

1 SPOKANE RIVER PUBLIC HEARING

2 WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

RECEIVED
OCT 30 2007

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
EASTERN REGIONAL OFFICE

COPY

3
4 * * * * *

5 Wednesday, October 3, 2007, 7:00 P.M.

6 Spokane Falls Community College, Student Union Building

7 3410 West Fort George Wright Drive,

8 Spokane, Washington 99224

9
10 Hearing Officer: Victoria Leuba

11
12 * * * * *

13
14 THE HEARING OFFICER: I'm Victoria Leuba, and I'm the
15 hearing officer for tonight's hearing. We have Ecology's
16 Eastern Regional Director, Grant Pfeifer, here and staff
17 from the Water Quality Program, who've been running our
18 workshop for us. On behalf of the Department of Ecology, I
19 want to welcome you and thank you for coming.

20 We do have a couple of unusual things for tonight's
21 hearing. There is a table set up over here in case you want
22 to take notes and your lap is not sufficient to that chore.
23 Mine never is.

24 On this registration table there was a little pamphlet
25 you could pick up that's how to comment effectively. And

1 there's also on that table a comment form. This form has
2 the name and address of the person who will be receiving
3 written comments on this document. So even if you don't
4 want to fill out that form tonight, you might want to pick
5 it up so you have that address.

6 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to gather public
7 comment on the Spokane River and Lake Spokane Dissolved
8 Oxygen Water Quality Improvement Report, or the TMDL report.
9 This hearing is part of the public comment period on the
10 TMDL, which ends on November 13th, 2007. Ecology will
11 respond to testimony received tonight in their Response to
12 Comments Appendix of the final TMDL.

13 Ecology will be holding a public hearing for the four
14 draft permits associated with the TMDL next Wednesday,
15 October 10th, here in the Spokane Falls Community College
16 Student Union Building, same room, same time.

17 Testimony about the Draft Water Quality Permits should
18 be given at that time. Tonight we are interested only in
19 comments on the Spokane River and Lake Spokane Dissolved
20 Oxygen Water Quality Improvement Report

21 Tonight's meeting will consist of two main parts. The
22 first one has just ended with the open house and Water
23 Quality Program staff available to answer your questions
24 regarding the Spokane River and Lake Spokane TMDL, water
25 quality standards, and what is a TMDL, TMDLs for the Little

1 Spokane River and Hangman Creek, and the water quality
2 permits associated with the TMDL.

3 We'll begin the more formal segment, which we have
4 done, when we record your comments for the public record.
5 Once the formal public hearing segment begins, it's all your
6 turn. You can ask questions for the record when you speak,
7 but at this point staff will not answer questions or enter
8 into any discussions.

9 Written or video comments can be given, will be given
10 the same consideration as verbal comments, so please
11 summarize lengthier comments or repetitive ones. You may
12 also submit additional written comment.

13 After the public hearing, staff will prepare a summary
14 which identifies questions and comments. As stated
15 previously, Ecology will respond to testimony received
16 tonight in the Response to Comments Appendix of the final
17 TMDL. If you put your name and address on a signup list at
18 the door, or if you are already on the mailing list, you
19 will receive notice when the TMDL and Response to Comments
20 are complete.

21 As tonight's hearing officer, my job is to conduct the
22 hearing. I have two responsibilities. First, I need to
23 make sure everyone who wants to has the opportunity to come
24 up and comment. Second, I need to make sure that Ecology
25 obtains a clear record of the hearing. That's what the

1 recording is for. And tonight we are assisted in getting a
2 clear record by having a court reporter - and I've forgotten
3 Rita's last name - Rita Ketzka, who will be transcribing
4 testimony as it is given.

5 To do our jobs we need your corporation. I have a few
6 ground rules designed to support common courtesy and to keep
7 order. I would like to go over these rules now. The first
8 ground rule is about speaking in order. I'll call your name
9 in the order in which you signed in. Then we'll open the
10 floor when those folks are done for anyone else who has
11 decided to speak.

12 Speakers will come down to the podium, where we can
13 all hear them, and I can record them. Please state your
14 name and address for the record. One person speaks at a
15 time. You have the floor.

16 Second ground rule is about the length of comments. I
17 want to make sure that you and your neighbors get to speak.
18 We know you took the time and trouble to come tonight and
19 may want to leave at a reasonable hour. So I'd like to ask
20 you to limit your speaking time to about four minutes. We
21 actually have a little bit more than that. I will let you
22 know when four minutes has elapsed, and I will cut you off
23 at five. That lets us get through everyone's testimony.
24 Does that sound fair?

25 My third and final ground rule involves noise from the

1 audience. Extra noise isn't appropriate. And we need to
2 get a clear recording of what's being said. And in that
3 effort, I'll ask everyone to silence their cell phones., Put
4 them on vibrate, turn them off, do whatever it takes to not
5 have them interrupt this meeting. And if you have a side
6 conversation that you need to carry on, please carry it on
7 in the atrium outside not in this room.

8 Okay, now it is your turn. Before we start, has
9 everyone who wants to signed up on the registration sheet
10 and had a card made out? Okay. If you would like another
11 opportunity, we still have cards at the back, and we can
12 still get them filled out. I'll be starting with people in
13 the order that you signed in. And then at the end we'll
14 open it up for the remainder.

15 One at a time. Questions are for the record. Limit
16 comments to about four minutes. And no extra noise. Is
17 everybody okay with all that?

18 Okay. When you are nearing the end of your time
19 allowance, I will hold up a card to let you know that you
20 have about 30 seconds left in which to finish up testimony,
21 oral testimony. When I call your name, please step down.
22 State your name and address for the record.

23 Let the record show that it's 7:09 p.m., on
24 October 3rd, 2007, and this hearing on the Draft Spokane
25 River and Lake Spokane Dissolved Oxygen Water Quality

1 Improvement Plan, or TMDL, is being held in the Student
2 Union Building at Spokane Falls Community College located at
3 3410 West Fort George Wright Drive.

4 Legal notice of this hearing was published in the
5 Spokesman Review Voices, the Inlander, and the Liberty Lake
6 Splash on Thursday, September 27th, and the Coeur d'Alene
7 Press on Sunday, September 30th, 2007.

8 Any testimony received at this hearing along with the
9 written comments received will be part of the hearing record
10 for this proposal.

11 We'll begin with John Osborn, who will be followed by
12 Rick Eichstaedt.

13 MR. OSBORN: My name is John Osborn. I'm a senior
14 physician at the VA Hospital here in Spokane. And I chair
15 the Upper Columbia River Group of the Sierra Club. I reside
16 at 2421 West Mission Avenue here in Spokane.

17 Every day as I go to work, I drive or ride my bicycle
18 along the Spokane River. And I'm impressed at the beauty of
19 the river. I also know from nearly a quarter century of
20 work and trying to protect and restore the river, that it is
21 a river that's dying. It's got significant water quality
22 and quantity problems.

23 Tonight I'm honored to, to read a statement that was
24 submitted to the Spokesman Review, although published in a
25 truncated form, by Drea Traeumer. It was the lead for the.

1 Spokane River TMDL. I think about Drea's work and her
2 courage and her integrity in stepping down from her role
3 prior to the release of the TMDL, I think it was truly an
4 act of courage. And I think it is a message that resonated
5 through the region

6 She writes, Recently there have been, there has been
7 much discussion about my decision to resign from Department
8 of Ecology and about the new water quality plan for the
9 Spokane River. Given the investment Spokane is about to
10 make in cleaning up the river, I think it important that I
11 clarify a few details. My decision to leave was not the
12 result of a scientific disagreement over details of the
13 computer simulation modeling. It was a disagreement over a
14 policy decision that, in my opinion, does not comport with
15 the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act and thus
16 renders the Spokane River dissolved oxygen cleanup plan,
17 also known as a TMDL, which was developed from this policy
18 decision, indefensible. To better understand the
19 significance of the policy decision, some background
20 follows.

21 A TMDL is required under the Clean Water Act for water
22 bodies that do not meet water quality standards. The
23 objective of a TMDL is to attain a water quality standard.
24 For the Spokane River TMDL, the point of compliance is Lake
25 Spokane, where the water quality standard for dissolved

1 oxygen is no measurable decrease from natural conditions.
2 Natural conditions are defined by Washington law as, quote,
3 "surface water quality that was present before any
4 human-caused pollution," end quote. Ecology considers up to
5 a .2 milligram per liter decrease in dissolved oxygen from
6 the natural condition as permissible.

7 The original 2004 TMDL used measured water quality at
8 the outlet of Coeur d'Alene Lake to represent the natural
9 condition of the Spokane River. This set the water quality
10 standard of the TMDL, or the bar, high, because the water
11 quality of Coeur d'Alene Lake, as relates to phosphorus and
12 dissolved oxygen, is good. As a result, nonpoint sources of
13 phosphorus needed to be reduced by up to 76 percent to
14 attain the standard, and there was no capacity left in the
15 river for permitted discharges of phosphorous greater than
16 10 micrograms per liter. This was not good news for the
17 dischargers, and thus began the two-year collaboration
18 effort.

19 As part of the collaboration, a policy decision was
20 made which effectively lowered the bar of the TMDL. Instead
21 of using the water quality at the outlet of Coeur d'Alene
22 Lake to represent the natural condition of the river, a
23 policy decision was made to substitute the water quality of
24 the river where it crosses the stateline as a natural
25 condition of the river. This policy decision is significant

1 for several reasons

2 First, the water quality at stateline includes the
3 Idaho dischargers at their proposed permit limits;
4 therefore, it is not representative of the natural condition
5 and is of poorer quality than the outlet of Coeur d'Alene
6 Lake. Thus, the bar for the water quality standard has been
7 lowered as a result of this policy decision.

8 Second, by lowering the bar for the water quality
9 standard, nonpoint sources of phosphorous now need to be
10 reduced by only 39 percent, as opposed to the original 76
11 percent, to attain the standard. Or, about half as much
12 clean up of nonpoint sources is now needed as a result of
13 lowering the bar.

14 Third, the proposed Idaho permits were developed to
15 just meet the downstream water quality standard in Lake
16 Spokane, that is, cause just up to the permissible 0.2
17 milligrams per liter dissolved oxygen decrease in Lake
18 Spokane.

19 MS. LEUBA: Mr. Osborn, I hate to interrupt you, but
20 you are running into your time limit. And we will finish
21 collecting testimony when everyone has had, had an
22 opportunity, provided we have time.

23 MR. OSBORN: How much time have I used?

24 MS. LEUBA: You've used about four and a half minutes.

25 MR. OSBORN: Okay. I would like to have the

1 opportunity to finish this statement. The Department has
2 had 10 years to complete the study.

3 MS. LEUBA: I understand that. And we will give you
4 the opportunity when everyone else in the room who desires
5 to speak has had that opportunity.

6 MR. OSBORN: Well, allow me to conclude --

7 MS. LEUBA: That's fine.

8 MR. OSBORN: -- with her remarks.

9 MS. LEUBA: Thank you.

10 MR. OSBORN: Time will tell if the policy decision and
11 ensuing TMDL are defensible; however, it is my opinion that
12 the water quality standard should remain the natural
13 condition. Given that, this TMDL cannot meet its objective
14 to attain the water quality standard, because the water
15 quality standard was not used.

16 MS. LEUBA: Thanks. And we will come back and pick up
17 the testimony that was left out, if we have the time.

18 Rick, and I'm gonna let you pronounce the last one
19 this time, followed by Rachael Osborn. Thank you.

20 MR. EICHSTAEDT: Okay. Thank you for the opportunity
21 to speak tonight on this very important issue. My name's
22 Rick Eichstaedt. I'm an attorney with the Center for
23 Justice. We represent the Sierra Club in the TMDL process
24 in other Spokane River cleanup processes. We are located at
25 35 West Main here in Spokane. I'm also a resident of

1 Spokane, personally.

2 The Sierra Club and its attorneys have been involved
3 in all aspects of this TMDL process, including the nearly
4 three-year TMDL collaboration process. We attended many
5 meetings. We devoted many personal, personal hours and
6 financial resources to consultants and other analysis to
7 further that process. We will be submitting detailed
8 written comments on the TMDL, as well as the NPDES permits.

9 But I'd like to take my time to focus quickly on two
10 issues. First, the TMDL, as Mr. Osborn stated, relies upon
11 an erroneous assumption that the phosphorous that comes
12 across the stateline from Idaho from three relatively small
13 dischargers is natural.

14 Washington's water quality standards clearly state
15 that all cumulative, all human-caused sources cannot
16 cumulatively cause a .2 milligram per liter reduction in
17 dissolved oxygen in Long Lake. This TMDL allows nearly
18 double that by assuming that the phosphorous that crosses
19 the stateline from Idaho is natural, and that allocating
20 another .2 milligram per liter reduction to the sources in
21 Washington. This results in a nearly .4 milligram per liter
22 reduction in dissolved oxygen, according to staff from
23 Ecology.

24 The Clean Water Act clearly requires that EPA ensure
25 that those sources in Idaho do not cause or contribute to a

1 water quality violation in Idaho. And that has simply not
2 occurred here. This shortcoming has been acknowledged by
3 staff in both Ecology and EPA. We were to receive it from
4 the former TMDL writer, as Mr. Osborn read into the record.

5 There's other statements. For example, the, in
6 September of 2005 in an e-mail from Ecology senior water
7 quality policy analyst, Mark Hicks, he stated, EPA appears
8 poised to grant a .2 milligram per liter depression from
9 naturally low dissolved oxygen levels to the point source
10 dischargers in Idaho and then grant another .2 milligram per
11 liter reduction for the Washington dischargers. However,
12 our standards only allow a .2 reduction below naturally low
13 dissolved oxygen levels from all sources combined, point and
14 nonpoint, not .4.

15 Mark's e-mail raised some very important policy
16 questions that have yet to be answered by either EPA or
17 Ecology. How can EPA interpret our standards as permitting
18 the .2 milligram allowance to go to the Idaho dischargers?
19 Shouldn't EPA be accountable for nonpoint source? How can
20 EPA ignore that our standards set a cumulative .2 depression
21 by granting a .4 milligram depression? Why did EPA, who has
22 told us that they believe that .1 is measurable and more
23 appropriate, not divide the .2 allowance between the two
24 states' dischargers?

25 Mark very wisely concluded the current EPA dialogue on

1 dissolved oxygen does not appear either defensible or
2 logical. The current approach of treating each issue
3 independently and inconsistently is almost certainly going
4 to lead to greater problems to the state in the future.

5 This, these comments were reflected by the former TMDL
6 writer. In June of, June 7th of 2007, she wrote to her
7 colleagues at EPA an e-mail. In part, I realize it's a
8 policy decision to include the Idaho point source
9 dischargers in our estimate of natural conditions. And that
10 this is not likely to be scientifically defensible, and it
11 will damage Ecology's credibility.

12 Moreover, some of the dischargers have shared these
13 concerns. In a letter from Mayor Hession of the City of
14 Spokane from May of this year, he wrote similar concerns
15 about this approach and stated that it is not fair for the
16 downstream dischargers to bear a disproportionate share of
17 the problem.

18 This decision has significant impacts. By assuming
19 that all the pollution that crosses the river, crosses the
20 stateline is natural, we are significantly underestimating
21 the amount of nonpoint source reduction we need to have.

22 Obviously, to have a defensible plan, we have to have
23 the right numbers. And that requires Ecology to stand up to
24 EPA and demand that they recognize and, and incorporate
25 Washington's standards. So far this has not happened. And

1 the TMDL, final TMDL must do this.

2 I just want to really quickly address the second
3 point. The second issue I want to address is Avista. The
4 Avista dams, Long Lake in particular, have an impact on
5 water quality on the Spokane River. In fact, Avista's own
6 studies recognize that the operations of Long Lake
7 contribute to not meeting the dissolved oxygen standard for
8 three to five months of the year. However, the TMDL's
9 absolutely silent as to this impact.

10 There are opportunities here to incorporate Avista,
11 its impacts into the TMDL. There's examples of where this
12 has occurred. Hell's Canyon, which was -- the TMDL for
13 Hell's Canyon, which was developed by Oregon. Washington
14 has done this. By not incorporating this, we fail to
15 recognize a significant source of the problem, as well as a
16 significant opportunity to solve the problem --

17 MS. LEUBA: Mr. Eichstaedt --

18 MR. EICHSTAEDT: -- by creative measures, such as
19 aeration or oxygenation.

20 MS. LEUBA: -- your time has --

21 MR. EICHSTAEDT: I'd like to submit a copy, written
22 copy of my comments, as well as some of the letters that
23 I've referred to. How do I do that?

