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VSP TECHNICAL PANEL MEETING

9:05 am: VSP Program update – Bill Eller, Ron Shultz, WSCC
Ron Shultz discusses Department of Commerce – series of workshops – critical area ordinance monitoring
Bill Eller – mentions the regional meetings the Commission is setting up in early December – topic will be implementation after plan adoption.
Ron Shultz mentions the status of the County contracts – down to 1-2 to be signed.

9:30 am: Yakima County - presentation on work plan monitoring, goals and benchmarks
Frank Hendrix introduces himself as the Yakima VSP work plan chairman. 20 meetings with the work group. 15 meetings with the commodity groups. Pre-review the Technical Panel provided was helpful. Want to get started on implementation asap.
Lisa Grueter brings up the letter that the Commission sent to the work group on receipt of the work plan and how that drove the structure of the PowerPoint presentation today.
Lisa Grueter begins the presentation.
Ron Shultz asks who is responsible for adaptive management.
Lisa Grueter says each goal and benchmark has that set out, but then largely the work group will be.
Stacy Polkowske says the overall plan is great, but we have some comments on a-l. Chapter 4 – relating to other plans – thought there could be a stronger tie of what pieces of those plans were used in VSP – highlight the key things in the plan. RCW 36.70A.720(1)(k) – own section – could be brief. Regulatory backstop – there is one for fish passage and screening that you might want to include.
Brian Cochrane discusses the outreach by technical providers. Saw the roles and responsibilities in Chapter 6, but didn’t see the connections and commitment of those who are the supporting technical providers.

Kelly McLain says the wording of that section should say something that “the county will contract with these technical providers” to something along those lines.

Lauren Driscoll says the targeted outreach is great with the number of producers. Are there individual stewardship plans target numbers?

Lisa Grueter says that North Yakima Conservation District was thinking about the priorities in that area and then try to get the most bang for the buck on the contacts with the landowners by phone calls, going to meetings, etc. They set out the acres parameters. There are 17,000 landowners in the critical area intersect. But that number drops when you consider larger rangeland (160 acres +) and irrigated acres along waterbodies and wetlands (20 acres +).

Brian Cochrane says that Section (g) says the technical service provider works to ensure the individual stewardship plans is working toward the goals and benchmarks. I think it was all there, but it was hard to tease out who was working with the entity to ensure the provider works with the landowners to ensure the individual stewardship plans are meeting the goals and benchmarks.

Lisa Grueter says we will cover that later in the presentation. There is also a survey monkey tool to match the goals and benchmarks.

Brian Cochrane asks about baseline monitoring and imaging monitoring. It was a little open when you say imaging will be used for monitoring.

Lisa Grueter continues with the presentation and how the technical assistance provider will do their work. There is a draft letter, short form, then a meeting, and a thorough review. Cost share and practices might be part of that. South Yakima Conservation District said education is also a piece of that. Both districts sought other funding and working with other areas on riparian enhancements. They often work with the agricultural producers to accomplish those.

Frank Hendrix says the county assessor says there are 40,000 taxpayers who have between 2-20 acres who will need training.

Brian Cochrane asks about the acres that the producer numbers represent. It would be helpful to know the context.

Kelly McLain says it would be helpful to have that number as another metric to consider.

Lisa Grueter says that in speaking with Mike Tobin in Yakima that there are eight large rangeland landowners in Yakima County.

Kelly McLain likes that we can add context around the percentage that was reached. If only eight contacts, but 80% of the land covered....

Lisa Grueter says the 17,000 landowners caused us come concern for our outreach efforts and that’s why the target was 160 acres+ for rangeland and 20 acres + for irrigated along waterbodies. But NYCD started there and came up with numbers for reach goals (e.g. 40+ acres and 5+ acres). Continues with presentation and participation priorities.

Tracking tool – survey monkey. Discussion ensues.

Brian Cochrane asks about duplication of data.

Sarah Sandstrom says it will be the North and South Yakima Conservation Districts who will be implementing this.
Kelly McLain says it can be organized by the commodity group in your database.

Sarah Sandstrom says that the conclusions are not necessarily based on tracking an individual over a number of years. There is less concern about tracking the same individual.

Lisa Grueter continues the presentation. What the technical provider will be doing on an annual basis and how they will be using the tracking tool annually. Every two years there will be mapping and producer surveys. Expert panels will be convened as needed. We added a definition of the expert panel. Imagery was a hot topic in the work group sub-committee. The work group created six imagery guiding principles.

