH withhold or limit approval of several individual WSPs until the water supplier could “straighten out” their water rights with Ecology. The expansion of water systems to serve new customers is threatened by these decisions. This case-by-case questioning of municipal water rights validity in the context of WSP reviews has impacted the community of Roosevelt in Klickitat County, and the cities of Entiat, Black Diamond and, more recently, Ellensburg. Dozens of cities and water districts have WSP updates due in the next one or two years, leading to an obvious need to solve this problem statewide. In the meantime, considerable friction and mistrust has arisen between these communities and Ecology, and even between Ecology and DOH. In fact, DOH is considering the option of ignoring Ecology comments on WSPs unless Ecology takes appealable action on against the water supplier.

**Water Rights Administration Rule:** Seeking to formalize its opinion regarding the applicability of *Theodoratus* to municipal water rights, Ecology proposed a new administrative rule in late 2000, which

---

would have clarified Ecology's process for reviewing WSPs and seeking rescission of pipes and pumps certificates. (Proposed Chapter 173-151 WAC). Substantial opposition to the rulemaking by municipalities led to legislative proposals that would have nullified Ecology's legal position (see discussion of Growing Communities Doctrine, below). The Governor intervened at the end of February 2001 with his own water strategy and convinced Ecology to table the rule's approach to municipal water rights. The Governor's intervention was appropriate, as Ecology was proceeding with rule-making without specific delegation from the legislature, without direction from the courts, and without cooperation with municipal water suppliers.

It is highly unlikely that Ecology could have defended a rule giving itself authority to rescind municipal water right certificates in the course of reviewing WSPs, because that would amount to a determination of the scope and validity of such water rights, a function the legislature delegated to the superior courts, not to Ecology. In *Rettkowski v. Ecology*, 122 Wn. 2d 219 (1993) (also known as the "Sinking Creek" case), the Supreme Court held that Ecology cannot determine the validity of water rights in order to regulate as between water rights with different priority dates, adjudication being the exclusive province of the superior courts. While Ecology staff have characterized pipes and pumps certificates as *ultra vires* and containing errors that need correction, the *Rettkowski* case prohibits Ecology from making determinations regarding the validity of municipal water rights, including whether a right is inchoate or perfected, or whether due diligence is being exercised. Such determinations constitute a de facto adjudication of water rights in contravention of *Rettkowski* and the Water Code.

At most, Ecology is authorized to "consult" with DOH in order to "integrate their efforts to the fullest extent possible and endorse policies in common." RCW 43.21A.140. Ecology also has a duty to "coordinate approval procedures [with DOH] to ensure compliance and consistency with the approved water system plan." RCW 90.03.386. The latter statute seems to operate in the reverse of the proposed Water Rights Administration Rule. Ecology is required to coordinate with DOH to ensure that its water rights application decisions are consistent with approved WSPs, but this does not authorize Ecology or DOH to withhold WSP approval based on Ecology determinations of municipal water right validity, especially outside the context of a municipal water right application. DOH is also constrained by *Rettkowski* from making determinations of water right validity and it has no agency expertise interpreting water rights or Western law in general. Therefore, another forum is necessary to resolve the interpretation of pipes and pumps certificates, place of use and other municipal issues.

**Growing Communities Doctrine:** In response to Ecology's proposed rulemaking and intervention in WSP reviews, the Washington Water Utility Council (WWUC) published a "Growing Communities White Paper" and prepared draft legislation designed to clarify state law. The Growing Communities Doctrine and proposed legislative clarifications recognize that municipal water rights allow for expansion in the place of use (service area) and for growth of public water systems over a reasonable time to serve our growing communities. The Governor's water strategy requested that this legislation be put on hold until the 2002 Legislative Session.

**Governor's Strategy:** The Governor's water strategy (dated February 28, 2001) describes a four-year plan to resolve water issues. Pursuant to the strategy, Ecology has suspended development of municipal water rights rules until after enactment of the Growing Communities Legislation and Ecology will not initiate any new litigation regarding municipal water rights. It remains to be seen how the Governor's strategy will develop through the 2001 Legislative Session and thereafter. Legislative funding for the Governor's Water Team, led by Jim Waldo, is uncertain. Hopefully this intervention on municipal water right issues, or its follow-up, will lead to consensus legislation in coming sessions that will avoid litigation and protect both growing communities and the environment. If the strategy fails, and Ecology or third parties continue to challenge municipal water rights, either the Legislature will have to find its own solution for growing communities, or the courts will be called on, perhaps in multiple cases.

