Meeting Notice

A meeting of the Planning Unit for the WRIA 55 and 57 Local Watershed Planning program for will be held at:

Time: **10:00 am**
Date: **January 17, 2001**
Place: **Second Floor Conference Room**
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Agenda

10:00 am **Call to Order - Introductions by Committee Members**
Facilitator Lead

10:05 **Work Group Information Discussion**
Stan Miller, Spokane County WQMP Instream Flow Work Group Mtg. Dec. 20, 2000

10:20 **Identification of Model User Needs, carryover from December**
Facilitator Lead
Follow up on questions 1 and 2
What specific questions do we want to answer with the model?
Who will use the model output data? What data does each user need?
Major point of discussion from December.
Who will operate and update the model?

11:00 **Consultant Presentation**
Golder Team: Discuss potential data gaps

11:45 **Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**

11:50 **Other items of Public or Committee Concern**
Facilitator Lead

11:55 **Set next meeting date, time and location**
Facilitator February 21, 2001 is the third Wednesday – our "regular" meeting date.
Do we want to start at 9:00 am to allow more time for discussion?

12:00 **Adjourn**

If you have any questions regarding this notice contact Stan Miller at (509) 477-7259 or via e-mail at *smiller@spokanecounty.org*

Meeting Summary
Planning Unit
Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan
January 17, 2001

Stan Miller called the meeting to order at 10:05

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Jani Gilbert
Lloyd Brewer
Megan White
Stan Miller
Joel White
Susan McGeorge
Steve Skipworth
Leon Sproule
Terry Liberty
Keith Halliday
Julia McHugh
Gary Fergen
Kevin Robinette
Reanette Boese
Ty Wick
Steve Roberge
Sandy Mack
Tim Lukas
Bryony Hansen, Golder

The meeting summary for the December 6th meeting was approved as corrected.

Jani Gilbert from the Department of Ecology was again present to facilitate the January meeting.

At the request of the facilitator, members present introduced themselves. A total of 19 members, guests and staff were present.

Stan Miller distributed a summary of the December 20th meeting of the Instream Flow work group.

Basically the group decided that the main need for instream flows will be for determining the availability of water for future uses. A good model will simply define the flow in the rivers under various conditions. Thus, a flow will be most useful during the planning and implementation phase of the project. Discussing the various funding options, our best hope is for additional funding from the Watershed Planning budget. Ecology is asking for an additional 3 million for this biennium. We should have no trouble getting the Phase 3 money ($500K) in July, but whether this will cover added instream flow work is not knowable until we get further along with our current work. Ecology is proposing that additional funding for WRIA's be allowed and that non-quantity related tasks be eligible for supplemental funding. We won't know how this fares until after the legislative session. The group concluded that to use Centennial Clean Water Grant funds we would have to find about $85,000 worth of watershed related work in the County/Golder scope, define a grant project for this subset of currently planned work and apply for funding. As CCW funds are primarily water quality related, and our watershed work is focused on quantity it will be hard to find this in our scope.

The work group posed the following questions for the Planning Unit:

What level of effort do we want to put into the work?
Should we pursue Centennial Clean Water funding?

On these question s these questions the group suggested that we do need to have an answer, based on sound science, as to what the flows need to be. But it will take a lot of work. Today we aren't even sure what species we need to consider. Al Sholz's Rainbow trout report won't be out until summer. Avista's work for relicensing will not begin for at least a year with the final results at least 4 years away – too long for the Planning Unit.

In the mean time we can lay the groundwork by looking at historic work from Avista and WDFW and having Golder continue work identifying three reaches to survey. The group will need to continue discussions to decide where to put our energy.

There was no consensus on applying for Centennial Funding. Given the current workload to get Golder off to a good start, staff will have a difficult time preparing a successful grant given the selection criteria. We could wait until July and hope the legislature allows additional funding for flow and water quality work.

The following information was taken directly from the notes recorded from the meeting (in normal text) augmented with comments on the discussion taken from notes (in italics).

The facilitator began by asking if there were additional comments on who will use the model and what questions need to be answered. The following points were made.

Data people need is linked to instream flows

Need models of mitigation aspects -- How groundwater affects the river.

May have to deal with two systems separately

Ecology won't issue new water rights unless mitigation is demonstrated

What effect will metering have on exempt wells – modeling should show

Looking at occupied dwellings planning unit will need to get a handle on this

May recommend that Ecology meter those near the river

At the November 29, 2000 meeting the Planning Unit identified the following question as the primary topic for discussion at the January meeting:

Who will operate / update the model?