Frank Hendrix says we don’t know what we will have available in five years, but it should be better than what we have now.

Lisa Grueter continues.

Brian Cochrane asks about “other tools.” Choice of tool, including imagery, depends on the questions you ask about monitoring – what are you going to monitor, how good of an answer do you need, and what can you afford.

Lisa Grueter says a table was added with what the types of information that mapping or imagery interpretation could provide for each critical area (e.g. composition, cover, complexity for shrub steppe).

Sarah Sandstrom says the imagery will be used for adaptive management.

Lisa Grueter continues and covers imagery interpretation. There is more than one monitoring method. What are we trying to get out of the imagery? We also added a definition of the expert panel.

Ron Shultz asks how aquifer recharge areas will be monitored.

Sarah Sandstrom says Appendix G is adaptive management. Monitoring is in it. Hydrologically related critical areas includes streams, wetlands, floodplains, and critical aquifer recharge areas. The county ordinance uses those terms, so we use them. We included critical aquifer recharge areas. We are looking at the functions of those critical areas.

Brian Cochrane says there are aquifer studies of the Yakima Valley that show that pumping goes up in times of drought.

Ron Shultz asks about row 4 in Appendix G – pathogens for groundwater contamination. I am looking at that. Memo from Ecology.

Bill Eller summarizes the memo that Ecology provided to the Commission late yesterday about CARA’s dated September 13, 2017 for the Yakima County work group to consider.

Sarah Sandstrom recognizes that the Lower Yakima GWMA was recognized by the Yakima County VSP work group, but didn’t want to duplicate those efforts in the work plan. The outcomes of the GWMA process will be used in the work plan as part of the regulatory backstop.

Ron Shultz says that the GWMA can help determine where outreach to landowners needs to occur.

Sarah Sandstrom says maybe in the adaptive management process might include a trigger for GWMA.
Ron Shultz would encourage an accurate statement about how the GMWA will be incorporated into the work plan. Put it in up front in the body of the plan.

More than stating the GWMA in a benchmark and in regulatory backstop?

Ron Shultz says yes.

Kelly McLain says there are two documents that the GWMA will produce by December that will describe targeted practices to address ground water – voluntary practices that they will suggest. Those documents don’t need to be specifically called out, but the work plan could include a clearer statement about that.

Sarah Sandstrom continues the presentation on goals and benchmarks. Shrub steppe metric lowered to 2.5% from 5%. Hydrologically related critical areas are what we will focus on now.

Brian Cochrane asks about a protection benchmark that relies on a regulatory benchmark (adjudication of water rights) and therefore doesn’t require monitoring.

Ron Shultz says water use affects hydrologically related critical areas.

Sarah Sandstrom says the adjudication regulates the water use and that is why monitoring isn’t needed.

Ron Shultz says if water use is impacting hydrologically related critical areas. Not sure what GMA/VSP will be able to do. Not sure there is a benchmark that could be used here. Don’t see a problem with it as a benchmark, but suggests leaving it out.

Kelly McLain says it is worth acknowledging.

Discussion related to referencing the adjudication in the Valley affecting the work plan. Would add context to discuss it in the work plan.

Sarah Sandstrom continues the presentation using hydrologically connected critical areas as the example.

Brian Cochrane asks what happens when the flood control districts implements practices that reduce flood plain connectivity.

Lisa Grueter says that will be part of the baseline analysis (new mapping analysis every 2 years).

Kelly McLain says there will be losses in one place, and gains in others.

General discussion about recharge, irrigation ditches, and flood control.

Sarah Sandstrom says there is a trigger of 10% connectivity in flood plain connectivity. The work group would do the analysis on why that might have occurred and if it is related to agriculture activities.

Lauren Driscoll asks about the implementation metrics – if they will be incorporated along with others for wetlands.

Sarah Sandstrom say they will be. Those could be pulled out separately. Sarah Sandstrom continues with the explanation of how the technical assistance provider will gather data to inform the success of the implementation metrics. Ecology’s wetlands change analysis can be used once it is complete. WDFW fish passage barriers will also be used.
Stacy Polkowske says the baseline conditions should likely include that these are known barriers. There is a regulatory backstop for fish passage. Barrier replacements could be considered an enhancement. Fish passage should probably be only in an enhancement. A current crossing could become a barrier in the future. That could be described in the inventory. Passages need to be revised so that they continue to be passages and don’t become barriers.