**Conclusion:** Ultimately what both municipal water suppliers and the environment need is more certainty regarding usage of water resources for people and fish. An inflexible legal application of agriculture-based water law doctrine will not satisfy the needs of our growing populations. New state policy is required that recognizes municipal water rights as vital to serving the current and future needs of the people. Municipalities must also take responsibility for conserving water and protecting instream uses (fish) and water quality, or the state and federal governments will be compelled to do so. Considering Ecology's failed attempts to resolve these issues, municipal water suppliers should be given the responsibility and flexibility they need to manage both issues in a coordinated manner. In the interim, case-by-case enforcement actions against municipal water purveyors are possible, perhaps prompted by citizen complaints and Ecology investigations. The Governor's strategy may have bought one more year of security for municipal WSP updates, but this is not a time for complacency. The coming months are critical for municipal leaders to forge consensus solutions to these issues. ∞

---

---

# How Should Water Rights Be Administered In Washington?

By Steve Hirshey, Washington Department of Ecology

**Some Background:** Our water management system must sustain both local communities and the natural systems on which we all rely. The allocation and appropriation of water is but one part of water management. Water rights are the mechanism to allow people, cities, farmers, parks and industries to legally use water. For example, cities and housing developments have water rights to provide water to homes and parks, farmers have water rights to irrigate crops and industries have water rights to run manufacturing facilities. Since 1917, Washington state has issued water right permits that allow people to install pipes or wells to withdraw water from lakes, streams and underground aquifers. Once the water has been put to use in accordance with the permit, Ecology (the agency now responsible for issuing water rights) issues water right certificates. Today, citizens and organizations hold approximately 65,000 water right permits and certificates. In addition, approximately 7,200 individuals, communities, and businesses have applied for new permits.

**Proposal to change how water rights are administered:** The water right administration system must protect existing rights, provide timely and predictable decisions and ensure clear accountability. The current water right rules, adopted in 1960, are quite brief and do not address many key issues that frequently arise in the water rights process. Ecology has proposed to update the rule because it is out of date with the current practices and directions of administering water rights. Over time, the way water rights are issued and managed has changed. Ecology is looking to talk with people about how best to develop a rule for administering and managing water right permits. Consistency, clarity and predictability should be self-evident when Ecology administers water rights. Communities, businesses and others who supply water to people, businesses and farms in our state deserve predictability. A goal of the

regulation is to provide guidance to Ecology staff, water right permit holders and applicants on how the agency administers water rights. The proposed rule is a first step toward replacing the current rule (see chapter 508-12 WAC) that is outdated and incomplete. The current rule does not reflect more than 40 years of legislative and case laws, we need to catch up with the times.

In November of 2000, Ecology proposed a draft scope of a rule that would answer questions such as:

- What is necessary to request the extension of a development of a water right permit pursuant to RCW 90.03.320?
- How is due diligence and reasonable progress to be evaluated both looking at the past and to the future?
- What is evidence of good faith on the part of the water right holder to use the water within a reasonable timeframe?
- What is a reasonable timeframe? If due regard by the decision-maker is given for the public interests affected, how is the public interest determined?

Regarding perfection of a water right: What information is necessary to show water has been legally put to use? What is required of a water right permit holder prior to Ecology issuing a certificate of water right? How does the applicant show that the conditions of the permit have been met? How does Ecology correct past administrative errors? How are water right certificates issued under the pumps and pipes policy evaluated? See AWRA Newsletter July 1998 (available on line at <http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>) for articles concerning Ecology's implementation of the Washington State Supreme Court's Ecology v. George Theodoratus, 135 Wn. 2d 582, 957 P. 2d 1241 (1998) decision.☺

---

---

## Help Restore Streamside Habitat with UW Student Chapter

By Johnny Grady, President of the University of Washington Student Chapter

During the summer of 1998 the student chapter adopted habitat restoration sites at Swamp Creek. Swamp Creek is an urban stream that flows into the Sammamish River near the north end of Lake Washington. Each year the chapter visits the lower reaches of the stream to maintain and monitor the sites as part of the King County Habitat Partners Program. In early spring of 1998, King County planted both banks with spruce and cedar saplings in an effort to improve habitat in this urban

stream. Today troublesome invasive weeds at the Swamp Creek sites threaten these plants. During our last visit we discovered that the main threats included Japanese knotweed, reed canary grass, and blackberry.