24 MS. LEUBA: We, we can have -- Karin, can you collect
25 written comments? Or Grant, can you reach over? I'll trip

1 myself on the tape.

2 MR. EICHSTAEDT: Thank you, Grant.

3 MS. LEUBA: And if there's additional testimony when
4 we're done, we will come back and pick it up.

5 Rachael Osborn?

6 MS. OSBORN: I'm gonna defer till the end of the
7 session.

8 MS. LEUBA: All right. Following Rachael is Bonne
9 Beavers. And following Bonne will be Rico Reed.

10 MS. BEAVERS: Good evening. My name is Bonne Beavers.
11 I, too, am an attorney with the Center for Justice working
12 with Rick Eichstaedt and the Upper Columbia Group of the
13 Sierra Club on these river issues. And tonight I will focus
14 my comments on the likelihood of success under this plan.

15 By law this TMDL or cleanup plan must be good enough
16 to provide reasonable assurance that it will result in
17 attainment of the water quality standards for dissolved
18 oxygen in Lake Spokane. As designed, this plan doesn't do
19 that for at least nine reasons.

20 First: As you've previously heard, the bottom line
21 for this TMDL is that we're using illusory numbers. The
22 loading of pollutants coming over the stateline from the
23 three Idaho wastewater treatment plants violate our water
24 quality standards for dissolved oxygen in Lake Spokane by a
25 factor of five.

1 EPA just issued permits to these three Idaho
2 dischargers that require them to reduce loading in 10 years,
3 but only enough so that all by themselves they will
4 contribute almost all of the allowable loading to Lake
5 Spokane. So the minute Washington adds more, we'll violate
6 the standards.

7 Second: By pretending that Idaho loading doesn't
8 exist, the TMDL allows Washington the double amount of
9 loading to the lake and pretty much assures we won't restore
10 the lake.

11 Third: The TMDL requires the Washington dischargers
12 to reduce phosphorous loadings to concentrations of around
13 10 micrograms per liter. It's all in this background. The
14 dischargers do not believe that they can reach this through
15 technology alone, so they hope to get lots of credits for
16 removing phosphorous from other sources, particularly
17 nonpoint sources.

18 The problem with that is it's really, really hard.
19 Success stories generally run no higher than 6 to 20 percent
20 reduction. Under the 2004 TMDL, when we admitted that Idaho
21 was contributing phosphorous loading to Washington, we
22 needed to reduce nonpoint source loading by around 80
23 percent to meet our goals. Now under this new TMDL, those
24 goals have been reduced to between 60 and 20 percent.

25 Why is this a problem? Because the dischargers get

1 credits for any nonpoint source reductions that they have
2 contributed to below that amount. This credit will be
3 illusory, because we know we have to take more out to
4 restore the lake.

5 Four: There are no enforceable waste load allocations
6 under this TMDL or in the dischargers' permits for 20 years.
7 The dischargers have all been given waste load allocations,
8 numbers of pounds of phosphorous they may discharge under
9 the TMDL, but they don't have to do that for 20 years.

10 Five: There are no hard interim limits, either. The
11 dischargers have to provide engineering plans for upgrades
12 with goals of reaching at least 50 micrograms per liter in
13 10 or so years. But there is nothing in their permits or
14 the TMDL that requires meeting 50 micrograms per liter.

15 By contrast, the Idaho dischargers have to reach 50 in
16 10 years. And EPA considers 50 micrograms per liter
17 economically and technically achievable. And they,
18 Ecology's science shows we'd get dramatic results, even at
19 that. But we don't have to go there.

20 Six: Let's go back to the credits for the nonpoint
21 source reductions. Who gets to decide whether these are
22 valid? Under the foundational context that guide the TMDL,
23 the TMDL oversight committee. Who's on this committee, the
24 dischargers and Ecology. But Ecology doesn't have a vote.

25 Seven: The 10-year assessment. The TMDL calls for a

1 10-year check-in. At that time we'll be checking to see if
2 we've made sufficient strides to justify continuing on. If
3 we haven't, the dischargers have insisted, and Ecology
4 agreed to consider lowering the standards. What are the
5 chances that we will have gotten very far in 10 years?

6 Dischargers don't have to have new technology in place
7 for 10 to 12 years. Even then, it doesn't have to meet any
8 particular limit. NPS, the nonpoint source program, will
9 barely have begun. Idaho dischargers will just be getting
10 around to putting in their new, new technology. And it's a
11 good bet we'll be getting, getting some illusory nonpoint
12 source credits by that time.

13 The TMDL does say, however, that if we have enough
14 data to make a good assessment, we'll delay the assessment.
15 But it doesn't say who gets to decide whether there's enough
16 data. It'll probably be the oversight committee.

17 Eight: By law the NPDES permits must be consistent
18 with the TMDL. The TMDL limits the discharges to current
19 flows. They aren't allowed to expand discharge unless their
20 expansion meets the final limits of the TMDL. That's 10
21 micrograms. That's good.

22 But the draft permit allows the City of Liberty Lake
23 to expand but without the requisite reductions in
24 phosphorous, ammonia, and BOD. The Idaho permits are
25 allowed to expand, as well. Not only does that not make

1 sense, it's against the law.

2 Nine: The TMDL states that although Ecology has
3 enforcement authority, the intent is for voluntary
4 compliance. And Ecology will only enforce identifiable
5 waste load allocation violations. As we have seen, these
6 aren't enforceable for 20 years.

7 This plan does not provide reasonable assurance that
8 we will restore Lake Spokane. But it wouldn't be that hard
9 to make it better. Ecology could do at least four things.
10 Stand up to EPA and demand that they have a plan that
11 allocates loading equitably among the states. Two, put hard
12 targets in the permits. Three, require a reassessment only
13 after appropriate upgrades have been made and other actions
14 in place long enough to see real changes. And four,
15 prohibit increased loading except where it meets the 10
16 micrograms per liter limit.

17 MS. LEUBA: Thirty seconds to spare.

18 MS. BEAVERS: Thank you.

19 MS. LEUBA: Thank you.

20 MR. REED: Rico Reed. I'm a resident of the Chattaroy
21 area. I live on the Little Spokane River. And I'm trying
22 to do my bit to reinforce the edge of the river and protect
23 it from runoff. We are very skeptical, I think with good
24 reason, of 20-year plans that have no teeth for, for that
25 long.

1 And we can cite examples of the 20-year plan that the
2 city has had to, to separate its storm sewers from the
3 sanitary sewers. They have just barely been meeting each
4 step along the way, not making any effort to get the job
5 done. You'd think the city near nature, near perfect would
6 not allow the dumping of raw sewage in the river, but that's
7 gone on and on and on even in non-stormy events, as we've
8 seen 27 of them in the years 2005, 2006.

9 I think that at least at the 10-year time you can find
10 some way to make some enforceable goals. And I certainly
11 hope you'll work toward that end, or we'll be fighting these
12 same battles for our children's lives into the future.

13 MS. LEUBA: Thank you.

14 Clare Sosso. And Clare Sasso.

15 MS. SOSSO: Hi. I'm representing two organizations
16 tonight. I'm Clare Sosso. I live in Nine Mile Falls,
17 1515 North Pheasant Road. The first organization is the
18 Riverside State Park Foundation and Advisory Committee,
19 Committees. We are a committee of citizens that represent
20 different interest groups in our area that enjoy the use of
21 the Riverside State Park. We advise the park management on
22 behalf of these groups and also provide volunteer services
23 and funding for improvement projects throughout the park.

24 Riverside State Park is a primary recreational and
25 environmental resource for the Spokane area. The park makes

1 the Spokane area a unique place in which to live. The
2 Spokane River, the Little Spokane River, and Lake Spokane
3 are vital resources and core attractions of one of
4 Washington State's largest state parks. These precious
5 water resources provide life-giving habitat to the local
6 wildlife, and recreational opportunities for our local
7 citizens.

8 We at the Riverside State Park Foundation and Advisory
9 Committees want to reiterate and reaffirm our statement from
10 2004. We want to express our expectations to the
11 Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of
12 Ecology for providing the maximum level of protection and
13 monitoring to protect these irreplaceable water resources
14 against industrial and manmade polluters.

15 We will stand behind every effort to a timely and
16 optimal restoration and preservation of these precious
17 life-giving resources of Riverside State Park and its
18 surrounding natural areas. We also reserve the right to
19 provide further comment.

20 My second statement is on behalf --

21 MS. LEUBA: Can I, can I interrupt you for just a
22 second before we go on, because I need to turn the tape
23 over.

24 MS. SOSSO: Okay.

25 Again, Clare Sosso, and I'm representing the Lake

1 Spokane Homeowners Association. On behalf of the members of
2 the Lake Spokane Homeowners Association I would like to
3 express our concern and frustration over the quality of
4 water conditions at the Lake Spokane. We at Lake Spokane
5 get everything that the greater Spokane area, Post Falls,
6 and Lake Coeur d'Alene send down the river.

7 In recent years we are experiencing more and more
8 algae blooms that last longer and cover larger areas. We
9 have less and less water in parts of our lake during the
10 summer months. We worry about our families swimming and
11 recreating in water that is downstream from unpredictable
12 sewage overflows, heavy metals and other unknown
13 contaminants. The conditions in recent years has diminished
14 or greatly restricted recreational use in certain areas.

15 We have a vested interest in the healthy state of the
16 Spokane River, the Little Spokane, and Lake Spokane. We are
17 counting on the Environmental Protection Agency and
18 Department of Ecology to develop, enforce, and carefully
19 monitor a timely plan to improve the recreation and
20 environmental safety of our lake as quickly as possible.

21 It would benefit the entire greater Spokane area of
22 residents who also come to our local area to recreate. We
23 also reserve the right to provide written comment.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. LEUBA: Julie Dalsaso followed by Kirsten Angell.

1 MS. DALASO: Thanks for the comment, opportunity to
2 comment tonight. I live in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, at the
3 confluence of the Spokane River as it pours out from Lake
4 Coeur d'Alene. I call Lake Coeur d'Alene the regulatory
5 void.

6 It's a culturally significant area at the confluence.
7 The Spokane River decision-making must include
8 representation from the tribes. Indigenous people who
9 fished the confluence before the 1922 Avista dam was built
10 have a real colorful history, as well as doing rendezvous
11 there and gaming.

12 I'm troubled with the unchecked development in, along,
13 in Lake Coeur d'Alene and along the Spokane River up to the
14 Washington border. This is part of the Superfund site. The
15 outflow of Lake Coeur d'Alene has major flooding and pours
16 toxins down. And that flooding needs to be considered with
17 this plan.

18 Also, there is a proposed dredging project, 220,000
19 cubic yards in the original proposal, at Blackwell Island,
20 which will disrupt the lake bottom to create an artificial
21 yacht basin.

22 And the tribal people in Coeur d'Alene have suggested
23 a moratorium on dredging. We need Washington to address
24 tough decision making and this degradation that comes from
25 unchecked development in Idaho.

1 Another example is Powderhorn Bay on Lake Coeur
2 d'Alene. There's 1,300 homes proposed on a steep hillside
3 with erosion and runoff issues, phosphate loading from the
4 proposed three 18-hole golf courses. The Harrison sewer
5 system is at capacity now.

6 As this TMDL relates to bi-state wastewater discharge
7 sources, the EPA has allowed three Idaho municipal
8 wastewater dischargers to effectively pretend no pollution
9 comes across the Washington stateline. The Department of
10 Ecology must address this mistake, as the NPDES permit
11 doubles the amount of pollution entering the Spokane River
12 from Idaho. The permit 10-year check-in must be coordinated
13 with on the ground cleanup in a practical way.

14 Lastly, the draft must be improved by including storm
15 water impacts. Fertilizers, boating fuels, milfoil from
16 boats that are being sprayed off at, on the docks,
17 destruction of riparian areas add to degradation. The
18 nonpoint sources will also relate to the known flooding
19 incidents and the flush of toxic metals down the Spokane
20 River.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Kirsten Angell.

23 MS. ANGELL: Thank you.

24 MS. LEUBA: Name and address.

25 MS. ANGELL: 3020 West Dalton, 99205, Spokane. I'm a

1 mother of three. And I live right by the Spokane River and
2 enjoy it on a daily basis. We don't swim in it, however,
3 because it's not clean enough. And I was extremely hopeful
4 when I heard that a cleanup plan was, was gonna be put out
5 and got very excited. I heard it was a collaborative plan,
6 and that it was a multi-hundred million dollar plan that
7 took nine years to create. So I assumed that it was
8 something that would actually do the job.

9 But then I read an article about Traeumer and her, the
10 third scientist to quit the planning process saying that
11 it's not scientifically defensible, and it's too weak. And
12 then I got -- those are some pretty big red flags, so I got
13 a little concerned. And I looked a little further. And
14 unfortunately, it's unfortunate that it takes people
15 quitting their jobs to get people's attention, but it got my
16 attention. And I went and tried to find more information
17 out. And luckily, the Center for Justice was, was educating
18 people. Because nobody else is really putting this
19 information out there in an easy to access way.

20 And so I took my evening away from my three kids. I
21 hired a babysitter and went to learn. And here's what I
22 found out, I found out that this plan is, basically,
23 inadequate. Clearly, the Spokane River needs a different
24 plan, a plan that is legal and will actually clean up our
25 Spokane River. I'm asking Department of Ecology to stop

1 moving this plan forward in its current form and revisit the
2 plan's weaknesses.

3 Now, I personally would see as the most significant
4 weaknesses, No. 1, not addressing EPA's proposal to issue
5 permits to the Idaho treatment plants, effectively
6 pretending that no pollution is coming across the stateline.
7 Department of Ecology needs to stand up to the EPA and
8 demand a basin-wide plan that advocates the pollution
9 equitably among polluters in both states. The 2004 plan did
10 this, and it's being done across the nation.

11 No. 2, the draft plan gives polluters 20 years to
12 achieve the final cleanup limits without any enforcement
13 until that time, not even benchmarks to show intent to
14 comply. Washington law gives only 10 years for polluters to
15 upgrade their treatment plants. At the very least, Ecology
16 needs to comply with Washington law and require enforceable
17 benchmarks within the next 10 years.

18 This plan permits a new wastewater treatment plant in
19 the Spokane Valley. It allows, is allowing Liberty Lake and
20 City of Spokane to increase the level of pollution into the
21 river before any improvements have been made in their
22 treatment technologies. This is illegal under the Clean
23 Water Act. So at least begin to clean up the river before
24 adding more pollution. That is the law.

25 And 4, Avista's Long Lake damn creates a hot

1 slow-moving reservoir that adds to growth of algae and
2 increases dissolved oxygen. Require Avista to address this
3 problem at their own cost, not a cost to taxpayers.

4 In closing, I ask that Department of Ecology hold back
5 the plan until it addresses these issues. We can't afford,
6 we can't afford to push ahead a plan that won't do the job.
7 That would be a sad waste of our money and our special
8 river.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. LEUBA: Bob Stokes then followed by Bart Haggin.

11 MR. STOKES: My name is Bob Stokes. I live out in
12 the, what is now called the City of Spokane Valley. Have
13 for about a decade now. I don't have any affiliation here.
14 I, I used to teach natural resource economics at University
15 of Washington. That's why I kind of continue to be
16 interested in things of this sort.

17 By the way, I do swim in the Spokane River. And I
18 love it. Anywhere after the 4th of July it gets warm
19 enough, thanks to the sun warming the water up in Coeur
20 d'Alene Lake. But wait, watch out sometime late August,
21 because they close the damn. And then nothing comes out
22 except what filters through the aquifer and turns ice cold.
23 It's wonderful swimming.

24 Anyway, I endorse, I come here in support of the, the
25 document, collaborative agreement, whatever it is we're

1 calling it now. And in particular the process that led to
2 the creation of that document, in which I include the
3 so-called UAA procedure that preceded the collaboration and
4 probably is what really led to its, its occurrence.

5 I won't claim to know all the numbers and formulas and
6 this kind of thing that have been, been discussed here. I
7 did do my best to read into it a little bit. It certainly
8 appears that, that what really needed, needs to be done was,
9 had been in place for some time. It was part of the UAA
10 proposal. Certainly is firmly implanted in this proposal
11 that brings the river, river quality up to a standard that
12 will sustain reasonably human use for foreseeable future.