Sarah Sandstrom covers riparian areas – area and cover as the metric.

Brian Cochrane asks about the metric – how much change would be the trigger?

Discussion about the WDFW mapping error rate for riparian areas – 10% in Appendix G. Could be changed to 5%.

Brian Cochrane says it is good to have the metric based on something real.

10:38 am:  Break

10:55 am:  Continue review – Yakima County work plan

Sarah Sandstrom – letter from Ecology – second bullet that starts with ”groundwater moves”. This is talking about enhancement not protection.

Lauren Driscoll says this is more about protecting the groundwater and not enhancement. Still need a baseline to show the existing practices being done.

Sarah Sandstrom says if 20 practices were done in 2011 and 20 practices when it is looked at again, that would meet the concern?

Lauren Driscoll says yes. The question is how that would be done by monitoring. The technical provider would be looking at that.

Sarah Sandstrom says yes. The technical provider will be looking at a portion of the projects they are implementing to ensure those practices are functioning as intended.

Brian Cochrane asks about sizes of facilities and loading rates. A larger animal facility would load more than a smaller.

Kelly McLain says there are things we know and don’t know. The bigger issue in Yakima is the 100,000 acres of irrigated agriculture as much as the dairies. Would talk about this in the narrative of the work plan. The technical service providers know what the effects are. The GWMA advisory committee has gone through 150 practices to determine the best ones.

Brian Cochrane asks if counting BMPs will get at protection.

Kelly McLain says yes, if they are the right BMPs. Groundwater protecting BMPs (as noted by the GWMA) could be identified in the work plan.

Frank Hendrix says it used to be common practice in potatoes to overload fertilizer.

Kelly McLain says new berry crops might overload the nutrients initially. More important is using the right BMPs to prevent overloading.
Sarah Sandstrom continues with their presentation and goes through a scenario as an example for hydrologically related critical areas. Continues with an analysis of shrub steppe goals and benchmarks, monitoring triggers and metrics. Fire was a big topic during the discussion of shrub steppe. State-managed lands that prohibit grazing.

Brian Cochrane asks what the technical service provider observations would include what?

Sarah Sandstrom says the individual stewardship plans will include that information.

Brian Cochrane asks if the survey has anything related to linkage and pinch points on it?

Lisa Grueter says the survey references critical area types and links to goals but does not have a question to sub-types of critical areas. North Yakima Conservation District has identified priorities.

Brian Cochrane asks about the forms being filled out and the linkage. Should like technical service provider observations to the individual stewardship plans.

Lisa Grueter says questions about linkage and pinch points could be added to the tool.

Sarah Sandstrom continues the presentation with a shrub steppe example. If shrub steppe is lost, it can't be recreated.

Brian Cochrane asks how shrub steppe is defined.

Sarah Sandstrom says the definition of shrub steppe was discussed by the work group, and WDFW PHS includes a definition. We also consider the cover of native species in terms of measuring the quality of habitat.

Stacy Polkowske asks about the fire and shrub steppe and how the technical service provider would access those lands affected by fire.

Lisa Grueter says we included these three scenarios to help explain how these will be applied. Sarah Sandstrom noted it is really about agricultural viability first, then enhancement.

Frank Hendrix says the definition of damage due to fire is important – when shrub steppe is lost, it will take decades to get back. Lost versus damaged.

Lauren Driscoll asks about how non-participating folks are being captured. Some is being captured with the aerial imagery.

Sarah Sandstrom says the resource assessment adaptive management metrics cover that.

Brian Cochrane – asks about assisting state agencies and their monitoring programs – didn't see how that was being accomplished.

Lisa Grueter says she thought that was in Chapter 4. Going back to Stacy Polkowske’s question - could add on sharing appropriate information on fish passage.

Stacy Polkowske says, similar to (k), calling it out would make it explicit.

Brian Cochrane says the same thing on “satisfying other reporting requirements of the program” – not sure where that is. Who is responsible for reporting is an example. Should add some detail to that.

Lisa Grueter says that is in Chapter 8. Could add a sentence.

Lauren Driscoll asks about a budget for implementation? Not a requirement.

Lisa Grueter says we did one, but didn't include one in the work plan.
Lauren Driscoll says it is helpful to see how the work group is thinking about implementation.