The reed canary grass at the lower restoration sites is growing incredibly fast (like a weed!) and unless we act now, we may never find the native plants on site again. At one of the lower sites the "trampling" technique is used as an alternative to

the traditional method of cutting reed canary grass while pruning shears are used along the banks of the creek to cut back the rampant blackberries. Ongoing volunteer maintenance will be the key to the success of this restoration project. Our next visit to the site will be April 28, 2001, 8:30am – noon. If this sounds like fun and you are interested in lending hand, you can contact us at [awra@u.washington.edu](mailto:awra@u.washington.edu). For more information on the AWRA Student Chapter or visit our web site at <http://students.washington.edu/>.

---

---

## Upcoming Events

**April 19, 2001. ASCE Water Resources Brown Bag.** Bellevue, Washington.

**May 1-3, 2001. PNWS-AWWA Conference.** Yakima, Washington.

**May 8-11, 2001. CWRA BC Branch Conference: Changing Water Environments: Research And Practice.** Whistler Conference Centre, Whistler, B.C., Canada

**May 17, 2001. AWRA Washington State Chapter Joint Social with AWRA-University of Washington Chapter,** University of Washington Waterfront Activities Center. For additional information email Johnny Grady, [awra@u.washington.edu](mailto:awra@u.washington.edu)

**May 20-24, 2001. ASCE (EWRI) World Water and Environmental Resources Congress.** Orlando, Florida.  
<http://www.asce.org/conferences>.

**May 20-24, 2001. ASCE (EWRI) Specialty Symposium: Integrated Surface and Ground Water Management Symposium, and the Urban Drainage Modeling Symposium.** Orlando, Florida.  
<http://www.asce.org/conferences>.

**June 5-6, 2001. Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team, Low Impact Development: A Conference On Innovative Stormwater Management Practices. Low Impact Development 2001,** SeaTac, Washington. <http://www.nwaep.org/Calendar.htm>

**June 27-30, 2001. AWRA Summer Specialty Conference: Decision Support Systems for Water Resources Management.** Snowbird, Utah. <http://www.awra.org/meetings/future.html>.

**June 27-30, 2001, Transbasin Water Transfer, A USCID Water Management Conference.** Denver, Colorado. For additional information email Larry Stephens, [stephens@uscid.org](mailto:stephens@uscid.org).

**August 27-31, 2001. Wetlands Engineering & River Restoration Conference 2001.** Reno, Nevada.

**November 15, 2001 AWRA Washington State Chapter Annual Fall Conference,** Albuquerque, New Mexico.

AWRA holds National, Regional, and State Conferences. Further information on future meeting schedules can be found on the AWRA Web-site <http://www.awra.org/meetings/future.html>.

### The Northwest Geological Society

(<http://www.scn.org/tech/nwgs/index.htm>) holds meetings or field trips. A list of the planned meetings and trips is <http://www.scn.org/tech/nwgs/calendar.htm#Calendar>

**The Washington Hydrologic Society** holds monthly meetings. Further information is available from Brian Drost at (253) 428-3600 ex. 2642 (<mailto:bwdrost@usgs.gov>) or Llyn Doremus (360) 592-2632 (<mailto:ladoremus@aol.com>).

For more information and web site links visit the AWRA Washington Chapter Web site at <http://earth.golder.com/waawra>.

---

---

### WA-AWRA Board Members

President: Fran Solomon  
(206) 296-1924  
[fran.solomon@metrokc.gov](mailto:fran.solomon@metrokc.gov)

Vice-President: Steve Hirschey  
(425) 649-7066  
[shir461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:shir461@ecy.wa.gov)

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

Secretary: Erin Nelson  
(206) 615-0838  
[erin.nelson@ci.seattle.wa.us](mailto:erin.nelson@ci.seattle.wa.us)

Treasurer: Ingrid Wertz  
(206) 633-4486  
[ingridw@taylorassoc.net](mailto:ingridw@taylorassoc.net)

Past-President: Peter Sturtevant  
(425) 453-5000 ext. 5284  
[psturtev@ch2m.com](mailto:psturtev@ch2m.com)