13 What particularly impressed me about what has happened
14 is that by usual beat-'em-over-the-head and ugly process of
15 American politics, we have actually gotten to something like
16 real equal facing, equal bargaining over a major, well,
17 water quality issue. That's what drew me in to watch the
18 UAA process and the beginning of the collaboration.

19 I was disturbed for awhile that, that the regional
20 leaders had, in fact, caved in and simply gone back to
21 getting down on their knees and obeying whatever they're
22 told to be, told to do by the people from over in Olympia or
23 by the people from the Sierra Club and their threats of
24 litigation and so on.

25 But indeed, the last few days, the last few weeks have

1 brought my spirits back up. We really have a real
2 bargaining process between equals, some representing the
3 cost of cleanup, some representing environmental values,
4 reaching something like middle ground.

5 I don't give a damn whether this program complies with
6 the rules of the state, of the Washington, State of
7 Washington, the state of Ecology. I think those rules are
8 unreasonable. And I wish they didn't exist, but they're
9 there. We can't, we can't get rid of them in this part of
10 the state. But we can -- apparently, we're in the process
11 of coming to some sort of a reasonable accommodation within
12 that process. And I certainly commend those involved, in
13 particular the regional people who dug in and fought hard
14 and fought smart at the right times and moved to restore
15 that process.

16 That's all I have to say.

17 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Bart Haggin followed by Harvey
18 Morrison.

19 MR. HAGGIN: My name is Bart Haggin. I live at
20 15418 Little Spokane Drive on the Little Spokane River.
21 Lived there for pretty much all my life, 71 years. And I'm
22 here to express some real reservations about the, the TMDL
23 plan as it's stated.

24 We know what the right thing to do is. And what we're
25 talking about here today is regulation and cost. And my

1 impression from the beginning was that I had very little
2 faith in the EPA or the DOE, because I know what
3 regulation's all about. That's what we're talking about
4 here today.

5 Talking about the regulators who are always afraid of
6 the politicians, the legislature or whatever, they're gonna
7 cut their budget. The politicians are afraid of the rich
8 and the powerful. They won't give them the campaign
9 contributions to be successful. And the rich and the
10 powerful aren't afraid of anybody. They've got the power.
11 And that's the way it is. And that's why I think that it's
12 very difficult to have much faith in what, what has
13 transpired here today. Because we know what the power is
14 all about and how this works.

15 I was really surprised to learn just recently about
16 what has happened with the Little Spokane from years and
17 years ago. 1974 there was a statute in the state
18 legislature that enforced the idea of minimum low flows for
19 all of the, for all of the rivers in the state of
20 Washington. And immediately the Department of Ecology
21 started to do that.

22 There got to be a little flap from the people that had
23 vested interests in, in their financial interests. And for
24 17 years now it hasn't had any enforcement. It's very
25 difficult for me to have any confidence in the integrity of

1 these organizations, because I know what kind of fears are
2 part of the process.

3 So we know what the right thing to do is. It may be
4 more expensive than is palatable to the politicians and the
5 rich and the powerful. But indeed, we know what the right
6 thing to do is, the question is, are we gonna do it.

7 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Harvey Morrison followed by
8 Shannon Work.

9 MR. MORRISON: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
10 My name's Harvey Morrison. I'm the local president of the
11 Spokane chapter of Trout Unlimited. And I live at 3805
12 South Lamonte in Spokane.

13 I'm not an attorney, and I'm not a scientist. But I
14 do agree with Dr. Osborn when he says the Spokane is a sick
15 and dying river. I mean, all you need is a nose and eyes to
16 tell in late summer that the river is not well.

17 The 10-year check-in and the 20-year implementation of
18 whatever plan develops is, I'm afraid I'm not gonna be
19 around long enough to see this happen. It seems like an
20 unreasonable length of time to put this off. In my reading
21 of the, of the report, it's flawed in too many ways and
22 should not proceed without major corrections.

23 I think amongst those is the failure to recognize the
24 pollution coming from across the stateline. I mean, that's
25 just so un-commonsensical it just, it's almost, it's

1 ludicrous, in my opinion. I think that this plan needs to,
2 to incorporate and connect with the other cleanup activities
3 that need to be made, as far as heavy metals, PCBs, and
4 other pollutants that we have, we know exist in the river.
5 And I think we definitely need to include the impact of the
6 Avista dam on Long Lake and the, basically, stagnant water
7 that they have to deal with every summer.

8 I think we need to stop the process and deal with a
9 comprehensive solution now rather than before we proceed any
10 further.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Is this Bruce Rawls? Who will
13 follow Shannon Work?

14 MR. WORK: This is Shannon Work. I thought, I thought
15 I was next.

16 MS. LEUBA: You're next.

17 MR. WORK: Okay. Shannon Work, W-O-R-K. My mailing
18 address is P.O. Box 3409, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, 83816. I'm
19 an attorney. I represent a group of people who from time
20 immemorial lived their lives up and down the length of the
21 river, from the top end near Lake Coeur d'Alene down to the
22 confluence of Columbia River. The Spokane people, Spokane
23 Tribe were able to live their lives there, to fish, to hunt,
24 to gather their medicines, to use the waters, to appreciate
25 the waters spiritually and religiously.

1 Today they are left with their permanent home, a
2 homeland reserved by the United States government by the
3 Tribe to provide for all future generations. That permanent
4 homeland exists now at the confluence of the, the
5 Spokane/Columbia Rivers.

6 And that's where the people, the Spokane people still
7 do practice their subsistence ways, their spiritual ways.
8 They appreciate the water. The Spokane River was known to
9 them as the path of life in their language. It did bring
10 life to them, and it continues to.

11 But Indian tribes are not just historical relics,
12 they're governments. And the Spokane Tribe of Indians a
13 number of years ago realized that what they needed to do in
14 order to protect their people and to protect their place and
15 protect their resources was to start establishing
16 environmental regulations. They've done so in the, in the
17 water quality standards under the Clean Water Act. They've
18 obtained approval by EPA. And they have standards
19 downstream of the State of Washington, Department of
20 Ecology's jurisdiction.

21 Those standards are not being met today. And under
22 the, the current proposed plan, they won't be met for at
23 least 20 years, and then who knows what happens beyond that.

24 Unfortunately, there's a whole, not a whole lot of
25 discussion in the document about what happens on the Spokane

1 Indian Reservation, that lowermost reach of the Spokane
2 River that we're supposed to be paying attention to in this.
3 And it's a little bit troubling to me as an attorney for the
4 Spokane Tribe to understand that by adhering to the, the law
5 of the United States and establishing standards that are
6 gonna be protective of the Tribe Reservation, Tribe's
7 resources, their people, those standards are being ignored.
8 They're not being paid attention to.

9 I see an awful lot of discussion in the document about
10 collaboration, about government-to-government relationship.
11 In fact, you know, a, a couple years ago I was involved in a
12 meeting with the Department of Ecology's director, Jay
13 Manning, and I was talking with him about the fact that
14 states and tribes historically had come to loggerheads,
15 historically had been blood enemies. Jay's response to me
16 was, well, it's a new day. Under myself, my own leadership,
17 and under Governor Greg, Gregoire, we want to see a new day.
18 We want to see Indian Tribe welcomed into the fold and to be
19 dealing with the state of government on a, on a good stead
20 in a fashion that's gonna lead to some good positive results
21 for our mutual concerns and interests.

22 And today looking at the document, I, I find a real
23 lack of attention being paid to the Spokane Indian
24 Reservation, the water quality on that reservation. And I
25 challenge Ecology to adhere to, to honor Jay Manning's

1 words.

2 This should be a new day, a day where the State of
3 Washington and the Spokane Tribe can truly collaborate. If
4 you're to look up the word collaborate in the dictionary,
5 I'm certain you would find things like working together and
6 cooperation. That's what I need to see in this document:
7 That's what the Spokane Tribe desires to see.

8 Thank you, very much.

9 MS. LEUBA: It is Bruce Rawls followed by Chuck
10 Tingstad.

11 MR. RAWLS: My name is Bruce Rawls. I'm here on
12 behalf of Spokane County Public Works. My address at work
13 is 1026 West Broadway, 99260.

14 Spokane County supports the collaboration that went on
15 over the last two years. We support the TMDL proposal
16 that's on the table. We encourage the Department of Ecology
17 to complete it and advance it to EPA, so that we can get on
18 with this river cleanup program.

19 We think that the collaboration and the resulting TMDL
20 are unprecedented in terms of the depth and breadth of
21 measures that have been proposed and committed to by our
22 regional agencies. And we think it's time to get on with
23 this program.

24 I wasn't gonna speak tonight, but I got an e-mail from
25 the Sierra Club today that really inspired me to address

1 some of the talking points that they've got here. Talking
2 point No. 5 is the failure of the plan to provide a
3 meaningful implementation schedule. It doesn't make
4 wastewater allocations enforceable for 20 years.

5 Well, the fact of the matter is, the dischargers in
6 the collaboration committed to implementing technology
7 that'll remove 90 percent of the current point source
8 pollution in the first 10 years and implement delta
9 elimination on nonpoint sources and other sources of
10 phosphorous pollution in 10 years. And then have a 10-year
11 tune-up and a 10-year monitoring of exactly how much
12 progress we've made, a mid-course correction, and another 10
13 years, if necessary, in order to clean this river up
14 adequately.

15 They also assert that the Washington law allows only
16 10 years for compliance. That's wrong. The law says if
17 there's a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit, it's 10
18 years. TMDLs often times are 20 to 30 years long, typical
19 of the one that we have in front of us.

20 Point No. 6, the plan allows for new increases in
21 pollution discharges. That's wrong. It does allow for more
22 water to go in the river. But water doesn't necessarily
23 have more pollution in it. In fact, the plan provides for
24 more than a 90 percent reduction in point sources from
25 wastewater plants.

1 No. 7, the plan allows for Spokane County to add
2 pollution to the river. That's wrong. The County's
3 proposal is to build a new 8 million gallon-a-day wastewater
4 treatment plant with state-of-the-art technology. And if we
5 had built this plant in 2003, when we wanted to start it, it
6 would be on line now. We'd be treating what goes into the
7 City of Spokane treatment plant at a much higher level and
8 would actually be removing more than 25 pounds of
9 phosphorous from the river that's going in today.

10 The fact of the matter is, this plan is going to allow
11 us to eliminate septic tanks, which are putting phosphorous
12 into the aquifer and the Spokane River. And it's gonna
13 lower the loading to the Spokane River over the next 10
14 years.

15 Point No. 8, the plan relies on unrealistic,
16 unrealistically on nonpoint sources. The fact of the matter
17 is over 50 percent of the pollution is from point sources,
18 but the remainder is from nonpoint. If we eliminate every
19 bit of either one of those, the river is not gonna meet the
20 water quality standards.

21 This plan that's on the table includes a 90 percent
22 reduction from treatment plants and a significant reduction
23 of nonpoint sources. And the dischargers have stepped up
24 and committed to doing a study and funding that to a certain
25 level. Also, we've committed to reclaimed water and water.

1 conservation. This plan has multiple aspects in it that are
2 unprecedented for a TMDL.

3 The talking point also encourages that we use all the
4 tools in the tool box. I think we have, and we're going
5 forward on that basis.

6 The last thing is stop and deal with the problem.
7 Well, if we stop, all we're gonna do is delay fixing the
8 water quality of the Spokane River.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Chuck Tingstad then Tom Brady.

11 MR. TINGSTAD: Thank you. My name is Chuck Tingstad.

12 My address is 963 East 10th, Spokane, Washington. I'm a
13 consultant in the renewable and green building business.

14 We need a holistic path here to, to solving this
15 problem. And I don't see that happening. I know there are
16 other TMDLs and other processes that need to occur, but I
17 don't see where this particular process has been integrated
18 with or even takes into account any of those other processes
19 that are, that are going to come through.

20 There are some, such glaring, you know, mistakes here
21 about, you know, ignoring the Idaho discharges, dischargers,
22 especially knowing what is happening in Idaho with the
23 growth over there. And also knowing that, you know, that
24 EPA will do anything for Idaho, will sign off on anything
25 under current administration. So, I mean, that's just so

1 obvious.

2 Well, we have to clean something up. Well, what are
3 you getting first. That's, that's -- you've got to figure
4 that out first. What's coming across the, the border.
5 Those numbers are just not realistic.

6 Another thing that just strikes me is in 20 years, 20
7 years we're looking at, and I've heard other people say,
8 like I heard Bruce say 10 years ago, too, they were gonna
9 fix it in two years. You know, we all well know the
10 dischargers, they're really gonna do it in 10 years, they
11 really are. Yeah, the county told us that, too.

12 We need, you know, we need rigorous, continuing
13 measurement of pollution in the river not just at the
14 sources, at the typical point sources but in all -- I mean,
15 I would envision there should be 60, 70 monitoring devices
16 all along river. And we should know what's happening. I
17 would also -- if there is some accidental discharge that
18 will, that will be red-flagged right away, so it can be
19 dealt with.

20 Another big red flag I heard mentioned were the, you
21 know, same old thing, Bart and I know this, dischargers were
22 in control. You know, we couldn't do enough to, to deal
23 from a regulatory basis. They're complaining about the, the
24 money they were going to have to spend, so that we don't
25 have a, a dead sea in Lake Spokane. And that's what we're

1 looking at.

2 I've been here for 15 years. And I enjoy recreating
3 down there. And I've seen it get worse year after year
4 after year. And we know that flow levels are going to go
5 down. Avista, everybody knows that the basin is not going
6 to be receiving as much moisture in the future going
7 forward, not to mention the usage. So, I mean, major things
8 that are being overlooked here.

9 I think that, obviously, there has been some good work
10 put into the plan. But, but there's so much, you know,
11 there's so much of that in error, that we're practically at
12 a do-over basis. And it needs to be done in a holistic
13 manner that, that the Avista dams, not just Long Lake dam,
14 all of the dams have to be included in this.

15 I mean, sure, I know, that's a big, you know, big
16 bugaboo to deal with, with Avista. But, you know, water
17 that's flowing through is not just how they're managing the
18 dam on, on Long Lake, it's the dams all along. So, I mean,
19 they, they have to be a part of that. That has significant
20 impact on, on them and on the electricity rates, and,
21 obviously, has an impact on, on the water quality. That has
22 to be addressed in this.

23 And, you know, for those who say, well, you're just
24 delaying it, no more delaying tactics, you know, if we
25 stopped it now, you know, well, it's doomsday. You know, we

1 had our plant in three years ago except for all this
2 delaying.

3 Well, you know, this is not a threat. I'm certainly
4 no lawyer or anything. But you will be in court if you
5 don't put together a plan that is built on basic science
6 that's, that, that's gonna be proven and shown to be
7 logical. Otherwise, yeah, shoot, you know, a backyard
8 lawyer like me could take you to court and say, you know,
9 your own scientists there can't stand behind this, are
10 saying that they were, that it was policy decisions that
11 made the plan come out like this not scientific, not the
12 best science, which is required by the Clean Air Act.

13 So -- and if we don't use the best science available,
14 then, then everybody loses. The dischargers don't know
15 what's going on. They don't know that, that what they are
16 committing to spend money on is really going to fix the
17 problem. Because, you know, nobody's gonna want to go back
18 to them in 5 or 10 years and say, you know, yeah, you spent
19 90 million dollars, but, damn it, it wasn't good enough.
20 Now we're -- now you need to spend more.

21 I mean, we need to do this thing right. The river
22 needs to be cleaned up so it can be a fishery. The fishery,
23 again, people can swim in it without feeling bad about it.
24 And you can eat more than one fish a year out of it without
25 getting sick. So I urge much more work to be done on this

1 plan.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. LEUBA: Thank you.

4 MR. BRADY: My name is Tom Brady. I live at 5714 West
5 Houston Avenue. That's about two blocks from the Spokane
6 River down in Northwest Terrace. I'm here representing
7 myself.

8 I was here a couple weeks ago when they presented the
9 draft plan. And I was the guy that asked the question why
10 did you wait 10 years to find out your last plan didn't
11 work. And they said they needed more data. Well, they're
12 doing that again. And 10 years is too long to return to the
13 same situation you have right now.

