Meeting Notice

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

Time: **10:00 am**
Date: **Wednesday, March 19, 2003**
Place: **Conference Room**
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Agenda

10:00 am **Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members**
Discuss and Approve February 19, 2003 Meeting Summary
Facilitator Lead

10:10 **Status of Spokane River Instream Flow Scope of Work Development**
(Note: You can learn more about Avista's relicensing and associated water quality and fisheries studies by visiting www.avistacorp.com.)
Stan Miller and Doug Allen

10:30 **Model Scenarios Work Group Report**
TBA

11:00 **Instream Flow Work Group Report**
Finalize Little Spokane River Instream Flow Elements Objectives and Criteria
(Note: Planning Unit to decide on final objectives and criteria)
TBA and Facilitator Lead

11:40 **Discuss Future Funding Needs and Timing of Applications**
Stan Miller

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

11:55 **Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**

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
March 19, 2003

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen, *Dept. of Ecology*
Lloyd Brewer, *City of Spokane*
Harry McLean, Jr., *City of Spokane Water*
Ken Kuhn, *Pend Oreille County Planning*
Ty Wick, *Spokane Aquifer Joint Board*
Julia McHugh, *SAJB*
Don Comins, *Pend Oreille Conservation District*
Steve Skipworth, *Vera Water*
Rick Noll, *Spokane County Conservation District*
Susan McGeorge, *Whitworth Water District*
Tom Hargreaves, *Friends of Little Spokane Valley*
Dave Jones, *Water Quality Advisory Committee*
Karin Divins, *Dept of Fish and Wildlife*
Jane Cunningham, *The Lands Council*
Stan Miller, *Spokane County*
Reanette Boese, *Spokane County*
Bill Gilmour, *Spokane County*

Consultants that attended the meeting were: Sarah Hubbard-Gray of Hubbard Gray Consulting and Bryony Hansen of Golder Associates.

Guests that attended the meeting were: none.

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. Since the Instream Flow Work Group was meeting before the Planning Unit, and since they had not finished developing their recommendations for the Little Spokane River Instream flow elements objectives and criteria, the agenda was adjusted, moving the Instream Flow Work Group report to the first item (see summary below). Then the Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah asked if there were comments on the February 19, 2003 Meeting Summary. Ty Wick indicated that he had attended the meeting. No additional comments or corrections to the meeting summary were requested.

Instream Flow Work Group: Sarah Hubbard-Gray suggested that the Work Group continue discussing the Little Spokane River Instream Flow Elements Objectives and Criteria with the Planning Unit members. As a full group the proposed objectives and criteria were reviewed, discussed and edited using a laptop computer with the text projected onto a screen. Revisions to the text were agreed to by all of the Planning Unit members present. These changes resulted in a set of final and confirmed objectives and criteria which are attached to this meeting summary.

Status of Spokane River Instream Flow Scope of Work Development: Stan Miller and Doug Allen reviewed the Avista fisheries and water quality evaluations, which are part of their re-licensing efforts. It was relayed that the Avista fisheries work team has expressed the need for coordination with the WRIA 55/57 instream flow effort. Stan explained that the opportunities to build on the Avista work has been confirmed, that the WRIA work will be broader, and that there is still a need to identify the additional information needed to evaluate low flows. Stan went on to explain that the Planning Unit will have to decide if additional sites not covered in Avista's work should be added to provide better coverage of the

river (e.g., between Monroe and the State line). Stan provided a copy of the Draft Avista scope of work which is still very vague to those interested. Some of the additional items that were discussed include:

- Opportunities to evaluate other options, such as augmenting river flows with aquifer water.
- Avista contractors that have been retained, including Golder and Parametrics.
- Latah Creek Instream Flow scope of work.
- Walla Walla River Fish Habitat Analysis using IFIM.

Stan explained that more information will be provided at the next meeting when Avista's scope will be more defined.