Director: Karen Allston  
(253)-939-3311  
[karen.allston@muckleshoot.nsn.us](mailto:karen.allston@muckleshoot.nsn.us)

Director: Grant Bailey  
(425) 822-1077  
[grantb@jsanet.com](mailto:grantb@jsanet.com)

Director: Susan Bolton  
(206) 685-7651  
[sbolton@u.washington.edu](mailto:sbolton@u.washington.edu)

Director: Chris Cleveland  
(360) 943-7525  
[ccleveland@brwncaid.com](mailto:ccleveland@brwncaid.com)

Director: Brian Drost  
(253) 428-3600, x2642  
[bwdrost@usgs.gov](mailto:bwdrost@usgs.gov)

Director: John Hoey  
(425) 453-5000  
[jhoey@ch2m.com](mailto:jhoey@ch2m.com)

Director: Stan Miller  
(509) 477-6024  
[smiller@spokanecounty.org](mailto:smiller@spokanecounty.org)

Director: Ann Root  
(206)-789-9658  
[aroot@adolfson.com](mailto:aroot@adolfson.com)

Director: Anne Savery  
(360)-651-4486  
[asavery@tulalip.nsn.us](mailto:asavery@tulalip.nsn.us)

Director: Mike Wert  
(206) 624-9190  
[mwert@shap.com](mailto:mwert@shap.com)

Student Chapter President:  
Johnny Grady  
(206) 779-8691  
[grady96@u.washington.edu](mailto:grady96@u.washington.edu)  
Faculty Advisor: Derek Booth  
(206) 543-7923  
[dbooth@u.washington.edu](mailto:dbooth@u.washington.edu)

---

---

# March Dinner Meeting on Using “Best Available Science” for Salmon Recovery

Review by Jon Honea, AWRA student chapter member.

On Tuesday evening, March 6<sup>th</sup>, nearly 50 AWRA members and guests met at the Pyramid Alehouse for lasagna and a lecture by Robert Fuerstenberg entitled “Science and salmon recovery in the PNW: the recovery science review panel and the technical recovery teams.” As a senior ecologist with the King County Department of Natural Resources for 15 years, Dr. Fuerstenberg is well acquainted with local aquatic conservation issues, particularly those involving salmon. His wealth of experience was acknowledged when he was selected last March to be a member of the NMFS Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (TRT). The mandate given by NMFS (and the Endangered Species Act) to the various Technical Recovery Teams is to use the “best available science” in identifying goals that must be reached to achieve the recovery of each evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) of Pacific salmon. Dr. Fuerstenberg’s talk addressed the challenge of recognizing and using “best available science.”

He began by pointing out that although various scientific fields may have different views on what science is, there are a few common and necessary attributes. Among these are 1) observations are repeatable, 2) hypotheses are testable, 3) theory and observation are linked, 4) science is tentative and revisable, and 5) discoveries are communal. Beyond these necessary attributes that define the core of what science is, there may be substantial differences in how science is practiced. For example, “mature” sciences like physics are generally quantitative and experimental and consequently data rich and data driven, while “young” sciences like ecology are generally qualitative and observational and therefore data poor and theory driven. Even within a particular discipline, there is both normal, textbook science as well as revolutionary or frontier science. He stated that we must understand these aspects of science in order to use it wisely. Science can be utilized to provide a method

for learning, describe conditions, provide causal explanations, and evaluate choice outcomes. However, science cannot define what the “problem” is; it cannot be used to define what is good or bad. Society must make these value choices.

With this characterization of what science is, Dr. Fuerstenberg went on to assess whether or not NMFS is attempting to use “best available science” in its Pacific salmon recovery plan. He pointed out that the Recovery Science Review Panel, mandated to develop an appropriate conceptual approach to salmon recovery, is composed of independent, well-esteemed scientists who aren’t compromised by being professionals in the area of salmon ecology. Additionally, the TRTs are composed of respected, local scientists who are experts in the various aspects of salmon ecology. The goal of the TRTs is to examine the ecological needs of salmon and from these develop criteria for the de-listing of the ESUs in their jurisdictions. The fact that NMFS is relying on independent scientists to guide recovery planning and local scientists to define the specific goals and actions necessary for recovery indicates that NMFS is indeed basing the Pacific salmon recovery effort on “best available science.”