14 I work as a geoscientist, and we collect all kinds of
15 information on a daily basis in deep underground mines. And
16 if we waited for 10 years to collect data like you guys are
17 planning on doing, the mine would be closed down. There'd
18 be no way you could do this. And when you deal with
19 geoscience, you have to do it on a timely basis in order to
20 present that data as giving you meaningful results, and so
21 you know if it works or not, and 10 years is way too long.

22 You need to go to some kind of plan that looks at it
23 at least at every three-year point. You need to look at it,
24 and then you need to evaluate that plan. And then, then you
25 can have a six-year plan, and then a nine-year plan to see

1 if that trend continues. But 10 years is way too long. And
2 then to have to go to 20 years before you make changes is
3 absolutely incredulous in the geosciences.

4 Finally, it's been pointed out that this study is
5 being done in isolation. A number of people have slightly
6 mentioned that the aquifer feeds into the river and the
7 river feeds into the aquifer. What I'm afraid is if you
8 don't do this right, you're gonna end up impacting the
9 public health of the people of the whole Inland Empire,
10 including the Spokane and Colville Tribe. Because they rely
11 on that water downstream.

12 And finally, I'd like to say that it appears to me
13 that, that this plan was flawed from the beginning by using
14 a policy decision rather than real science. And for anybody
15 that deals in geosciences or any kind of things that deal
16 with the earth, science has to be the basis for doing
17 something right. And it doesn't matter if, if - and what
18 the man previously pointed out - if you don't do it right,
19 somebody could spend 90 million dollars to build a plant
20 that doesn't work. Because you haven't monitored closely
21 enough. And you haven't actually designed for the, for the
22 data that you're actually not collecting. So I would say
23 this plan is flawed. And it needs to be revisited and
24 re-presented to the people of Spokane.

25 Thank you.

1 MS. LEUBA: Mike Peterson. And Mike, before you
2 begin, Tom Agnew had thought, perhaps, he would speak. Is
3 Tom still here? Tom has left. Okay. Sorry. Thank you.
4 Go ahead.

5 MR. PETERSON: My name is Mike Peterson. I'm the
6 director of the Lands Council. And we're located at
7 25 West Main. And I appreciate the opportunity to give my
8 thoughts tonight.

9 We were here a few years ago, and it was a very
10 contentious meeting. I think it was at this same college.
11 And, and after that meeting some things happened. A
12 collaboration started. People, dischargers, agency people,
13 elected officials, environmentalists all got together and
14 worked pretty hard to craft a plan that was really designed
15 to do something different. It was designed to try and meet
16 everyone's interest, address the issues of cleaning up our
17 river, and then move forward.

18 And I'd like to think of this draft as a, as a little
19 bit of a detour off of what we came up in that plan. And
20 it's a detour I hope we can get back on track. Because
21 that's what drafts are for, is to put some documents in
22 front of the public and then allow the public to, hopefully,
23 improve these documents.

24 It's very troubling to me and the Lands Council that
25 the Department of Ecology has not stood up to the EPA when

1 the EPA took a very wrong turn and decided to go move away
2 from a watershed approach but do their own thing in Idaho.
3 And part of their own thing was to give different limits to
4 the Idaho dischargers. Even though some of the Idaho
5 dischargers didn't, they wanted to play with the rest of
6 Washington people and do the right thing.

7 And so the EPA made their mistake. But it was
8 compounded by the fact that Ecology instead of saying no,
9 the water coming across the stateline already has pollution
10 in it, that has been to accounted for. Ecology said no,
11 we'll consider that as background pollution. And that's
12 wrong. It, it sets a precedent that frightens me. What
13 about when PCBs start getting measured. What about if
14 Canada catches wind of this and says, hey, everything we're
15 dumping in the Columbia River is just background, don't
16 worry about it.

17 So a very bad precedent. That needs to get fixed. I
18 hope it can get fixed. That's that policy thing that we
19 didn't talk about that in the fundamental concepts, we would
20 not have agreed with that. We agreed on something very
21 different. So I hope that gets fixed.

22 There's some other errors in there. And to me, I do
23 believe, you know, the county and city have made
24 commitments, and I think they'll follow through on those.
25 But on the other hand, we've seen things happen, and we'd

1 like to see that tightened up a bit. You know, have that
2 check-in tightened up. I think we can all agree on what
3 that might mean. That doesn't seem too onerous to make sure
4 we measure things, and that we're making progress.

5 There's some technical errors in the document that
6 appear to give some extra wastewater discharge to Liberty
7 Lake and some other dischargers. I think those can be
8 fixed.

9 But really, what we have here is a little bit of a
10 detour of the spirit of the collaboration that really did
11 come up with some very innovated things. We were all
12 looking at the possibility that Spokane County couldn't put
13 new pollutants into the river. And I think the entire
14 collaboration found a very creative way to put some
15 investment in nonpoint discharges. And I think that's
16 innovative and commendable.

17 And I think that if Ecology can fix this document up,
18 get together with some of the people who are having problems
19 with it, I think maybe we can salvage this thing. So I
20 appreciate the opportunity to speak.

21 MS. LEUBA: Mr. Peterson was the last person on my
22 list. I know that Ms. Osborn would like to speak last. And
23 we do have a couple of speakers I had to cut off, which we
24 can go back and pick up. Is there anyone else in the
25 audience who would like to offer public testimony tonight

1 for the record?

2 Yes, sir. Please come forward. State your name, your
3 address. And we'll ask you to fill out a card, so we have a
4 written record of your testimony.

5 MR. MIELKE: Thank you. For the record, my name is
6 Tom Mielke. I'm a Spokane County commissioner. My work
7 address is 1116 West Broadway, 99260. Thank you for the
8 opportunity to speak. I didn't, obviously, plan on doing
9 that this evening and was interested in listening to the
10 comments made.

11 I, I do want to comment with regard to some of those
12 comments that have been made with regard to this process.
13 And let me start off by saying, you know, I'm not here to
14 speak on behalf of EPA. I think they get to do that on
15 their own opportunity when that time's appropriate.

16 But I do want to remind people that as we entered this
17 process, and it has been going on for a number of years, and
18 very intensely for the last three years, is that we had two
19 processes before us that are allowed under the Federal Clean
20 Water act. We had the TMDL process that stands before us
21 this evening. And we had the UAA process, as well. Both
22 justifiable under the Federal Clean Water Act. And we chose
23 to do our very best to proceed under the more stringent
24 proposal, which is that of the TMDL.

25 Speaking on behalf of Spokane County, I have said this

1 often times before, and that is that we would engage any
2 technology that would beat, that would, excuse me, meet or
3 beat the most stringent standard anywhere in the United
4 States. That has been our commitment to this process. That
5 continues to be our commitment to this process.

6 We also recognize that we use tax dollars as
7 responsibly as we can. We take that commitment very
8 seriously and recognize that it would be, I think, bad
9 financial judgment for us to invest in technologies that
10 have not proved, been proven on a scaleable level. In our
11 case, Spokane County, we're looking at approximately that
12 size of 8 mgds. That, again, continues to be our
13 commitment, as well as investing in nonpoint sources.

14 The issue of collaboration was brought up. And I do
15 want to say this has been an extremely collaborative process
16 where everyone was allowed around the table. And everyone,
17 not only around the table, but in the audience was allowed
18 to speak and provide comments at any time. And so for those
19 that say the process lacked collaboration, I don't think
20 they sat through two years of meetings. And, and I do find
21 fault in that argument.

22 With regard to the 10-year process, we believe that
23 the 10-year process does have very specific standards. And
24 the issue is, is when we have permits and financing in
25 place, we know that it takes four to five years to construct

1 a facility or to do a major renovation. Our goal is to be
2 able to operate for two to three years and have some data
3 about how we're doing.

4 And so that 10-year, that 10-year limit, or that
5 10-year review was intended to be able to complete that
6 construction and be able to see how we were doing. So it is
7 very strict to have our construction done, to have it
8 operating for that period of time, so we can collect the
9 data. And to also do the nonpoint source projects that
10 we've identified in those early years, as well. So that's
11 where the 10 years came from. And at that point at 10
12 years, we could make any further adjustments to further
13 refine and improve the water quality that we were getting.

14 The last comment that I want to address is I have been
15 a lifelong resident of this community. I used to swim in
16 Long Lake as a child. And I remember sitting on the dock
17 and, frankly, not being able to see my feet when the water
18 only came to my knees. I look at where we are today. And
19 by no means am I implying that we're done or that, that we
20 have hit our goal. We have a long way to go. But for those
21 that believe that we're going backwards, it's just not the
22 case. We have gone substantially forward since the early
23 '70s. There's a long ways to go. And we'll only get there
24 by moving forward in this process.

25 Thank you for your time.

1 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Ms. Osborn?

2 MS. OSBORN: Thank you.

3 MS. LEUBA: And Mr. Osborn and Mr. Eichstaedt, do you
4 want to continue your testimony?

5 MR. OSBORN: Yeah.

6 MS. OSBORN: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is
7 Rachael Osborn. And I volunteer as the Spokane River
8 Project Coordinator for the Sierra Club. In which capacity
9 I've spent hundreds of hours working on the dissolved oxygen
10 TMDL plan, cleanup plan.

11 I think from the testimony tonight and review of the
12 document, it's clear that there are problems at both the top
13 and the bottom of the watershed. At the top with Idaho
14 consuming the total pollutant level and the plan failing to
15 deal with it. If the plan is -- and the State of Washington
16 is not going to address the decision to allocate all load to
17 Idaho, then the load for Washington should be zero.

18 Problems at the bottom of the watershed with the
19 Spokane Indian Tribe's water quality standards not being
20 met, the plan fails to deal with it. Basically, the plan
21 needs to be revised to address the fact that those water
22 quality standards are not being met and must be met as a
23 matter of law.

24 Avista is a major part of the problem with the Long
25 Lake dam. Plan doesn't deal with it. Plan needs to go back

1 and address Avista's role and contribution.

2 I think more fundamentally, the plan is relying upon
3 the collaborative process and agreement that is a result --
4 basically, it's a political solution that occurred when the
5 dischargers rather than accept the 2004 plan, which did
6 include hard targets, reasonable implementation dates and
7 specific activities, threatened to sue the state with the
8 use attainability analysis, which is a proposal to weaken
9 the standards. And which was not supportable by federal or
10 state law. Which was disagreed with by the Department of
11 Ecology scientists who analyzed it, and involved a, really,
12 an unaccountable waste of more than a million dollars by the
13 city and the county through their water quantity funding
14 that they get, for which there is very little
15 accountability. The plan, basically, says that at year 10,
16 we will look again at doing a use attainability analysis.

17 Through that political solution that was created by
18 the collaboration, it was learned that the numbers in the
19 2004 plan didn't satisfy the polluters, so we manipulated
20 model. Plan needs to go back and use credible science as
21 the basis for the model

22 Polluters wanted more time. So the plan gives them a
23 20-year guarantee on their technology. I actually don't
24 disagree with Commissioner Mielke that time for the county
25 to get, bring plan on line is, it will take a few years.

1 But that is not the case with any of the existing polluters
2 who we ought to know within a fairly short time frame who
3 ought to have the technology in place and know what the
4 results are going to be.

5 No more room for pollution in the river. That's the
6 consequence of both not dealing with Idaho and the fact that
7 we are water quality impaired at this point. And so the
8 plan contemplates that we're gonna play a game, let the
9 county play a game that I call aquifer hostage. In which,
10 basically, the county cleans up the septic tanks but turns
11 around and puts that pollution in the river.

12 I guess I would just conclude by saying that political
13 solutions are not in conformity with the requirements of the
14 Clean Water Act or the State Water Pollution Control Act,
15 which are laws that really ought to be best friends of the
16 Spokane River and not something to be tossed out when the
17 local dischargers degree. We need a plan that is legal and
18 enforceable. We need a plan that is supported by science,
19 supported by law, and supported by the water quality staff
20 who participate in the process. And we need a plan that is
21 supported by the public. To date we don't have that plan.
22 And I would urge the Department of Ecology to go back to the
23 drawing board and reconsider the TMDL that it has offered.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. LEUBA: Thank you. Would you like to continue

1 your testimony at this time?

2 MR. OSBORN: I think it's entirely appropriate to
3 conclude or nearly conclude with Drea Traeumer's words.
4 Again, she was the, the TMDL lead for the Department of
5 Ecology for the Spokane River.

6 Simply put, the policy decision to alter the water
7 quality standard from natural condition to the quality of
8 the water that flows across the stateline lower the bar of
9 this TMDL and resulted in a win-win situation for
10 Washington, Idaho, and Idaho dischargers. Idaho dischargers
11 will be allowed to cause the permissible 0.2 milligram per
12 liter dissolved oxygen decrease in Lake Spokane. Washington
13 dischargers will also be allowed to cause the permissible
14 0.2 milligram per liter dissolved oxygen decrease in Lake
15 Spokane. And the amount of nonpoint sources of phosphorous
16 that must be reduced is about half of what it originally
17 was.

18 Time will tell if the policy decision and ensuing TMDL
19 are defensible; however, it is my opinion that the water
20 quality standard should remain the natural condition. Given
21 that, this TMDL cannot meet its objective to attain the
22 water quality standard, because the water quality standard
23 was not used.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. LEUBA: Is there anyone remaining who would like

1 to offer testimony to the record this evening?

2 Written comments will be received until November 13th.
3 Instructions for submitting those are on the registration
4 table. Before we close tonight, I want to thank you all for
5 coming and remind you all that all testimony received at
6 this hearing along with all written or video comments
7 received will be part of the official hearing record for
8 this proposal. Ecology staff will review all the written
9 and verbal comments received and include them as part of the
10 appendix in the TMDL.

11 On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you for
12 coming tonight and spending your evening with them. I
13 appreciate your cooperation and your courtesy. And this
14 hearing is formally adjourned at 8:22.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
2 COUNTY OF SPOKANE) : ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3
4 I, Rita A. Ketzka, a notary public
5 in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing Public Hearing
7 was taken on the date and at the time and place as shown on
8 Page 1 hereto;

9 That the foregoing is a true and
10 correct transcription of my shorthand notes of the requested
11 Public Hearing transcribed by me or under my direction;

12
13
14
15
16
17
18 WITNESS my hand and seal this
19 19th day of October 2007.