Lisa Grueter says that is what we have in the draft budget and it can be added, provided it’s considered draft and work group has flexibility.

Frank Hendrix says the more money we can get on the ground is the thing to me. The RC&D has the staff to handle the inventory.

Stacy Polkowske asks about an enhancement goal in fire – coordination with federal and tribal entities. Has that started?

Sarah Sandstrom says that hasn’t really started, other than they did ask a Firing Center representative to attend the work group meeting.

Frank Hendrix says there are some legal issues with the Firing Center, so they may not want to talk right now. There are opportunities with the WDFW and choke points and discussions around that. That happened because of VSP.

Brian Cochrane asks about rural fire districts.

Frank Hendrix says yes, that discussion was had. We are trying to work out something for these areas.

Sarah Sandstrom says that working with WDFW to incorporate grazing allowances on new lands that are acquired by the agency is the low hanging fruit.

General discussion about next steps and schedule for the Yakima (and Walla Walla) work plans.

Schedule for Yakima and Walla Walla’s further Technical Panel review:
October 11th – agency comments due to Bill Eller at Commission
October 12th – Bill Eller provides the summary of the agency comments to the work group and Technical Panel
October 24th – work group has the final version of the work plan done and provided to the Commission and is sent out to the Technical Panel for review.
October 27th – next meeting on Yakima’s plan – vote intended to be taken then.

12:30 pm: Walla Walla County – presentation on work plan monitoring, goals and benchmarks

Renee Hadley begins the presentation. Watersheds and some critical areas go across-state lines. Table 2.5. New column for how much agriculture interests with each critical area. Agriculture has little wetlands in the county. Other critical areas widespread in the county. 90% of residents live in urban areas. Trend is downward for agriculture acres. Farm size down.

Stacy Polkowske asks if the trend column will be added.

Renee Hadley says yes. Continues with the presentation and the baseline analysis, Table 3-1, page 3. Recharge is happening in Oregon, not documented in Washington. CRP contract acres – 45% of CRP acres will expire in September 2018. These are the highest wind erosion areas. Critical area goals. Table 5 handout. There are changes that have been made since the work plan was submitted.

Discussion about Section 5 handout.
Renee Hadley continues with the presentation. Describes outreach and technical assistance. Lots of education to the public. Press releases and meetings. Difficult to engage local folks in VSP.

Lauren Driscoll asks what is the outreach that will happen as part of implementation. Section 6, page 6-2 – all the action are on-going.

Renee Hadley says those are the outreach items that we are doing now. Continues with the presentation. Gives an example of an individual landowner. Landowners are concerned about regulatory certainty. The individual stewardship plan doesn't really address this.

Lauren Driscoll comments on the Table 5 handout. Likes the additions, but has questions about the wetlands changes – agriculture in the county, not the county as a whole.

Stacy Polkowske asks what datasets were used to establish the baselines?

Renee Hadley says Section 3. 2.3, 2.4. Those sources should be listed, if not they can be added.

Lauren Driscoll says other plans list the sources of their data, would suggest that be added here. Were there targets for outreach and participation?

Renee Hadley says yes, but not as in-depth as Yakima. See Table 5.

General discussion on the numbers – context about the numbers of producers in Table 5 – how many producers would 30 be out of the total number in the county? Context is important.

Lauren Driscoll says more about the benchmark of 10% of interested farmers to agencies for financial assistance.

Renee Hadley says it depends on what comes through the door and what their want to do.

Brian Cochrane asks how the plan will capture on those who won’t participate in VSP but would otherwise implement BMPs that would benefit critical areas. It is an incomplete view to look just at VSP participants.

Kelly McLain asks about the uniqueness of crops in Walla Walla. A lot of people own farm land, but don’t farm each year (fallow).

Renee Hadley says there are lots of folks who own farms but don’t farm, or who own land and do farm. How can critical areas be protected – that is the challenge.

Kelly McLain says that one of potential barriers to VSP implementation could be the landowner engagement factors. It is hard to get absentee landowners involved.

Renee Hadley says that discussion could be added.

Lauren Driscoll asks about the enhancement goals for wetlands. Would the individual stewardship plans have data on the number of acres enhanced?

Stacy Polkowske would like more description on the monitoring methods used in Table 5.1. What is the tool?