Dr. Fuerstenberg provided a thorough review of how a scientist views the process of integrating science into the management of natural resources. However, it seems likely that economic and political concerns will mediate the degree to which “best science” will be acknowledged and implemented in the Pacific salmon recovery effort. Given his many years of work on conservation and his membership on the Puget Sound TRT, Dr. Fuerstenberg has developed unique insight into the exceedingly complex process by which the “best available science” identified by scientists is reinterpreted and reprioritized by the desires of society. ∞

---

---

## 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, national, and international organizations. A **bi-monthly 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 will be held November 15, 2001. 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 approximately 15 members meets regularly to plan, organize and facilitate events. 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 on Page 5.

---

---

**Save the Date !!!**  
**November 15, 2001**  
**AWRA Washington Chapter Annual Fall Conference**

**“Issues of Northwest Energy Management in Times of Drought: the collision of a water shortage and an energy crisis**

The Washington Chapter of AWRA will be holding its annual Fall Conference on November 15, 2001 at the Seattle Art Museum. This year's topic will be "Issues of Northwest Energy Management in Times of Drought: the collision of a water shortage and an energy crisis". The conference will address the technical and policy challenges associated with balancing power generation in Washington state with water and other natural resource issues. Invited speakers will focus on strategies and case studies that deal with traditional and innovative approaches to energy management, and what roles water plays in each.☺

---

**ANNOUNCING !!!**  
**The Annual Award For Outstanding Contribution**  
**To Washington's Water Resources**

The AWRA, Washington Section plans to honor an individual at our annual conference on November 15, 2001 for outstanding contribution to the water resources profession in the State of Washington. The winner will be awarded a handsome plaque commemorating the honor. In addition, the AWRA Board will make a donation to a water-related, nonprofit organization of the individual's choosing.

**The following criteria will apply.**

- Outstanding contribution or achievement in the water resources field (broadly defined) in the State of Washington.
- Leadership, so that others are enabled, inspired or organized to advance the understanding, management or wise use of water resources.
- Degree of innovation.
- Interdisciplinary or bridge-building qualities.
- Acknowledgement of the outstanding contribution from a diversity of perspectives.

Current State Chapter members are encouraged to send in a nominating letter for themselves or another candidate. In addition to identifying a nominee, the letter must contain an explanation of how the candidate specifically meets the criteria listed above. An individual need not satisfy all of the criteria to win the award, and other appropriate factors brought up in the nomination letter may be considered. Any person may be nominated for this award, but only current State Chapter members may submit a nomination. The nomination letter must be post marked by July 16, 2001. Submit all letters of nomination to:

**Peter Sturtevant**  
Nominations Subcommittee  
c/o CH2M HILL  
PO Box 91500  
Bellevue, WA 98009-2050

There are lots of people out there working hard to protect and enhance Washington's water resources. This a chance to bring them some much-deserved recognition.☺

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. Comments on articles are welcome.

Reprints and circulation for non-profit purposes are allowed without additional permission if proper credit is given to both the source and the author, unless specifically copyrighted in the byline of the article.

Submissions are welcome for the May-June, 2001 newsletter. The submittal due date is May 2, 2001. The editor reserves the right to make changes for reasons of length, grammar or clarity. Contact Chris Pitre at (425) 883-0777, or send submittals directly to [cpitre@golder.com](mailto:cpitre@golder.com) (most document/graphic formats are acceptable). Recent newsletters are available on: <http://earth.golder.com/waawra/>

---

**2001 Membership Application / Change of Address Form**

( ⌘ please circle, as appropriate ↗ )

Annual membership in the state chapter costs \$25.

(If you attended the 2000 November Conference, you are already a member for 2001 – Welcome!)

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Phone(\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax(\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail \_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

  

Please indicate if you prefer to receive your newsletter electronically.

Check -----if----- you would like to be actively involved on a committee.  
You will be contacted one of the board members.

2001 Membership Dues: \$25.00. **Checks only.** Please make check payable to **AWRA Washington Section.**

Mail to: AWRA, Washington Section  
c/o Ingrid Wertz, Taylor Associates  
3917 Ashworth Ave. N.  
Seattle, WA 98103

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  
3917 Ashworth Ave. N.  
Seattle, WA 98103

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