20
21 *Rita Ketzka*

22 RITA KETZKA
23 CCR No. 2136,
24 Notary Public in and for the
25 State of Washington, residing
at Spokane.

WORD LIST

A				
able 32:23 49:2,5,6 49:17	addressing 26:4	48:17 53:11,13	53:2	Avista 14:3,4,10 23:9 27:2 32:6 40:5,13,16 50:24
about 2:17 4:8,16 4:20 5:16,20 7:1,7 7:8,9 9:11,24 13:15 22:10 25:9 27:13 28:13 29:22 29:25 30:3,3,5,14 30:15 33:25 34:9 34:10,13 38:21 39:23 41:23 42:5 45:13,13,16,19 49:3 53:16	adds 16:5 27:1	allowing 26:19	approval 33:18	Avista's 14:5 26:25 51:1
absolutely 14:9 43:3	adequately 36:14	allows 11:17 16:8 18:22 26:19 36:15 36:20 37:1	approximately 48:11	away 25:20 39:18 45:1
accept 51:5	adhere 34:25	almost 13:3 16:4 31:25	aquifer 27:22 37:12 43:6,7 52:9	awful 34:9
access 25:19	adhering 34:4	alone 16:15	area 19:21 20:20,25 21:1 22:5,21,22 23:6	awhile 28:19
accidental 39:17	adjourned 54:14	along 6:8,18 20:4 23:12,13 39:16 40:18 54:6	areas 21:18 22:8,14 24:17	
accommodation 29:11	adjustments 49:12	already 3:18 45:9	argument 48:21	B
according 11:22	administration 38:25	alter 53:6	around 16:12,22 18:10 31:19 48:16 48:17 52:11	babysitter 25:21
account 38:18	admitted 16:20	although 6:24 19:2	article 25:9	back 5:11 10:16 15:4 17:20 27:4 28:20 29:1 41:17 44:20 46:24 50:25 51:20 52:22
accountability 51:15	advance 35:17	always 30:5	artificial 23:20	background 7:19 16:13 45:11,15
accountable 12:19	advise 20:21	American 28:15	asked 42:9	backwards 49:21
accounted 45:10	Advisory 20:18 21:8	ammonia 18:24	asking 25:25	backyard 41:7
achievable 17:17	advocates 26:8	among 19:11 26:9	aspects 11:3 38:1	bad 41:23 45:17 48:8
achieve 26:12	aeration 14:19	amongst 31:23	assert 36:15	bar 8:10,20 9:6,8,13 53:8
acknowledged 12:2	affiliation 27:13	amount 13:21 16:8 17:2 24:11 53:15	assessment 17:25 18:14,14	barely 18:9 20:3
across 11:12 24:9 26:6,10 31:24 39:4 45:9 53:8	afford 27:5,6	analysis 11:6 51:8 51:16	assisted 4:1	bargaining 28:16 29:2
act 7:4,15,21 11:24 26:23 33:17 41:12 47:20,22 52:14,14	afraid 30:5,7,10 31:18 43:7	analyst 12:7	associated 2:14 3:2	Bart 27:10 29:17,19 39:21
actions 19:13	after 3:13 19:13 27:18 40:3,4 44:11	analyzed 51:11	Association 22:1,2	basic 41:5
activities 32:2 51:7	again 21:25 41:23 42:12 48:12 51:16 53:4	Angell 22:25 24:22 24:23,25	assumed 25:7	basically 25:22 32:6 50:20 51:4,15 52:10
actually 4:21 25:8 25:24 28:15 37:8 43:21,22 51:23	against 19:1 21:14	another 5:10 11:20 12:10 24:1 36:12 39:6,20	assuming 11:18 13:18	basin 23:21 40:5
add 24:17 37:1	agencies 35:22	answer 2:23 3:7	assurance 15:16 19:7	basin-wide 26:8
adding 26:24	agency 21:11 22:17 44:12	answered 12:16	assures 16:9	basis 25:2 38:5 39:23 40:12 42:15 42:19 43:16 51:21
additional 3:12 15:3	agreed 18:4 45:20 45:20	anybody 30:10 43:14	atrium 5:7	battles 20:12
address 2:2,5 3:17 4:14 5:22 14:2,3 23:23 24:10,24 27:2 32:18 35:12 35:25 38:12 44:16 47:3,7 49:14 50:16 50:21 51:1	agreement 27:25 51:3	anything 38:24,24 41:4	attain 7:23 8:14 9:11 10:14 53:21	Bay 24:1
addressed 40:22	ahead 27:6 44:4	Anyway 27:24	attainment 15:17	bear 13:16
addresses 27:5	Air 41:12	anywhere 27:18 48:3	attended 11:4	beat 28:14 48:2,3
	algae 22:8 27:1	apparently 29:10	attention 25:15,16 34:2,8,23	beauty 6:18
	allocate 50:16	appear 13:1 46:6	attorney 10:22 15:11 31:13 32:19 34:3	Beavers 15:9,10,10 19:18
	allocates 19:11	appears 12:7 28:8 43:12	attorneys 11:2	before 5:8 8:3 21:22 23:9 26:21,23 32:9 43:2 44:1 47:19,20 48:1 54:4
	allocating 11:19	appendix 2:12 3:16 54:10	attractions 21:3	begin 3:3 6:11 26:23 44:2
	allocation 19:5	appreciate 32:24 33:8 44:7 46:20 54:13	audience 5:1 46:25 48:17	beginning 28:18
	allocations 17:5,7 36:4	approach 13:2,15 45:2	August 27:20	
	allow 10:6 12:12 20:6 36:21 37:10 44:22	appropriate 5:1 12:23 19:13 47:15	authority 19:3	
	allowable 16:4		available 2:23 41:13	
	allowance 5:19 12:18,23		Avenue 6:16 42:5	
	allowed 18:19,25 24:7 47:19 48:16			

30:1 43:13
begins 3:5
begun 18:9
behalf 1:18 20:22
 21:20 22:1 35:12
 47:14,25 54:11
behind 21:15 41:9
being 5:2 6:1 24:16
 26:10 33:21 34:7,8
 34:23 40:8 43:5
 49:17 50:19,22
believe 12:22 16:14
 45:23 48:22 49:21
below 12:12 17:2
benchmarks 26:13
 26:17
benefit 22:21
best 28:7 41:12,13
 47:23 52:15
bet 18:11
better 7:18 19:9
between 12:23
 16:24 29:2
beyond 33:23
bicycle 6:17
big 25:12 39:20
 40:15,15
bit 4:21 19:22 28:7
 34:3 37:19 44:19
 46:1,9
bi-state 24:6
Blackwell 23:19
blocks 42:5
blood 34:15
blooms 22:8
board 52:23
boating 24:15
boats 24:16
Bob 27:10,11
BOD 18:24
bodies 7:22
Bonne 15:8,9,10
border 23:14 39:4
both 12:3 26:9
 47:21 50:12 52:6
bottom 15:20 23:20
 50:13,18
box 32:18 38:4
Brady 38:10 42:4,4
breadth 35:20
bring 33:9 51:25
brings 28:11
Broadway 35:13
 47:7

brought 29:1 48:14
Bruce 32:12 35:9,11
 39:8
budget 30:7
bugaboo 40:16
build 37:3 43:19
building 1:6 2:16
 6:2 38:13
built 23:9 37:5 41:5
business 38:13

C

call 4:8 5:21 23:4
 52:9
called 27:12
calling 28:1
calls 17:25
came 44:19 49:11
 49:18
campaign 30:8
Canada 45:14
Canyon 14:12,13
capacity 8:14 24:5
 50:8
card 5:10,19 47:3
cards 5:11
carefully 22:18
carry 5:6,6
case 1:21 48:11
 49:22 52:1
catches 45:14
cause 9:16 11:16,25
 53:11,13
caved 28:20
CCR 55:23
cell 5:3
Center 10:22 15:11
 25:17
century 6:19
certain 22:14 35:5
 37:24
certainly 13:3 20:10
 28:7,10 29:12 41:3
CERTIFICATE 55:1
certify 55:5
chair 6:14
challenge 34:25
chances 18:5
changes 19:14 43:2
chapter 31:11
Chattaroy 19:20
checking 18:1
check-in 18:1 24:12
 31:17 46:2

child 49:16
children's 20:12
chore 1:22
chose 47:22
Chuck 35:9 38:10
 38:11
cite 20:1
citizens 20:19 21:7
city 13:13 18:22
 20:2,5 26:20 27:12
 37:7 45:23 51:13
claim 28:5
Clare 20:14,14,16
 21:25
clarify 7:11
clean 7:15,21 9:12
 11:24 25:3,24
 26:22,23 33:17
 36:13 39:2 41:12
 47:19,22 52:14
cleaned 41:22
cleaning 7:10 44:16
cleans 52:10
cleanup 7:16 10:24
 15:15 24:13 25:4
 26:12 29:3 32:2
 35:18 50:10
clear 3:25 4:2 5:2
 50:12
clearly 11:14,24
 25:23
close 27:21 54:4
closed 42:17
closely 43:20
closing 27:4
Club 6:15 10:23
 11:2 15:13 28:23
 35:25 50:8
Coeur 6:6 8:8,11,21
 9:5 22:6 23:2,4,4
 23:13,15,22 24:1
 27:19 32:18,21
cold 27:22
collaborate 35:3,4
collaboration 8:17
 8:19 11:4 28:3,18
 34:10 35:14,19
 36:6 44:12 46:10
 46:14 48:14,19
 51:18
collaborative 25:5
 27:25 48:15 51:3
colleagues 13:7
collect 14:24 42:14

42:16 49:8
collecting 9:21
 43:22
college 1:6 2:15 6:2
 44:10
colorful 23:10
Columbia 6:15
 15:12 32:22 45:15
Colville 43:10
combined 12:13
come 3:23 4:12,18
 10:16 15:4 22:22
 27:24 34:14 38:19
 41:11 46:11 47:2
comes 11:11 23:24
 24:9 27:21
coming 1:19 15:22
 26:6 29:11 31:24
 39:4 45:9 54:5,12
commend 29:12
commendable
 46:16
comment 1:25 2:1,7
 2:9 3:12,24 21:19
 22:23 23:1,2 47:11
 49:14
comments 2:3,12
 2:19 3:4,9,10,11
 3:14,16,19 4:16
 5:16 6:9 11:8 13:5
 14:22,25 15:14
 47:10,12 48:18
 54:2,6,9
commissioner 47:6
 51:24
commitment 48:4,5
 48:7,13
commitments
 45:24
committed 35:21
 36:6 37:24,25
committee 17:23,23
 18:16 20:18,19
Committees 20:19
 21:9
committing 41:16
common 4:6
 2:15 6:2 49:15
complaining 39:23
complete 3:20 10:2
 35:17 49:5
compliance 7:24
 19:4 36:16,17

complies 29:5
comply 26:14,16
comport 7:14
compounded 45:8
comprehensive
 32:9
computer 7:13
concentrations
 16:12
concepts 45:19
concern 22:3
concerned 25:13
concerns 13:13,14
 34:21
conclude 10:6
 52:12 53:3,3
concluded 12:25
condition 8:6,9,22
 8:25 9:4 10:13
 53:7,20
conditions 8:1,2
 13:9 22:4,13
conduct 3:21
confidence 30:25
confluence 23:3,6,9
 32:22 33:4
conformity 52:13
connect 32:2
consequence 52:6
conservation 38:1
consider 18:4 45:11
consideration 3:10
considered 23:16
considers 8:4 17:16
consist 2:21
consistent 18:17
construct 48:25
construction 49:6,7
consultant 38:13
consultants 11:6
consuming 50:14
contaminants
 22:13
contemplates 52:8
contentious 44:10
context 17:22
continue 27:15 50:4
 52:25
continues 33:10
 43:1 48:5,12
continuing 18:2
 39:12
contrast 17:15
contribute 11:25

14:7 16:4 contributed 17:2 contributing 16:21 contribution 51:1 contributions 30:9 control 39:22 52:14 conversation 5:6 cooperation 35:6 54:13 coordinated 24:12 Coordinator 50:8 copy 14:21,22 core 21:3 corporation 4:5 correct 55:10 correction 36:12 corrections 31:22 cost 27:3,3 29:3,25 Council 44:6,24 counting 22:17 county 35:12,14 37:1 39:11 45:23 46:12 47:6,25 48:11 51:13,24 52:9,10 55:2 County's 37:2 couple 1:20 34:11 42:8 46:23 courage 7:2,4 courses 24:4 court 4:2 41:4,8 courtesy 4:6 54:13 cover 22:8 craft 44:14 create 23:20 25:7 created 51:17 creates 26:25 creation 28:2 creative 14:18 46:14 credibility 13:11 credible 51:20 credit 17:2 credits 16:15 17:1 17:20 18:12 Creek 3:1 crosses 8:24 11:18 13:19,19 cubic 23:19 culturally 23:6 cumulative 11:15 12:20 cumulatively 11:16 current 12:25 13:2	18:18 26:1 33:22 36:7 38:25 cut 4:22 30:7 46:23 <hr/> D daily 25:2 42:15 Dalsaso 22:25 23:1 Dalton 24:25 dam 23:9 32:6 40:13,18 50:25 damage 13:11 damn 26:25 27:21 29:5 41:19 dams 14:4 40:13,14 40:18 data 18:14,16 42:11 42:16,20 43:22 49:2,9 date 52:21 55:7 dates 51:6 day 6:17 34:16,17 35:2,2 55:19 days 28:25 dead 39:25 deal 32:7,8 38:6 39:22 40:16 42:18 43:15 50:15,20,25 dealing 34:19 52:6 deals 43:15 dealt 39:19 decade 27:13 decide 17:21 18:15 decided 4:11 45:1 decision 7:7,11,14 7:18,19 8:19,23,25 9:7 10:10 13:8,18 23:24 43:14 50:16 53:6,18 decisions 41:10 decision-making 23:7 decrease 8:1,5 9:17 53:12,14 deep 42:15 defensible 10:11 13:1,10,22 25:11 53:19 defer 15:6 defined 8:2 definitely 32:5 degradation 23:24 24:17 degree 52:17 delay 18:14 38:7	delaying 40:24,24 41:2 delta 36:8 demand 13:24 19:10 26:8 Department 1:2,18 7:7 10:1 21:11 22:18 24:9 25:25 26:7 27:4 30:20 33:19 34:12 35:16 44:25 51:10 52:22 53:4 54:11 depression 12:8,20 12:21 depth 35:20 designed 4:6 15:18 43:21 44:14,15 desires 10:4 35:7 destruction 24:17 detailed 11:7 details 7:11,12 detour 44:19,20 46:10 develop 22:18 developed 7:17 9:14 14:13 development 23:12 23:25 develops 31:18 devices 39:15 devoted 11:5 dialogue 12:25 dictionary 35:4 different 20:20 25:23 44:15 45:3 45:21 difficult 30:12,25 diminished 22:13 direction 55:11 director 1:16 34:12 44:6 disagree 51:24 disagreed 51:10 disagreement 7:12 7:13 discharge 17:8 18:19 24:6 39:17 46:6 dischargers 8:17 9:3 11:13 12:10,11 12:18,24 13:9,12 13:16 16:2,11,14 16:25 17:6,7,11,15 17:24 18:3,6,9	24:8 36:5 37:23 38:21 39:10,21 41:14 44:12 45:4,5 46:7 51:5 52:17 53:10,10,13 discharges 8:15 18:18 36:21 38:21 46:15 discussed 28:6 discussion 7:7 33:25 34:9 discussions 3:8 disproportionate 13:16 disrupt 23:20 dissolved 2:7,19 5:25 7:16,25 8:5 8:12 9:17 11:17,22 12:9,13 13:1 14:7 15:17,24 27:2 50:9 53:12,14 disturbed 28:19 divide 12:23 dock 49:16 docks 24:16 document 2:3 27:25 28:2 33:25 34:9,22 35:6 46:5 46:17 50:12 documents 44:21 44:23 DOE 30:2 doing 23:10 37:24 42:12,17 43:16 47:8 49:3,6 51:16 dollar 25:6 dollars 41:19 43:19 48:6 51:12 done 3:4 4:10 14:14 15:4 20:5 26:10 28:8 33:16 40:12 41:25 43:5 49:7,19 doomsday 40:25 door 3:18 double 11:18 16:8 doubles 24:11 down 4:12 5:21 7:2 22:6 23:16 24:19 28:21 32:20,21 40:3,5 42:6,17 downstream 9:15 13:16 22:11 33:19 43:11 do-over 40:12	Dr 31:14 draft 2:14,17 5:24 18:22 24:14 26:11 42:9 44:18 drafts 44:21 dramatic 17:18 drawing 52:23 Drea 6:25 53:3 Drea's 7:1 dredging 23:18,23 drew 28:17 drive 1:7 6:3,17 29:20 dug 29:13 dumping 20:6 45:15 during 22:9 dying 6:21 31:15 d'Alene 6:6 8:8,11 8:21 9:5 22:6 23:2 23:4,4,13,15,22 24:2 27:20 32:18 32:21 <hr/> E each 13:2 20:3 early 49:10,22 earth 43:16 East 38:12 Eastern 1:16 easy 25:19 eat 41:24 Ecology 1:2,18 2:10 2:13 3:15,24 7:8 8:4 11:23 12:3,6 12:17 13:23 17:24 17:24 18:3 19:2,4 19:9 21:12 22:18 24:10 25:25 26:7 26:15 27:4 29:7 30:20 34:25 35:16 44:25 45:8,10 46:17 51:11 52:22 53:5 54:8,11 Ecology's 1:15 13:11 17:18 33:20 34:12 economically 17:17 economics 27:14 edge 19:22 educating 25:17 effectively 1:25 8:20 24:8 26:5 effort 5:3 8:18 20:4 21:15
--	---	--	---	---