Brian Cochrane says that you won’t meet your threshold for wetlands if you are only looking at 10% a year – would take 10 years. How to know if meeting the threshold if you don’t have a sense of the total amount.

Lauren Driscoll says one way to look at this is if you inventory 10% of the wetlands acres a year. That is small amount.
Renee Hadley says there is approximately 1,600 acres of wetlands that intersect with agriculture.

Brian Cochrane says you should be able to inventory the wetlands pretty quick.

General discussion on how many wetlands are in Walla Walla (1,600 acres) and how they could be inventoried.

Kelly McLain asks if the work group has identified specific critical areas that they feel comfortable targeting.

Renee Hadley says that discussion hasn’t happened yet.

General discussion on the inventory of wetlands.

Renee Hadley says that prioritization of wetlands could occur along with the inventory.

Brian Cochrane asks about incorporating other plans and why they were important to the work plan (RCW 36.70A.720(1)(a)). How were those plans picked and how do they connect with the work plan?

Kelly McLain says a lot of the salmon recovery work has highlighted what needs to be done.

Brian Cochrane says that should help with developing priorities and benchmarks.

Stacy Polkowske asks about the work group members and how that process occurred.

Renee Hadley says there is a separate letter there that covers that. Will be incorporated in the work plan.

Stacy Polkowske asks about Section 5.0 – there is a protection measure now for frequently flooded areas. Will take that off my list. There is a regulatory backstop associated with fish passage. Maybe some language in the other regulations and plans sections that could be added. Increase by 3 new fish passage barriers in Adaptive Management threshold for fish and wildlife habitat.

Lauren Driscoll asks about the individual stewardship plan and how that would work – what would be asked of the landowner? Are you doing aerial comparisons and asking the landowner about changes.

Renee Hadley says we will do both.

Brian Cochrane asks if aerial mapping will be done for geological hazard areas.

Renee Hadley says yes.

Lauren Driscoll asks about water quality and critical aquifer recharge.

Renee Hadley says we don’t have a complete handle on all the aquifer recharge issues.

Brian Cochrane asks how frequently flooded areas will be measured – the goals, objectives, and benchmarks.

Renee Hadley says the conservation district will comment on changes in zoning.

Kelly McLain suggests changing the language to say “track changes in flood plains.” Through the tracking of zoning or designation changes should show loss of connectivity.
Renee Hadley asks how agriculture can affect that.

General discussion about frequently flooded areas and how they can be protected and how agriculture can help in protection or enhancement.

Kelly McLain says a review of plans doesn’t get to maintaining acreages.

Brian Cochrane says he is struggling with the connectivity of the incisions and flood plains. A lot of the flood plain connectivity has been lost due to incisions.

Renee Hadley says that nature changes the landscape in ways that is difficult for agriculture to affect.

More discussion on flood plain connectivity.

Kelly McLain asks what could agriculture apply, that is in their control that would affect frequently flooded areas. Tracking of projects or activities on the landscape that were a negative to flood resistance. Impervious surface.

Renee Hadley still wonders what the adaptive management would be for that.

Stacy Polkowske says Table 4.3 on page 14 might give some ideas on what could be done. Might need more conversation.

More discussion on flood plain protection generally and what could be measured. Loss of the flood plain that is directly related to agriculture activities. More discussion could occur at the work group.

Stacy Polkowske asks if the work group discussed beavers.

Renee Hadley says the work group did discuss beaver dams. Will propose more grant applications for beaver dams.

Lauren Driscoll asks about the baseline for protection of flood plains is county flood regs.

General discussion continues about flood plain protection and the conservation district reviewing county flood plan applications.

John Stuhlmiller asks about the adaptive management action for not reaching 30. Rather than revert to the "regulatory measures", perhaps change the communications program.

Ron Shultz agrees. Also should distinguish between the 30 number from individual stewardship plans and landowner contacts.

John Stuhlmiller says the answer isn’t to just quit VSP, but to change the communications plan.

Ron Shultz says the 5 year review with the Commission would be involved in looking at the contacts that were made, the efforts that were made, to engage landowners.

John Stuhlmiller says to bring the wording in line on Table 5 to what agriculture can affect. Agriculture continues to protect since 2011. The goals, benchmarks, and triggers should reflect that in the language.

Stacy Polkowske says to protect with increased mapping is a product and not really the right objective.

