

## PROJECTED GROWTH IN SPOKANE COUNTY:

Spokane County	Projection Year: 2046 Population Target = 654,665		Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Emergency Housing Needs (Temporary)
			0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%		
	Total	Non-PSH	PSH								
User Input - % Share of County Population Growth. Values must sum to 100%		Countywide Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	221,840	6,613	937	34,798	91,803	32,035	20,981	34,673	1,192
		Countywide Additional Units Needed (2020-2046)	75,184	19,905	5,714	13,620	8,844	4,772	3,937	18,392	3,037
		Sum of Allocation to Jurisdictions (from User Inputs)	75,177	19,903	5,713	13,619	8,843	4,772	3,937	18,390	3,036
		99.99% <-- Sum of user inputs for jurisdiction shares of county future net housing need. If below 100%, increase shares. If above 100%, decrease shares.									
	* The location of 28 emergency housing beds within Spokane County is unknown. Therefore, they are not included in the jurisdiction table below.		Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Emergency Housing Needs (Temporary) *
			Total	Non-PSH	PSH	>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
35.21 %	Unincorporated Spokane County	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	59,013	1,179	0	5,981	14,559	9,421	9,603	18,270	30
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	26,472	7,008	2,012	4,796	3,114	1,680	1,386	6,476	1,069
6.66 %	Airway Heights city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	3,626	67	0	685	1,997	545	134	198	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	5,007	1,326	381	907	589	318	262	1,225	202
3.37 %	Cheney city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	5,354	256	0	935	3,097	690	153	223	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	2,534	671	193	459	298	161	133	620	102
1.36 %	Deer Park city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	1,902	45	0	434	804	275	99	245	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	1,023	271	78	185	120	65	54	250	41
0.00 %	Fairfield town	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	228	5	0	79	104	23	5	12	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.00 %	Latah town	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	88	0	0	35	41	6	2	4	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.78 %	Liberty Lake city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	4,915	39	0	208	1,133	1,238	930	1,367	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	6,601	1,748	502	1,196	776	419	346	1,615	267
0.24 %	Medical Lake city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	1,828	184	0	159	839	329	96	221	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	180	48	14	33	21	11	9	44	7
0.05 %	Millwood city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	820	27	0	147	413	142	37	54	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	38	10	3	7	4	2	2	9	2
0.07 %	Rockford town	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	195	0	0	62	85	25	7	16	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	53	14	4	10	6	3	3	13	2
0.00 %	Spangle city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	127	6	0	42	56	12	3	8	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23.34 %	Spokane city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	99,938	3,534	937	19,479	47,090	11,873	7,118	9,907	1,134
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	17,548	4,646	1,334	3,179	2,064	1,114	919	4,293	709
20.90 %	Spokane Valley city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	43,751	1,265	0	6,515	21,579	7,456	2,792	4,144	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	15,713	4,160	1,194	2,846	1,848	997	823	3,844	635
0.01 %	Waverly town	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	55	6	0	37	6	0	2	4	0
		Allocation Method A (2020-2046)	8	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0

- NOTE:** The above chart is pulled from Spokane County's 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update Board of County Commissioners Strategic Discussion Handout (dated 04.08.2024). The full handout is available here:  
[https://www.spokanecounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/54050/BoCC\\_2026\\_CompPlanUpdate\\_StrategicDiscussion\\_Handout\\_20240408?bidId=](https://www.spokanecounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/54050/BoCC_2026_CompPlanUpdate_StrategicDiscussion_Handout_20240408?bidId=)

## WATER RIGHTS HELD BY CITY OF SPOKANE

CHAPTER 3 — SYSTEM ANALYSIS AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

Table 3.18: Water Rights and Current Production compared to Current Demands

WFI SOURCE NUMBER / WELL NAME	WATER RIGHT PERMIT NO.	EXISTING WATER RIGHTS		CURRENT SOURCE PRODUCTION (BASED ON 2020 DATA)			
		Primary Qi (Maximum Rate Allowed: Estimated Per Site)	Primary Qa (Maximum Volume Allowed: Estimated Per Site)	Total Qi (Maximum Instantaneous Flow Rate Withdrawn)	Current Qi Surplus (or Deficiency)	Total Qa (Maximum Annual Volume Withdrawn)	Current Qa Surplus (Or Deficiency)
		gpm	Acre-ft	gpm	gpm	Acre-ft	Acre-ft
S 01 NEVADA ST	3199-A 504-D* 548-A*	25,000	20,000	23,905	1,095	3,830	16,170
S 02 WELL ELECTRIC	504-D* 548-A*	54,750	36,000	36,583	18,167	16,949	19,051
S 03 PARKWATER	548-A* 504-D*	63,000	51,240	34,198	28,802	33,406	17,834
S 04 RAY STREET	505-D 503-D 504-D* 507-D**	14,000 7,000 1,250 2,600	1,870 350 2,000 520	16,001	8,849	5,633	(893)
S 05 HOFFMAN AVE	506-D 504-D* 548-D*	11,600	1,280	5,447	6,153	1,582	(302)
S 06 GRACE AVE	728-A 503-D 504-D* 548-A*	11,000 20,000	4,080 1,000	17,005	13,995	3,866	1,214
S 08 CENTRAL AVE	3903-A 503-D 4503-A 728-A	7,000 7,000 7,900 9,000	11,480 350 12,640 4,760	8,830	22,070	5,558	23,672
S 10 HAVANA ***	504-D* 548-A*						
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>241,100</b>	<b>147,570</b>	<b>141,969</b>	<b>99,131</b>	<b>70,824</b>	<b>76,746</b>

\*Certificates 504-D and 548-A submitted for and received Certificates of Change in 2016. The Report of Examination for Water Right Change specific to each certificate is included in Appendix 3.5. Under this change, the place of use of the water right is anywhere within the City's service area so long as the water system is and remains in compliance with the criteria in [RCW 90.03.386\(2\)](#) rather than the place of use is tied to a specific well location. All other City water rights certificates remain unchanged and have the place of use designated as described in the table above.