Eichstaedt 6:12 10:20,22 14:17,18 14:21 15:2,12 50:3	19:10 24:7 26:7 30:2 33:18 35:17 38:24 44:25 45:1,7 47:14	extremely 25:3 48:15 eyes 31:15 e-mail 12:6,15 13:7 35:24	first 2:22 3:22 4:7 9:2 11:10 15:20 20:17 36:8 39:3,4 fish 32:23 41:24 fished 23:9 fishery 41:22,22 five 4:23 14:8 15:25 17:10 48:25 fix 39:9 41:16 46:17 fixed 45:17,18,21 46:8 fixing 38:7 flag 39:20 flags 25:12 flap 30:22 flawed 31:21 43:13 43:23 flooding 23:15,16 24:18 floor 4:10,15 flow 40:4 flowing 40:17 flows 18:19 30:18 53:8 flush 24:19 focus 11:9 15:13 fold 34:18 folks 4:10 follow 32:13 45:24 followed 6:11 10:19 22:25 27:10 29:17 31:7 35:9 following 15:8,9 follows 7:20 foregoing 55:6,9 foreseeable 28:12 forgotten 4:2 form 2:1,1,4 6:25 26:1 formal 3:3,5 formally 54:14 former 12:4 13:5 formulas 28:5 Fort 1:7 6:3 forward 26:1 38:5 40:7 44:17 47:2 49:22,24 fought 29:13,14 found 25:22,22 46:14 Foundation 20:18 21:8 foundational 17:22 four 2:13 4:20,22	5:16 9:24 17:5 19:9,14 48:25 frame 52:2 frankly 49:17 friends 52:15 frightens 45:12 from 1:17 4:25 6:19 7:2,7,17 8:1,5 11:12,12,19,22 12:3,6,8,13 13:13 13:14 15:22 16:16 19:23 20:2 21:9 22:11 23:3,8,24 24:3,12,15 25:20 28:22,23 30:1,16 30:22 31:24 32:19 32:21 35:24 36:24 37:9,17,18,22 39:23 42:5 43:13 45:2 49:11 50:11 53:7 front 36:19 44:22 frustration 22:3 fuels 24:15 fundamental 45:19 fundamentally 51:2 funding 20:23 37:24 51:13 further 11:7 21:19 25:13 32:10 49:12 49:12 future 13:4 20:12 28:12 33:3 40:6
Eight 18:17 either 12:16 13:1 17:10 37:19 elapsed 4:22 elected 44:13 electricity 40:20 eliminate 37:11,18 elimination 36:9 Empire 43:9 em-over-the-head 28:14 encourage 35:16 encourages 38:3 end 5:13,18 8:4 15:6 20:11 32:21 43:8 ended 2:22 endorse 27:24 ends 2:10 enemies 34:15 enforce 19:4 22:18 enforceable 17:5 19:6 20:10 26:16 36:4 52:18 enforced 30:18 enforcement 19:3 26:12 30:24 engage 48:1 engineering 17:11 enjoy 20:20 25:2 40:2 enough 15:15 16:3 18:13,15 19:14 25:3 27:19 31:19 39:22 41:19 43:21 ensuing 10:11 53:18 ensure 11:24 enter 3:7 entered 47:16 entering 24:11 entire 22:21 46:13 entirely 53:2 environmental 20:25 21:11 22:17 22:20 29:3 33:16 environmentalists 44:13 envision 39:15 EPA 11:24 12:3,7,16 12:17,19,20,21,25 13:7,24 16:1 17:16	EPA's 26:4 equal 28:16,16 equals 29:2 equitably 19:11 26:9 erosion 24:3 erroneous 11:11 error 40:11 errors 45:22 46:5 especially 38:22 establishing 33:15 34:5 estimate 13:9 evaluate 42:24 even 2:3 17:18 18:7 20:7 26:13 38:18 45:4 evening 15:10 25:20 47:9,21 54:1 54:12 events 20:7 every 6:17 21:15 32:7 37:18 42:23 everybody 5:17 40:5 41:14 everyone 3:23 5:3,9 9:21 10:4 48:16,16 everyone's 4:23 44:16 everything 22:5 45:14 exactly 36:11 example 12:5 24:1 examples 14:11 20:1 except 19:15 27:22 41:1 excited 25:5 excuse 48:2 exist 16:8 29:8 32:4 existing 52:1 exists 33:4 expand 18:19,23,25 expansion 18:20 expectations 21:10 expensive 31:4 experiencing 22:7 express 21:10 22:3 29:22 extra 5:1,16 46:6	facility 49:1 facing 28:16 fact 14:5 28:20 34:11,13 36:5,23 37:10,16 45:8 50:21 52:6 factor 15:25 fail 14:14 failing 50:14 fails 50:20 failure 31:23 36:2 fair 4:24 13:15 fairly 52:2 faith 30:2,12 Falls 1:6 2:15 6:2 20:16 22:5 families 22:10 far 13:25 18:5 32:3 fashion 34:20 fault 48:21 fears 31:1 federal 7:15 47:19 47:22 51:9 feeds 43:6,7 feeling 41:23 feet 49:17 Fertilizers 24:15 few 4:5 7:11 28:25 28:25 44:9 51:25 fighting 20:11 figure 39:3 fill 2:4 47:3 filled 5:12 filters 27:22 final 2:12 3:16 4:25 14:1 18:20 26:12 finally 43:4,12 financial 11:6 30:23 48:9 financing 48:24 find 20:9 25:16 34:22 35:5 42:10 48:20 fine 10:7 finish 5:20 9:20 10:1 firmly 28:10	F first 2:22 3:22 4:7 9:2 11:10 15:20 20:17 36:8 39:3,4 fish 32:23 41:24 fished 23:9 fishery 41:22,22 five 4:23 14:8 15:25 17:10 48:25 fix 39:9 41:16 46:17 fixed 45:17,18,21 46:8 fixing 38:7 flag 39:20 flags 25:12 flap 30:22 flawed 31:21 43:13 43:23 flooding 23:15,16 24:18 floor 4:10,15 flow 40:4 flowing 40:17 flows 18:19 30:18 53:8 flush 24:19 focus 11:9 15:13 fold 34:18 folks 4:10 follow 32:13 45:24 followed 6:11 10:19 22:25 27:10 29:17 31:7 35:9 following 15:8,9 follows 7:20 foregoing 55:6,9 foreseeable 28:12 forgotten 4:2 form 2:1,1,4 6:25 26:1 formal 3:3,5 formally 54:14 former 12:4 13:5 formulas 28:5 Fort 1:7 6:3 forward 26:1 38:5 40:7 44:17 47:2 49:22,24 fought 29:13,14 found 25:22,22 46:14 Foundation 20:18 21:8 foundational 17:22 four 2:13 4:20,22	G gallon-a-day 37:3 game 52:8,9 gaming 23:11 gather 2:6 32:24 generally 16:19 generations 33:3 George 1:7 6:3 geoscience 42:19 geosciences 43:3 43:15 geoscientist 42:14 gets 17:21 18:15 27:18 45:21 getting 4:1 18:9,11 18:11 28:21 39:3 41:25 45:13 49:13 give 10:3 29:5 30:8 44:7 45:3 46:6 given 2:18 3:9,9 4:4

7:9 10:13 17:7 53:20 gives 26:11,14 51:22 giving 42:20 glaring 38:20 go 4:7 6:17 12:18 17:19,20 21:22 36:22 40:4 41:17 42:22 43:2 44:4 45:1 46:24 49:20 49:23 50:25 51:20 52:22 goal 49:1,20 goals 16:23,24 17:12 20:10 goes 37:6 going 13:3 37:9,10 38:4,19 39:24 40:4 40:5,6 41:15,16 47:17 49:21 50:16 52:4 golf 24:4 gone 20:7 28:20 49:22 gonna 10:18 15:6 25:4 30:6 31:6,18 34:6,20 35:24 37:12,19 38:7 39:8 39:10 41:6,17 43:8 52:8 good 8:12,16 15:10 15:15 18:11,14,21 19:23 34:19,20 40:9 41:19 gotten 18:5 28:15 government 33:2 34:19 governments 33:12 government-to-... 34:10 Governor 34:17 grant 1:16 12:8,10 14:25 15:2 granting 12:21 greater 8:15 13:4 22:5,21 greatly 22:14 green 38:13 Greg 34:17 Gregoire 34:17 ground 4:6,8,16,25 24:13 29:4 group 6:15 15:12	32:19 groups 20:20,22 growth 27:1 38:23 guarantee 51:23 guess 52:12 guide 17:22 guy 42:9 guys 42:16 <hr/> H habitat 21:5 Haggin 27:10 29:17 29:19,19 half 9:11,24 53:16 hand 45:25 55:18 Hangman 3:1 happen 31:19 45:25 happened 13:25 28:13 30:16 44:11 happening 38:15,22 39:16 happens 33:23,25 hard 16:18 17:10 19:8,11 29:13 44:14 51:6 Harrison 24:4 Harvey 29:17 31:7 31:10 hate 9:19 having 4:2 46:18 health 43:9 healthy 22:15 hear 4:13 heard 15:20 25:4,5 39:7,8,20 hearing 1:1,10,14 1:15,15,21 2:6,9 2:13 3:5,13,21,22 3:25 5:24 6:4,8,9 54:6,7,14 55:6,11 heavy 22:12 32:3 held 6:1 Hell's 14:12,13 her 7:1,2,2 10:8 13:6 25:9 hereto 55:8 Hession 13:13 hey 45:14 Hi 20:15 Hicks 12:7 high 8:10 higher 16:19 37:7 hillside 24:2 him 34:13	hired 25:21 historical 33:11 historically 34:14 34:15 history 23:10 hit 49:20 hold 5:19 27:4 holding 2:13 holistic 38:14 40:12 home 33:1 homeland 33:2,4 Homeowners 22:1 22:2 homes 24:2 honor 34:25 50:6 honored 6:23 hope 16:15 20:11 44:20 45:18,21 hopeful 25:3 hopefully 44:22 Hospital 6:14 hostage 52:9 hot 26:25 hour 4:19 hours 11:5 50:9 house 2:22 Houston 42:5 human 28:12 human-caused 8:4 11:15 hundreds 50:9 hunt 32:23 <hr/> I ice 27:22 Idaho 9:3,14 11:12 11:19,25 12:1,10 12:18 13:8 15:23 16:1,7,20 17:15 18:9,24 23:2,25 24:7,12 26:5 32:18 38:21,22,24 45:2,4 45:4 50:13,17 52:6 53:10,10,10 idea 30:18 identifiable 19:4 identified 49:10 identifies 3:14 ignore 12:20 ignored 34:7 ignoring 38:21 illegal 26:22 illusory 15:21 17:3 18:11	immediately 30:20 immemorial 32:20 impact 14:4,9 32:5 40:20,21 impacting 43:8 impacts 13:18 14:11 24:15 impaired 52:7 implanted 28:10 implement 36:8 implementation 31:17 36:3 51:6 implementing 36:6 implying 49:19 important 7:10 10:21 12:15 impressed 6:18 28:13 impression 30:1 improve 22:19 44:23 49:13 improved 24:14 improvement 2:8 2:20 6:1 20:23 improvements 26:21 inadequate 25:23 incidents 24:19 include 13:8 23:7 28:2 32:5 51:6 54:9 included 40:14 includes 9:2 37:21 including 11:3 24:14 43:10 inconsistently 13:3 incorporate 13:24 14:10 32:2 incorporating 14:14 increase 26:20 increased 19:15 increases 27:2 36:20 incredulous 43:3 indeed 28:25 31:5 indefensible 7:18 independently 13:3 Indian 33:11 34:1 34:18,23 50:19 Indians 33:12 Indigenous 23:8 industrial 21:14 information 25:16	25:19 42:15 Inland 43:9 Inlander 6:5 innovated 46:11 innovative 46:16 insisted 18:3 inspired 35:25 instead 8:20 45:8 Instructions 54:3 integrated 38:17 integrity 7:2 30:25 intended 49:5 intensely 47:18 intent 19:3 26:13 interest 20:20 22:15 44:16 interested 2:18 27:16 47:9 interests 30:23,23 34:21 interim 17:10 interpret 12:17 interrupt 5:5 9:19 21:21 invest 48:9 investing 48:13 investment 7:9 46:15 involved 11:2 29:12 34:11 51:11 involves 4:25 irreplaceable 21:13 Island 23:19 isolation 43:5 issue 10:21 13:2 14:3 26:4 28:17 48:14,24 issued 16:1 issues 11:10 15:13 24:3 27:5 44:16 It'll 18:16 <hr/> J Jay 34:12,25 Jay's 34:15 job 3:21 20:4 25:8 27:6 jobs 4:5 25:15 John 6:11,13 judgment 48:9 Julie 22:25 July 27:18 June 13:6,6 jurisdiction 33:20
---	--	---	---	--

just 2:22 9:15,16
14:2 16:1 18:9
20:3 21:21 30:15
31:25,25 33:11
38:25 39:5,6,13
40:13,17,23 45:15
49:21 52:12
Justice 10:23 15:11
25:17
justifiable 47:22
justify 18:2

K

Karin 14:24
keep 4:6
Ketza 4:3 55:4,22
kids 25:20
kind 27:15 28:6
31:1 42:22 43:15
kinds 42:14
Kirsten 22:25 24:22
knees 28:21 49:18
know 4:18,22 5:19
6:19 17:3 28:5
29:24 30:2,13 31:1
31:3,5 32:4 34:11
38:15,20,21,23
39:9,9,12,16,21,21
39:22 40:4,10,15
40:15,16,23,24,25
40:25 41:3,7,8,14
41:15,17,18 42:21
45:23 46:1,22
47:13 48:25 52:2,3
knowing 38:22,23
known 7:17 24:18
33:8
knows 33:23 40:5

L

lack 34:23
lacked 48:19
lake 2:7,19,24 5:25
6:5 7:24 8:8,11,22
9:6,15,17 11:17
14:4,6 15:18,24
16:4,9,10 17:4
18:22 19:8 21:2,25
22:2,4,4,6,9,16,20
23:3,4,13,15,20
24:1 26:19,25
27:20 32:6,21
39:25 40:13,18
46:7 49:16 50:25

53:12,14
Lamonte 31:12
Lands 44:6,24
language 33:9
lap 1:22
larger 22:8
largest 21:4
last 4:3 10:18 22:8
28:25,25 35:15
38:6 42:10 46:21
46:22 47:18 49:14
Lastly 24:14
late 27:20 31:16
law 8:2 15:15 18:17
19:1 26:14,16,24
34:4 36:15,16
50:23 51:10 52:19
laws 52:15
lawyer 41:4,8
lead 6:25 13:4 34:20
53:4
leaders 28:20
leadership 34:16
learn 25:21 30:15
learned 51:18
lease 26:15
least 15:19 17:12
19:9 20:9 26:23
33:23 42:23
leave 4:19 7:11
led 28:1,4
left 5:20 8:14 10:17
33:1 44:3
legal 6:4 25:24
52:17
legislature 30:6,18
length 4:16 31:20
32:20
lengthier 3:11
less 22:9,9
let 4:21 5:19,23
10:18 47:13 52:8
lets 4:23
letter 13:13
letters 14:22
Let's 17:20
Leuba 1:10,14 9:19
9:24 10:3,7,9,16
14:17,20,24 15:3,8
19:17,19 20:13
21:21 22:25 24:22
24:24 27:10 29:17
31:7 32:12,16 35:9
38:10 42:3 44:1

46:21 50:1,3 52:25
53:25
level 21:12 26:20
37:7,25 48:10
50:14
levels 12:9,13 40:4
Liberty 6:5 18:22
26:19 46:6
life 29:21 33:9,10
lifelong 49:15
life-giving 21:5,17
like 4:7,19 5:10 9:25
11:9 14:21 22:2
28:15 29:4 31:19
35:5 39:8 41:8,11
42:16 43:12 44:18
46:1,22,25 52:25
53:25
likelihood 15:14
likely 13:10
limit 4:20 5:15 9:20
18:8 19:16 49:4
limits 9:3 17:10
18:18,20 26:12
45:3
line 15:20 37:6
51:25
list 3:17,18 46:22
listening 47:9
liter 8:5,16 9:17
11:16,20,21 12:8
12:11 16:13 17:12
17:14,16 19:16
53:12,14
litigation 28:24
little 1:24 2:25 4:21
19:21 21:2 22:16
25:13,13 28:7
29:20,20 30:1,16
30:22 34:3 44:18
46:9 51:14
live 19:21 20:16
21:1 23:2 25:1
27:11 29:19 31:11
32:23 42:4
lived 29:21 32:20
lives 20:12 32:20,23
load 17:5,7 19:5
50:16,17
loading 15:22 16:2
16:4,7,9,21,22
19:11,15 24:3
37:13
loadings 16:12

local 21:5,6 22:22
31:10 52:17
located 6:2 10:24
44:6
loggerheads 34:14
logical 13:2 41:7
long 11:17 14:4,6
19:14,25 26:25
31:19 32:6 36:18
40:13,18 42:12,21
43:1 49:16,20,23
50:24
longer 22:8
look 35:4 42:23
49:18 51:16
looked 25:13
looking 34:22 39:7
40:1 46:12 48:11
looks 42:22
loses 41:14
lot 33:24 34:9
lots 16:15
love 27:18
low 12:9,12 30:18
lower 37:13 53:8
lowered 8:20 9:7
lowering 9:8,13
18:4
lowermost 34:1
luckily 25:17
ludicrous 32:1