Spokane County will develop the ability to operate *the model*. May need UNIX operating system. *If so the use of the model may be limited due to hardware considerations. We need to be sure the model is accessible to at least the initiating agencies and water resources planning and regulatory agencies via some type of information exchange program.*

Spokane County as lead agency in Watershed Planning has the responsibility to develop the capability of operating any model produced. Ongoing operation of the model and planning will depend on community support for continued funding after the grant period. The County's role as lead agency also gives them a responsibility to try to set up a long term process.

While most of the groups identified above will likely have some financial involvement in the program and thus should have "free" access to the product, some potential users may not. In that case: Fee structure already exists, users should pay.

Make simple parts available – but what about how it's used

Shouldn't need to change the info for people. They should use own engineers

If someone changes calibration, (eg) results are not valid. Need safeguards

* Need official version somewhere

Use internet and only input for model to give answers

The discussion on the several points above yielded the following general conclusions. The Planning Unit wants to make the model as widely available as possible. The use of the Internet at least to present the general results of the work we do is an effective tool. Actually having the model available via Internet will depend on the model selected and funding to maintain the site. The "selected safeguard" was to simply note that the official results are the ones obtained by the model maintained by Spokane County or its designee. We will try to make the model "code" available but other output products created by changing the model assumptions will be considered informative only.

Again the committee expressed the understanding that the answers to many of the operation and use questions lie in the model selected. Some related items are listed below:

Need to know model first

Choosing UNIX will give us controls need to talk to manufacturer to get ok for uses

First get model that can do what we want.

Model should be widely available. *See above note.*

Output needs to be useful to ecology and purveyors to consider water rights. *This is the most important use of the model at this time.*

Need to address stormwater too (ecy)
Land use changes too
Both of these are being incorporated by Golder

Stormwater management effects both ground water recharge and river flow depending on the method used. The model needs to provide for evaluating the effect of various land uses on runoff volumes and hw handling runoff using infiltration / injection differs from using piped discharges to surface water.

User friendly, accessible over the Internet. *See above note.*

Will technology so everyone can run unix?

Some eng firms will want to be able to run it

A question about using the proposed model of the River being done by the Corps of Engineers for our purposes was asked. This could save us some money and effort.

Golder will check with the person doing model that includes TMDL WQ info.

Need new matrix of models and capabilities and price

Decision on model in March or so.

Finally if we are going to make an informed decision the Planning Unit needs some idea of at least the relative cost of the possible models. The Planning Unit requested that Golder prepare a new matrix showing both model attributes and cost. The list of models may be shorter than that presented in November now that we have identified some of the most important uses better.

The group concurred with the previously scheduled meeting for January 17th as the next meeting date. After a brief discussion on the need to extend meeting times to 3 hours, 9:00 to 12:00 the group decided next month's meeting will be from 10:00 – 12:00 am. When we need more time, possibly at the March meeting, we'll go longer

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55

Direct copy of Facilitator notes
1

Avista Notice of intent in license in 2002
4 years out – studies unknown at this time (Sandy)

Don't have Rainbow trout report yet – Dr. Al Sholtz (Kevin)

Instream flow needs to be specific to a species of fish.
What impact do low flows have on trout?

WSFW have some info on the above

Golder ID'ing three reaches to survey.
Group will decide where to put energy

2

Data people need linked to instream flows

Need models of mitigation aspect. -- How groundwater affects the river.

May have to deal with two systems separately

Ecy won't issue new water rights unless mitigation is demonstrated

What effect will metering have on exempt wells – modeling should show

Looking at occupied dwellings planning unit will need to get a handle on this

May recommend that ecy meter those near the river, no metering in PO. HA HA.

3

Who will operate Model?

Spokane County will develop the ability to operate Need UNIX oper. System

Fee structure already exists, users should pay

Make simple parts available – but what about how it's used

Shouldn't need to change the info for people. They should use own engineers

If someone changes calibration, (eg) results are not valid. Need safeguards

* Need official version somewhere

Use internet and only input for model to give answers
4

Need to know model first

Choosing UNIX will give us controls need to talk to manufacturer to get ok for uses

First get model that can do what we want.

Model should be widely available

Output needs to be useful to ecy and purveyors to consider water rights

Need to address stormwater too (ecy)
- Land use changes too
- Both of these are being incorporated by Golder

User friendly, accessible over the internet.

5

Will technology so everyone can run unix?

Some eng firms will want to be able to run it

Golder will check with the person doing model that includes TMDL WQ info.

Need new matrix of models and capabilities and price

Decision on model in March or so

Next mo's meeting 10 – 12 am when we need more time we'll go longer