Renee Hadley says the tribe really wants those to remain in the VSP plan.

Brian Cochrane says mapping is a tool, not a benchmark.
Lauren Driscoll wonders if it could stay in the plan for the tribe.

General discussion on how to reword that.

Renee Hadley says that will be reworded and the Technical Panel generally agrees to that new language.

Stacy Polkowske asks about fish passage and how that will be measured. Most of the county was surveyed recently for fish passage barriers.

Lauren Driscoll says the plans that were incorporated in Section 1.2 to include the connections to agriculture and how they are related to agriculture.

Renee Hadley asks if another column could be added to Table 5.0.

Lauren Driscoll says that is one way it could be done. Another could be to describe it in the work plan. Section 4 – like the way it is set up.

Stacy Polkowske asks about RCW 36.70A.720(1)(k) – didn’t see much there. Could add more to that in the work plan.

Brian Cochrane says Section 5.1 where it says that monitoring is too expensive. I would disagree. Monitoring asks what is the question, how good of an answer do you need, what tools are available. Those should all be looked at. Need to do that analysis.

Brian Cochrane also asks about who is on the hook for the "other reporting requirements of the program" – didn’t see that in the work plan. RCW 36.70A.720(1)(l).

Section 5.5 has a note about that and Section 5.6 – no 5.6. Should be 5.4.

Lauren Driscoll asks about Tables 3.1 and 3.2. What are the difference between the two?

Renee Hadley says Table 3.1 is contract acres. 3.2 doesn’t fit contract acres.

Lauren Driscoll did like the links on those tables and the distinction between the two tables.

Brian Cochrane asks about mapping and critical areas that are susceptible to erosion. How will erosion going to be handled outside of the farm bill?

Renee Hadley says the district addressed this in our newsletter. We are very concerned about it.

Brian Cochrane says the county should be concerned and likely it should be addressed in the plan.

Renee Hadley says it was discussed in Section 4.

Brian Cochrane asks how it plays out in the actions, which is the piece. Looking in the geological areas – strategies, it isn’t really there.

Lauren Driscoll agrees with Brian Cochrane.

Brian Cochrane says if CRP isn’t available, what else can be done?

Renee Hadley says I see most of that ground going back into production.
Brian Cochrane says then agriculture will need to protect for that – the critical area.

General discussion about CRP, CREP and Walla Walla County.

Stacy Polkowske asks about the lack of reference to PHS in the work plan, from WDFW’s perspective. The county is going to be doing their CAO re-do. Maybe this plan can incorporate PHS a little more at some point. Not for monitoring, but incorporate as a tool.

Renee Hadley says that the county maps we used were derived somewhat from WDFW’s PHS. The county maps may not be as updated as the PHS.

Lauren Driscoll asks about participation goals. It is in Table 5.0, but wondering where in the plan narrative it is.

Renee Hadley says it is in the beginning of Section 4. Could add more there.

Brian Cochrane asks about the requirement to work with the technical service provider to ensure that the individual stewardship plans meet to goals and benchmarks.

Kelly McLain says that is a statement on closing the loop. The individual stewardship plans should align with the goals and benchmarks of the work plan.

Brian Cochrane says other work plans rely on CPPP. This plan says there are BMPs that will be used. Maybe make those connections a little bit stronger so it is clearer. The BMP should have a benefit – just need to describe that.

Lauren Driscoll says it is in the individual stewardship plans example.

1:45 pm: Next meetings –
- October 27, 2017 –
  - Second review meeting – Yakima County and Walla Walla
    - Schedule for Yakima and Walla Walla’s further Technical Panel review:
      - October 11th – agency comments due to Bill Eller at Commission
      - October 12th – Bill Eller provides the summary of the agency comments to the work group and Technical Panel
      - October 24th – work group has the final version of the work plan done and provided to the Commission and is sent out to the Technical Panel for review.
      - October 27th – next meeting on Yakima’s plan – vote intended to be taken then.
- November 17, 2017 –
  - Tentative – first formal review – Stevens County / San Juan
    - Bill Eller will contact Stevens and San Juan to see if they can submit by October 16th so as to give the Technical Panel members more time to review their plans before the Nov 17th meeting.
- December 8, 2017 – Stevens / San Juan
- December 15, 2017 – Franklin
- January 12, 2018 - Franklin

Agency comments due 2 weeks after first meeting.

2:00 pm: Adjourn