M

made 5:10 8:20,23
18:2 19:13 26:21
32:3 36:12 41:11
45:7,23 47:10,12
mailing 3:18 32:17
main 2:21 10:25
44:7
major 23:15 28:16
31:22 40:7 49:1
50:24
make 3:23,24 4:17
7:10 18:14,25 19:9
20:10 36:3 43:2
46:3 49:12
makes 20:25
making 20:4 23:24
46:4
man 43:18
management 20:21
managing 40:17
manipulated 51:19

manmade 21:14
manner 40:13
Manning 34:13
Manning's 34:25
many 11:4,5 31:21
Mark 12:7,25
Mark's 12:15
matter 36:5 37:10
37:16 43:17 50:23
maximum 21:12
may 3:11 4:19 13:14
17:8 31:3
maybe 46:19
Mayor 13:13
mean 31:15,24
38:25 39:14 40:7
40:15,18 41:21
46:3
meaningful 36:3
42:20
means 49:19
measurable 8:1
12:22
measure 46:4
measured 8:7 45:13
measurement
39:13
measures 14:18
35:21
medicines 32:24
meet 7:22 9:15
10:13 16:23 18:7
37:19 44:15 48:2
53:21
meeting 2:21 5:5
14:7 17:14 20:3
34:12 44:10,11
meetings 11:5
48:20
meets 18:20 19:15
members 22:1
mention 40:7
mentioned 39:20
43:6
message 7:4
met 33:21,22 50:20
50:22,22
metals 22:12 24:19
32:3
mgds 48:12
micrograms 8:16
16:13 17:12,14,16
18:21 19:16
middle 29:4

mid-course 36:12
Mielke 47:5,6 51:24
might 2:4 46:3
Mike 44:1,1,5
Mile 20:16
milfoil 24:15
milligram 8:5 11:16
 11:20,21 12:8,10
 12:18,21 53:11,14
milligrams 9:17
million 25:6 37:3
 41:19 43:19 51:12
mine 1:23 42:17
mines 42:15
minimum 30:18
minute 16:5
minutes 4:20,22
 5:16 9:24
Mission 6:16
mistake 24:10 45:7
mistakes 38:20
model 51:20,21
modeling 7:13
moisture 40:6
money 27:7 39:24
 41:16
monitor 22:19
monitored 43:20
monitoring 21:13
 36:11 39:15
months 14:8 22:10
moratorium 23:23
more 3:3 4:21 12:22
 16:5 17:3 22:7,7
 25:16 26:24 31:4
 36:21,23,24 37:8
 40:24 41:20,24,25
 42:11 47:23 51:2
 51:12,22 52:5
Moreover 13:12
Morrison 29:18 31:7
 31:9,10
most 26:3 48:3
mother 25:1
move 44:17 45:1
moved 29:14
moving 26:1 49:24
much 7:7 9:11,23
 16:9 29:21 30:12
 35:8 36:11 37:7
 40:6,10,11 41:25
multiple 38:1
multi-hundred 25:6
municipal 24:7

must 14:1 15:15
 18:17 23:7 24:10
 24:12,14 50:22
 53:16
mutual 34:21
myself 15:1 34:16
 42:7

N

name 2:2 3:17 4:3,8
 4:14 5:21,22 6:13
 15:10 24:24 27:11
 29:19 35:11 38:11
 42:4 44:5 47:2,5
 50:6
name's 10:21 31:10
nation 26:10
natural 8:1,2,6,8,22
 8:24 9:4 10:12
 11:13,19 13:9,20
 21:18 27:14 53:7
 53:20
naturally 12:9,12
nature 20:5
near 20:5,5 32:21
nearing 5:18
nearly 6:19 11:3,17
 11:21 53:3
necessarily 36:22
necessary 36:13
need 3:22,24 4:5
 5:1,6 9:9 13:21
 21:22 23:23 31:15
 32:3,5,8 35:6
 38:14,16 39:12,12
 41:20,21 42:22,23
 42:24 52:17,18,20
needed 8:13 9:12
 16:22 28:8 33:13
 42:11
needs 23:16 25:23
 26:7,16 28:8 32:1
 40:12 41:22 43:23
 45:17 50:21,25
 51:20
neighbors 4:17
never 1:23
new 7:8 16:23 18:6
 18:10,10 26:18
 34:16,17 35:2
 36:20 37:3 46:13
news 8:16
next 2:14 26:17
 32:15,16 37:13

nine 15:19 19:2
 20:16 25:7
nine-year 42:25
nobody 25:18
nobody's 41:17
noise 4:25 5:1,16
nonpoint 8:12 9:9
 9:12 12:14,19
 13:21 16:17,22
 17:1,20 18:8,11
 24:18 36:9 37:16
 37:18,23 46:15
 48:13 49:9 53:15
non-stormy 20:7
North 20:17
Northwest 42:6
nose 31:15
notary 55:4,23
notes 1:22 55:10
nothing 17:13 27:21
notice 3:19 6:4
November 2:10
 54:2
NPDES 11:8 18:17
 24:10 36:17
NPS 18:8
number 33:13 43:5
 47:17
numbers 13:23
 15:21 17:8 28:5
 39:5 51:18

O

obeying 28:21
objective 7:23
 10:13 53:21
obtained 33:18
obtains 3:25
obvious 39:1
obviously 13:22
 40:9,21 47:8
occur 38:16
occurred 12:2 14:12
 51:4
occurrence 28:4
October 1:5 2:15
 5:24 55:19
off 4:22 5:4 24:16
 31:20 38:24 44:19
 46:23 47:13
offer 46:25 54:1
offered 52:23
officer 1:10,14,15
 3:21

official 54:7
officials 44:13
often 36:18 48:1
okay 5:8,10,17,18
 9:25 10:20 21:24
 32:17 44:3
old 39:21
Olympia 28:22
Once 3:5
one 2:22 4:14 5:15
 10:18 21:3 36:19
 37:19 41:24
onerous 46:3
ones 3:11
only 2:18 9:10 12:12
 16:3 18:25 19:4,12
 26:14 36:15 48:17
 49:18,23
open 2:22 4:9 5:14
operate 49:2
operating 49:8
operations 14:6
opinion 7:14 10:11
 32:1 53:19
opportunities 14:10
 21:6
opportunity 3:23
 5:11 9:22 10:1,4,5
 10:20 14:16 23:1
 31:9 44:7 46:20
 47:8,15
opposed 9:10
optimal 21:16
oral 5:21
order 4:7,8,9 5:13
 33:14 36:13 42:19
Oregon 14:13
organization 20:17
organizations
 20:15 31:1
original 8:7 9:10
 23:19
originally 53:16
Osborn 6:11,13,13
 9:19,23,25 10:6,8
 10:10,19 11:10
 12:4 15:5,6 31:14
 46:22 50:1,2,3,5,6
 50:7 53:2
other 10:24 11:6
 12:5 16:16 19:13
 22:12 32:2,4 36:9
 38:16,16,18 39:7
 45:22,25 46:7

Otherwise 41:7
ought 52:2,3,15
out 2:4 5:10,12
 10:17 17:3 23:3
 25:4,17,19,22,22
 27:11,20,21 39:4
 41:11,24 42:10
 43:4,18 47:3 52:16
outflow 23:15
outlet 8:8,21 9:5
outside 5:7
over 1:21 4:7 7:12
 7:13 14:25 15:22
 21:23 22:3 28:16
 28:22 35:15 37:13
 37:17 38:23
overflows 22:12
overlooked 40:8
oversight 17:23
 18:16
own 14:5 27:3 34:16
 41:9 45:2,3 47:15
oxygen 2:8,20 5:25
 7:16 8:1,5,12 9:17
 11:17,22 12:9,13
 13:1 14:7 15:18,24
 27:2 50:9 53:12,14
oxygenation 14:19

P

Page 55:8
paid 34:8,23
palatable 31:4
pamphlet 1:24
park 20:18,21,21,23
 20:24,25 21:8,17
parks 21:4
part 2:9 6:9 8:19
 13:7 23:14 28:9
 29:9 31:2 40:19
 45:3 50:24 54:7,9
participate 52:20
particular 14:4 18:8
 28:1 29:13 38:17
particularly 16:16
 28:13
parts 2:21 22:9
path 33:9 38:14
paying 34:2
PCBs 32:3 45:13
people 5:12 23:8,22
 25:14,18 28:22,23
 29:13 30:22 32:19
 32:22 33:6,6,14

34:7 39:7 41:23 43:5,9,24 44:12,12 45:6 46:18 47:16 people's 25:15 per 8:5,16 9:17 11:16,20,21 12:8 12:10 16:13 17:12 17:14,16 19:16 53:11,14 percent 8:13 9:10 9:11 16:19,23,24 36:7,24 37:17,21 perfect 20:5 perhaps 44:2 period 2:9 49:8 permanent 33:1,3 permissible 8:6 9:16 53:11,13 permit 9:3 18:22 24:10,12 36:17 permits 2:14,17 3:2 9:14 11:8 16:1 17:6,13 18:17,24 19:12 26:5,18 48:24 permitted 8:15 permitting 12:17 person 2:2 4:14 46:21 personal 11:5,5 personally 11:1 26:3 Peterson 44:1,5,5 46:21 Pfeifer 1:16 Pheasant 20:17 phones 5:3 phosphate 24:3 phosphorous 8:15 9:9 11:11,18 16:12 16:16,21 17:8 18:24 36:10 37:9 37:11 53:15 phosphorus 8:11,13 physician 6:14 pick 1:25 2:4 10:16 15:4 46:24 place 18:6 19:14 21:1 28:9 33:14 48:25 52:3 55:7 plan 6:1 7:8,16 13:22 15:14,15,18 19:7,10 20:1 22:19 23:17 25:4,5,6,22	25:24,24 26:1,8,9 26:11,18 27:5,6 29:23 31:18 32:1 33:22 36:2,20,23 37:1,10,15,21 38:1 40:10 41:5,11 42:1 42:9,10,22,24,25 42:25 43:13,23 44:14,19 47:8 50:10,10,14,15,20 50:20,25,25 51:2,5 51:15,19,20,22,25 52:8,17,18,20,21 planning 25:10 42:17 plans 17:11 19:24 plant 26:18 37:4,5,7 41:1 43:19 plants 15:23 26:5 26:15 36:25 37:22 plan's 26:2 play 45:5 52:8,9 please 3:10 4:13 5:6 5:21 47:2 podium 4:12 point 3:7 7:24 12:9 12:13 13:8 14:3 36:2,7,20,24 37:15 37:17 38:3 39:14 42:23 49:11 52:7 pointed 43:4,18 points 36:1 poised 12:8 policy 7:14,17,19 8:19,23,25 9:7 10:10 12:7,15 13:8 41:10 43:14 45:18 53:6,18 political 51:4,17 52:12 politicians 30:6,7 31:4 politics 28:15 pollutant 50:14 pollutants 15:22 32:4 46:13 polluters 21:14 26:9 26:11,14 51:19,22 52:1 pollution 8:4 13:19 24:8,11 26:6,8,20 26:24 31:24 36:8 36:10,21,23 37:2 37:17 39:13 45:9	45:11 52:5,11,14 poorer 9:5 positive 34:20 possibility 46:12 possible 22:20 Post 22:5 pounds 17:8 37:8 pours 23:3,15 Powderhorn 24:1 power 30:10,13 powerful 30:8,10 31:5 practical 24:13 practically 40:11 practice 33:7 preceded 28:3 precedent 45:12,17 precious 21:4,16 prepare 3:13 present 8:3 42:20 presented 42:8 preservation 21:16 president 31:10 Press 6:7 pretend 24:8 pretending 16:7 26:6 pretty 16:9 25:12 29:21 44:14 previously 3:15 15:20 43:18 primary 20:24 prior 7:3 probably 18:16 28:4 problem 13:17 14:15,16 16:18,25 27:3 38:6,15 41:17 50:24 problems 6:22 13:4 46:18 50:12,18 procedure 28:3 proceed 31:22 32:9 47:23 process 10:23 11:3 11:4,7 25:10 28:1 28:14,18 29:2,10 29:12,15 31:2 32:8 38:17 47:12,17,20 47:21 48:4,5,15,19 48:22,23 49:24 51:3 52:20 processes 10:24 38:16,18 47:19 program 1:17 2:23	18:8 29:5 35:18,23 progress 36:12 46:4 prohibit 19:15 project 23:18 50:8 projects 20:23 49:9 pronounce 10:18 proposal 6:10 23:19 26:4 28:10,10 35:15 37:3 47:24 51:8 54:8 proposed 9:3,14 23:18 24:2,4 33:22 35:21 protect 6:20 19:22 21:13 33:14,14,15 protection 21:11,12 22:17 protective 34:6 proved 48:10 proven 41:6 48:10 provide 15:16 17:11 19:7 20:22 21:5,19 22:23 33:3 36:2 48:18 provided 9:22 provides 36:23 providing 21:12 public 1:1 2:6,9,13 3:4,5,13 35:12 43:9 44:22,22 46:25 52:21 55:4,6 55:11,23 published 6:4,24 purpose 2:6 push 27:6 put 3:17 5:3 19:11 25:4 31:20 40:10 41:5 44:21 46:12 46:14 53:6 puts 52:11 putting 18:10 25:18 37:11 p.m 1:5 5:23 P.O 32:18	28:11,17 33:17 34:24 37:20 38:8 40:21 49:13 50:19 50:22 52:7,19 53:7 53:7,20,22,22 quantity 6:22 51:13 quarter 6:19 question 31:6 42:9 questions 2:23 3:6 3:7,14 5:15 12:16 quickly 11:9 14:2 22:20 quit 25:10 quitting 25:15 quote 8:2,4
R				
Rachael 10:19 15:5 15:8 50:7 raised 12:15 rates 40:20 rather 32:9 43:14 51:5 raw 20:6 Rawls 32:12 35:9,11 35:11 reach 14:25 16:14 17:15 34:1 reaching 17:12 29:4 read 6:23 12:4 25:9 28:7 reading 31:20 reaffirm 21:9 real 19:14 23:10 28:16 29:1,22 34:22 43:14 realistic 39:5 realize 13:7 realized 33:13 really 14:2 16:18,18 25:18 28:4,8 29:1 30:15 35:25 39:10 39:11 41:16 44:14 46:9,10 51:11 52:15 reason 19:24 reasonable 4:19 15:16 19:7 29:11 51:6 reasonably 28:12 reasons 9:1 15:19 reassessment 19:12 receive 3:19 12:3				
Q				
quality 1:17 2:8,17 2:20,23,25 3:1 5:25 6:21 7:8,22 7:23,25 8:3,7,9,11 8:21,23 9:2,5,6,8 9:15 10:12,14,15 11:14 12:1,7 14:5 15:17,24 22:3				