\*\* Baxter Well water rights officially decommissioned in 2003, with water rights transferred to the Ray Street Well, as shown. The priority date is January 12, 1945.

\*\*\*Havana Well Station is in construction and not operational; therefore, no observed production data is available and no specified maximum rate or maximum volume per site was specified.

- **NOTE:** The above chart is pulled from the City of Spokane's 2023 Water System Plan (updates required every 6 years).
- The full document / 2023 Water System Plan is available here:  
<https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/publicworks/water/2023-water-system-plan-final.pdf>

## **SECTION 8 OF ECOLOGY POLICY 2030 – INCHOATE WATER**

Policy 2030 is Ecology's Municipal Water Law Policy and Interpretive Statement and provides guidance on how to handle transfers of municipal water rights.

### **Section 8: Transfer/Sale of Inchoate Municipal Water Rights to Another Entity**

Transfers of water rights for municipal water supply purposes to another entity must meet the requirements under RCW 90.03.380 for surface water rights and RCW 90.44.100 for groundwater rights (see Section 5, Changing Municipal Water Rights). For these transfers, Ecology evaluates the right to determine if the inchoate quantities are in good standing and eligible for change/transfer.

#### **8.1 Surface Water Certificates**

Generally, only the perfected quantities "which have been applied to beneficial use" per RCW 90.03.380(1) are valid for transfer to another entity. Inchoate quantities may be transferred if they can meet the additional requirements of RCW 90.03.570. When holders of surface water rights for municipal water supply purposes apply for transfer to another entity, Ecology conducts a tentative determination of extent and validity.

#### **8.2 Groundwater Certificates**

RCW 90.44.100 could allow the perfected and inchoate portions of groundwater permits or certificates for municipal water supply purposes to be transferred to another entity. This policy focuses on certificates, while changing or transferring groundwater permits is covered in Ecology POL-1260.<sup>12</sup>

When holders of groundwater certificates for municipal water supply purposes apply for a transfer to another entity, Ecology conducts a tentative determination of extent and validity. Ecology determines whether any inchoate quantities remain in good standing and valid for transfer based on the original intent described in the water right authorization as well as subsequent changes to the place of use through modification of the service area in a Department of Health approved planning or engineering document. Ecology also evaluates whether reasonable diligence to develop the water right has occurred and if the transfer would be detrimental to the public welfare.

- **Note:** It was last updated in Nov. 2024 and is available in full here:  
<https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2411100.pdf>

## **RELEVANT CASE LAW FOR THE ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION ON COST OF FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE:**

A governmental entity (including water purveyors) can impose conditions on development, including dedication of land, infrastructure, money to pay for such items, and fees.

- [Hillis Homes, Inc. v. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1 of Snohomish Cnty., 105 Wn.2d 288, 301, 714 P.2d 1163, 1170 \(1986\)](#)
  - A utility may charge reasonable fees to customers and may have “[d]ifferent classes of customers may be charged different rates as long as the classifications themselves are reasonable.”
- [Irvin Water Dist. No. 6 v. Jackson P'ship, 109 Wn. App. 113, 120–21, 34 P.3d 840, 845 \(2001\)](#)
  - “No municipal corporation is bound by a connection fee schedule for service to be provided at a future date unless there is a contract to provide such service at that rate.”
  - A developer does “not have a vested right in any particular fee schedule, at least before application and payment of the applicable connection fees.”

However, there are *Nollan* / *Dolan* constitutional limitations on the conditions imposed on real estate development:

- [Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825, 837, 107 S. Ct. 3141, 3148, 97 L. Ed. 2d 677 \(1987\)](#)
  - Conditions imposed on development need to have an “essential nexus” or a connection between the development and the condition imposed, otherwise it will be an unconstitutional taking.
- [Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 374, 391, 114 S. Ct. 2309, 2319–20, 129 L. Ed. 2d 304 \(1994\)](#)
  - “We think a term such as ‘rough proportionality’ best encapsulates what we hold to be the requirement of the Fifth Amendment. No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the city must make some sort of individualized determination that the required dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed development.”
- [Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Mgmt. Dist., 570 U.S. 595, 619, 133 S. Ct. 2586, 2603, 186 L. Ed. 2d 697 \(2013\)](#)
  - “We hold that the government's demand for property from a land-use permit applicant must satisfy the requirements of *Nollan* and *Dolan* even when the government denies the permit and even when its demand is for money.”
- [Sheetz v. Cnty. of El Dorado, California, 601 U.S. 267, 279, 144 S. Ct. 893, 902, 218 L. Ed. 2d 224 \(2024\)](#)
  - Legislatively imposed fees on development are subject to *Nollan*/*Dolan* analysis.