<p>received 2:11 3:15 6:8,9 54:2,5,7,9 receiving 2:2 40:6 recent 22:7,13 recently 7:6 30:15 reclaimed 37:25 recognize 13:24 14:6,15 31:23 48:6 48:8 reconsider 52:23 record 3:4,4,6,25 4:2,13,14 5:15,22 5:23 6:9 12:4 47:1 47:4,5 54:1,7 recording 4:1 5:2 recreate 22:22 recreating 22:11 40:2 recreation 22:19 recreational 20:24 21:6 22:14 red 25:12 39:20 reduce 16:2,12,22 reduced 8:13 9:10 16:24 53:16 reduction 11:16,20 11:22 12:11,12 13:21 16:20 36:24 37:22,22 reductions 17:1,21 18:23 red-flagged 39:18 Reed 15:9 19:20,20 referred 14:23 refine 49:13 reflected 13:5 regard 47:11,12 48:22 regarding 2:24 region 7:5 regional 1:16 28:19 29:13 35:22 registration 1:24 5:9 54:3 regulation 29:25 regulations 33:16 regulation's 30:3 regulators 30:5 regulatory 23:4 39:23 reinforce 19:22 reiterate 21:9 relate 24:18 relates 8:11 24:6</p>	<p>relationship 34:10 relatively 11:12 release 7:3 relics 33:11 relies 11:10 37:15 religiously 32:25 rely 43:10 relying 51:2 remain 10:12 53:20 remainder 5:14 37:18 remaining 53:25 remarks 10:8 remember 49:16 remind 47:16 54:5 remove 36:7 removing 16:16 37:8 renders 7:16 rendezvous 23:10 renewable 38:13 renovation 49:1 repetitive 3:11 report 2:8,8,20 31:21 reporter 4:2 REPORTER'S 55:1 represent 8:8,22 10:23 20:19 32:19 representation 23:8 representative 9:4 representing 20:15 21:25 29:2,3 42:6 requested 55:10 require 16:2 19:12 26:16 27:2 required 7:21 41:12 requirements 7:15 52:13 requires 11:24 13:23 16:11 17:14 requisite 18:23 reservation 34:1,6 34:24,24 reservations 29:22 reserve 21:18 22:23 reserved 33:2 reservoir 27:1 reside 6:15 resident 10:25 19:20 49:15 residents 22:22 residing 55:24</p>	<p>resign 7:7 resonated 7:4 resource 20:25 27:14 resources 11:6 21:3 21:5,13,17 33:15 34:7 respond 2:11 3:15 response 2:11 3:16 3:19 34:15 responsibilities 3:22 responsibly 48:7 rest 45:5 restoration 21:16 restore 6:20 16:9 17:4 19:8 29:14 restricted 22:14 result 7:12 8:12 9:7 9:12 15:16 51:3 resulted 53:9 resulting 35:19 results 11:21 17:18 34:20 42:20 52:4 return 42:12 review 6:5,24 49:5 50:11 54:8 revised 50:21 revisit 26:1 revisited 43:23 re-presented 43:24 rich 30:7,9 31:5 Rick 6:12 10:18,22 15:12 Rico 15:9 19:20 rid 29:9 ride 6:17 right 13:23 15:8 21:18 22:23 25:1 29:14,24 31:3,5 39:18 41:21 42:13 43:8,17,18 45:6 rigorous 39:12 riparian 24:17 Rita 4:3 55:4,22 Rita's 4:3 river 1:1 2:7,19,24 3:1 5:25 6:15,18 6:19,20,21 7:1,9 7:10,16,24 8:9,15 8:22,24,25 10:24 13:19 14:5 15:13 19:21,22 20:6 21:2 21:2 22:6,16 23:3</p>	<p>23:7,13 24:11,20 25:1,23,25 26:21 26:23 27:8,17 28:11,11 29:20 31:15,16 32:4,21 32:22 33:8 34:2 35:18 36:13,22 37:2,9,12,13,19 38:8 39:13,16 41:21 42:6 43:6,7 44:17 45:15 46:13 50:7 52:5,11,16 53:5 rivers 30:19 33:5 Riverside 20:18,21 20:24 21:8,17 Road 20:17 role 7:2 51:1 room 2:16 5:7 10:4 52:5 rule 4:8,16,25 rules 4:6,7 29:6,7 run 16:19 running 1:17 9:20 runoff 19:23 24:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>sad 27:7 safety 22:20 salvage 46:19 same 2:16,16 3:10 20:12 39:21 42:13 44:10 sanitary 20:3 Sasso 20:14 sat 48:20 satisfy 51:19 saying 25:10 41:10 45:8 47:13 52:12 says 31:14 36:16 45:14 51:15 scaleable 48:10 schedule 36:3,17 science 17:18 41:5 41:12,13 43:14,16 51:20 52:18 scientific 7:12 41:11 scientifically 13:10 25:11 scientist 25:10 31:13 scientists 41:9 51:11</p>	<p>sea 39:25 seal 55:18 second 3:24 4:16 9:8 14:2,3 16:7 21:20,22 seconds 5:20 19:17 see 18:1 19:14 26:3 31:19 34:9,17,18 35:6,7 38:15,17 42:25 46:1 49:6,17 seem 46:3 seems 31:19 seen 19:5 20:8 40:3 45:25 segment 3:3,5 send 22:6 senior 6:13 12:6 sense 19:1 separate 20:2 September 6:6,7 12:6 septic 37:11 52:10 seriously 48:8 services 20:22 session 15:7 set 1:21 8:9 12:20 sets 45:12 Seven 17:25 several 9:1 sewage 20:6 22:12 sewer 24:4 sewers 20:2,3 Shannon 31:8 32:13 32:14,17 share 13:16 shared 13:12 sheet 5:9 shoot 41:7 short 52:2 shortcoming 12:2 shorthand 55:10 show 5:23 26:13 shown 41:6 55:7 shows 17:18 sick 31:14 41:25 side 5:5 Sierra 6:15 10:23 11:2 15:13 28:23 35:25 50:8 sign 38:24 signed 4:9 5:9,13 significance 7:19 significant 6:21 8:25 13:18 14:15</p>
---	---	---	---	---

14:16 23:6 26:3
37:22 40:19
significantly 13:20
signup 3:17
silence 5:3
silent 14:9
similar 13:14
simply 12:1 28:20
53:6
simulation 7:13
since 49:22
sir 47:2
site 23:14
sitting 49:16
situation 42:13 53:9
Six 17:20
six-year 42:25
size 48:12
skeptical 19:23
slightly 43:5
slow-moving 27:1
small 11:12
smart 29:14
solution 32:9 51:4
51:17
solutions 52:13
solve 14:16
solving 38:14
some 7:19 12:15
13:12 14:22 18:11
20:10,10 25:12
28:9 29:2,3,11,22
34:20 36:1 38:20
39:17 40:9 42:22
44:11,21 45:4,22
46:5,6,7,11,14,18
47:11 49:2
somebody 43:19
something 25:8
28:15 29:4 39:2
43:17 44:15 45:20
52:16
sometime 27:20
Sorry 44:3
sort 27:16 29:11
Sosso 20:14,15,16
21:24,25
sound 4:24
source 12:9,19 13:8
13:21 14:15 16:22
17:1,21 18:8,12
36:7 49:9
sources 8:12 9:9,12
11:15,20,25 12:13

16:16,17 24:7,18
36:9,9,24 37:16,17
37:23 39:14,14
48:13 53:15
South 31:12
so-called 28:3
spare 19:17
speak 3:6 4:11,17
10:5,21 31:9 35:24
44:2 46:20,22 47:8
47:14 48:18
speakers 4:12
46:23
speaking 4:8,20
47:25
speaks 4:14
special 27:7
specific 48:23 51:7
spend 39:24 41:16
41:20 43:19
spending 54:12
spent 41:18 50:9
spirit 46:10
spirits 29:1
spiritual 33:7
spiritually 32:25
Splash 6:6
Spokane 1:1,6,8 2:7
2:7,15,19,19,24,24
3:1 5:24,25 6:2,14
6:16,18 7:1,9,9,16
7:24,25 8:9 9:16
9:18 10:24,25 11:1
13:14 14:5 15:18
15:24 16:5 19:8,21
20:25 21:1,2,2,2
22:1,2,4,4,5,16,16
22:16,21 23:3,7,13
24:11,19,25 25:1
25:23,25 26:19,20
27:12,17 29:20,20
30:16 31:11,12,14
32:22,22 33:6,8,12
33:25 34:1,4,23
35:3,7,12,14 37:1
37:7,12,13 38:8,12
39:25 42:5 43:10
43:24 46:12 47:6
47:25 48:11 50:7
50:19 52:16 53:5
53:12,15 55:2,24
Spokane/Colum...
33:5
Spokesman 6:5,24

sprayed 24:16
ss 55:1
staff 1:16 2:23 3:7
3:13 11:22 12:3
52:19 54:8
stagnant 32:6
stand 13:23 19:10
21:15 26:7 41:9
standard 7:23,25
8:10,14 9:6,9,11
9:15 10:12,14,15
14:7 28:11 48:3
53:7,20,22,22
standards 2:25 7:22
11:14 12:12,17,20
13:25 15:17,24
16:6 18:4 33:17,18
33:21 34:5,7 37:20
48:23 50:19,22
51:9
stands 47:20
start 5:8 33:15 37:5
45:13 47:13
started 30:21 44:12
starting 5:12
state 1:2 4:13 5:22
11:14 13:4 20:18
20:21,24 21:4,8,17
22:15 29:6,6,7,10
30:17,19 33:19
34:19 35:2 47:2
50:15 51:7,10
52:14 55:1,5,24
stated 3:14 11:10
12:7 13:15 29:23
stateline 8:24 9:2
11:12,19 13:20
15:22 24:9 26:6
31:24 45:9 53:8
statement 6:23
10:1 21:9,20
statements 12:5
states 12:24 19:2,11
26:9 33:2 34:5,14
48:4
State's 21:4
state-of-the-art
37:4
statute 30:17
stead 34:19
steep 24:2
step 5:21 20:4
stepped 37:23
stepping 7:2

still 5:11,12 33:6
44:3
Stokes 27:10,11,11
stood 44:25
stop 25:25 32:8
38:6,7
stopped 40:25
stories 16:19
storm 20:2 24:14
strict 49:7
strides 18:2
strikes 39:6
stringent 47:23
48:3
Student 1:6 2:16
6:1
studies 14:6
study 10:2 37:24
43:4
submit 3:12 14:21
submitted 6:24
submitting 11:7
54:3
subsistence 33:7
substantially 49:22
substitute 8:23
success 15:14 16:19
successful 30:9
sue 51:7
sufficient 1:22 18:2
suggested 23:22
summarize 3:11
summary 3:13
summer 22:10
31:16 32:7
sun 27:19
Sunday 6:7
Superfund 23:14
support 4:6 27:24
35:15
supportable 51:9
supported 52:18,19
52:19,21
supports 35:14
supposed 34:2
sure 3:23,24 4:17
40:15 46:3
surface 8:3
surprised 30:15
surrounding 21:18
sustain 28:12
swim 25:2 27:17
41:23 49:15
swimming 22:10

27:23
system 24:5

T

table 1:21,24 2:1
35:16 37:21 48:16
48:17 54:4
tactics 40:24
take 1:22 11:9 17:3
41:8 48:7 51:25
taken 55:7
takes 5:4 25:14
38:18 48:25
talk 45:19
talking 29:25 30:3,5
34:13 36:1,1 38:3
tanks 37:11 52:10
tape 15:1 21:22
targets 19:12 51:6
tax 48:6
taxpayers 27:3
teach 27:14
technical 46:5
technically 17:17
technologies 26:22
48:9
technology 16:15
18:6,10 36:6 37:4
48:2 51:23 52:3
teeth 19:24
tell 10:10 31:16
53:18
terms 35:20
Terrace 42:6
testimony 2:11,17
3:15 4:4,23 5:20
5:21 6:8 9:21
10:17 15:3 46:25
47:4 50:4,11 53:1
54:1,5
thank 1:19 10:9,19
10:20 15:2 19:18
19:19 20:13 22:24
24:21,22,23 27:9
29:17 31:7,9 32:11
32:12 35:8 38:9,10
38:11 42:2,3 43:25
44:3 47:5,7 49:25
50:1,2,6 52:24,25
53:24 54:4,11
thanks 10:16 23:1
27:19
their 2:11 5:3 9:3
17:13 18:10,19

water 1:17 2:8,17
 2:20,22,24 3:1
 5:25 6:21 7:8,15
 7:21,21,22,23,25
 8:3,7,9,10,21,23
 9:2,6,8,15 10:12
 10:14,14 11:14,24
 12:1,6 14:5 15:17
 15:23 21:5,13 22:4
 22:9,11 24:15
 26:23 27:19 28:17
 32:6 33:8,17,17
 34:24 36:22,22
 37:20,25,25 38:8
 40:16,21 43:11
 45:9 47:20,22
 49:13,17 50:19,21
 51:13 52:7,14,14
 52:19 53:6,8,19,22
 53:22
waters 32:24,25
watershed 45:2
 50:13,18
way 20:4,10 24:13
 25:19 27:17 30:11
 42:18,21 43:1
 46:14 49:20
ways 31:21 33:7,7
 49:23
weak 25:11
weaken 51:8
weaknesses 26:2,4
Wednesday 1:5
 2:14
weeks 28:25 42:8
welcome 1:19
welcomed 34:18
well 10:6 11:8 14:15
 14:22 18:25 23:10
 28:16 31:16 34:16
 36:5 38:7 39:2,2,9
 40:23,25 41:3
 42:11 47:21 48:13
 49:10
went 25:16,21
 35:14
were 9:14 12:3 13:5
 32:23 39:8,20,21
 39:24 41:10 44:9
 46:11 49:6,13
West 1:7 6:3,16
 10:25 24:25 35:13
 42:4 44:7 47:7
we'll 3:3 4:9 5:13

6:11 16:5 18:1,11
 18:14 20:11 45:11
 47:3 49:23
we're 15:4,21 27:25
 29:10,24 30:3 34:2
 38:4,7 39:7,25
 40:11 41:20 44:6
 45:14 46:4 48:11
 49:3,19,21 52:8
we've 18:2 20:7
 36:12 37:25 45:25
 49:10
whole 33:24,24 43:9
who've 1:17
wildlife 21:6
wind 45:14
win-win 53:9
wisely 12:25
wish 29:8
WITNESS 55:18
wonderful 27:23
word 35:4
words 35:1 53:3
work 6:17,20 7:1
 20:11 31:8 32:13
 32:14,14,17,17
 35:12 40:9 41:25
 42:11,14 43:20
 47:6
worked 44:14
working 15:11 35:5
 50:9
works 30:14 35:12
 42:21
workshop 1:18
worry 22:10 45:16
worse 40:3
wouldn't 19:8
Wright 1:7 6:3
writer 12:4 13:6
writes 7:6
written 2:3 3:9,12
 6:9 11:8 14:21,25
 22:23 47:4 54:2,6
 54:8
wrong 36:16,21
 37:2 45:1,12
wrote 13:6,14
W-O-R-K 32:17

Y

yacht 23:21
yards 23:19
yeah 39:11 41:7,18

50:5
year 13:14 14:8
 40:3,3,4 41:24
 51:15
years 10:2 16:2
 17:6,9,13,16 18:5
 18:7 19:6 20:8
 22:7,13 25:7 26:11
 26:14,17 29:21
 30:16,17,24 33:13
 33:23 34:11 35:15
 36:4,8,10,13,16,18
 36:18 37:14 39:6,7
 39:8,9,10 40:2
 41:1,18 42:10,12
 42:16,21 43:1,2
 44:9 47:17,18
 48:20,25 49:2,10
 49:11,12 51:25

Z

zero 50:17

0

0.2 9:16 53:11,14

1

1 12:22 26:4 55:8
1,300 24:2
10 8:16 10:2 16:2,13
 17:13,16 18:5,7,20
 19:15 26:14,17
 36:8,10,12,16,17
 37:13 39:8,10
 41:18 42:10,12,16
 42:21 43:1 49:11
 49:11 51:15
10th 2:15 38:12
10-year 17:25 18:1
 20:9 24:12 31:17
 36:10,11 48:22,23
 49:4,4,5
1026 35:13
1116 47:7
12 18:7
13th 2:10 54:2
15 40:2
1515 20:17
15418 29:20
17 30:24
18-hole 24:4
19th 55:19
1922 23:9
1974 30:17

2

28:5 11:16,20 12:8
 12:10,12,18,20,23
 26:11
20 16:19,24 17:6,9
 19:6 26:11 33:23
 36:4,18 39:6,6
 43:2
20-year 19:24 20:1
 31:17 51:23
2003 37:5
2004 8:7 16:20
 21:10 26:9 51:5,19
2005 12:6 20:8
2006 20:8
2007 1:5 2:10 5:24
 6:7 13:6 55:19
2136 55:23
220,000 23:18
2421 6:16
25 37:8 44:7
27 20:8
27th 6:6

3

3 1:5
3rd 5:24
30 5:20 36:18
30th 6:7
3020 24:25
3409 32:18
3410 1:7 6:3
35 10:25
3805 31:11
39 9:10

4

4 11:21 12:14,21
 26:25
4th 27:18

5

5 36:2 41:18
50 17:12,14,15,16
 37:17
5714 42:4

6

6 16:19 36:20
60 16:24 39:15

7

7 37:1
7th 13:6

7:00 1:5
7:09 5:23
70 39:15
70s 49:23
71 29:21
76 8:13 9:10

8

8 37:3,15 48:12
8:22 54:14
80 16:22
83816 32:18

9

90 36:7,24 37:21
 41:19 43:19
963 38:12
99205 24:25
99224 1:8
99260 35:13 47:7