Model Scenarios Work Group Report: Reanette Boese gave an update on the work group meeting and distributed a handout with 10 draft model run scenarios. The 10 scenarios were reviewed and the Planning Unit was asked if they think there are missing items and whether the descriptions should be refined prior to asking for Golder Associates review and input. The Planning Unit provided the following suggestions:

- Add additional flow augmentation scenarios.
- Consider wider variations of aquifer flow coming from Idaho into Washington, based on Idaho water use increases associated with future growth.
- Consider more than one growth scenario; refer to Comp Plan for 20 and 50 year growth horizons.

Future Funding Needs and Timing of Applications: Stan Miller explained that the Middle Spokane River Instream Flow contract was signed and effective on March 1, 2003.

Stan gave an update on the Department of Ecology's DO TMDL process for the Spokane River and that Ecology has indicated that it would be good for the watershed planning and associated water quality supplement money to be used for water quality evaluation in the Spokane River. The majority of the Spokane River associated with the DO TMDL effort is in WRIA 54. Stan explained that the Spokane County Commissioners have indicated support for starting a WRIA 54 watershed planning effort. Stan indicated that he would start contacting initiating agencies in WRIA 54 to evaluate the possibility of initiating this effort. Doug Allen explained that most of the watershed planning money has already been earmarked for existing planning efforts, but that the Eastern Regional Ecology Office would probably recommend that the WRIA 54 effort be funded, which will increase the chances of funding. Doug also indicated that the watershed funds will be drying up in future years which will only decrease the chances of WRIA 54 funding in the future. The Planning Unit discussed various aspects of this effort and Stan said he would provide an update at the next Planning Unit meeting.

Other items of Public or Committee Concern: The status of State legislative initiatives relating to watershed planning were discussed, nothing is known to have passed both the House and Senate to date.

The next meeting was set for Wednesday April 16, 2003 at 10:00 am at the Spokane County Conservation District. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Little Spokane River Instream Flow Elements Objectives and Criteria
~ Confirmed at February 19, 2003 PU meeting ~

Overall

Objectives:

- Assure that recommended instream flows for the Little Spokane River protect all designated beneficial uses.

Aquatic Biota

Objectives:

- Assure that instream flow recommendations resulting from this plan meet the needs of selected fish species (rainbow trout and mountain whitefish) and other representative aquatic biota.

Criteria:

- Are the flows adequate for Rainbow Trout and Mountain Whitefish spawning and rearing in the mainstream and major tributaries?
- Do the high flow levels provide adequate flow to cleanse deposited silt, without increasing erosion or excessive silt deposits?
- Do the flows support diverse aquatic biota production (e.g., macroinvertebrates, frogs, salamanders)?
- Is the existing instream flow rule sufficiently protective of fish habitat?
- Are changes to the existing instream flow needed to protect selected fish species?

Water Quality

Objectives:

- Identify water quality parameters that are limiting to beneficial uses and are flow related:
  - Identify point and non-point sources that adversely effect water quality.
  - Assure that flow is adequate for dilution of current point and non-point sources.
- Identify minimum channel maintenance flows.

Criteria:

- Are the flows adequate to support meeting the state surface water quality standards and beneficial uses? (including temperature and swimming)
- If public access on Little Spokane River is allowable above Dartford, is the flow/water quality relationship adequate for contact and/or non-contact uses throughout all of the public use river reaches?
- Will the flows protect streambanks and maintain integrity of streambank protection measures implemented?
- Will intensity of use at a given flow result in water quality degradation that will impair beneficial uses?

Recreation & Aesthetics

Objectives:

- Inventory natural areas, boating, fishing, and pubic access, and determine current level of recommended use and the flow needed for recreational use.
- Determine the potential recreational uses and the flow needed for each recreational use.
- Determine the legal status of public access and use, and the amount of actual public use.
- Determine the possibility of changing the legal status of public access and use.

Criteria:

- Are the flows sufficient to assure that the water quality and quantity is suitable for swimming (e.g., Pine River Park)?
- Are the flows adequate to support canoeing, kayaking, tubing/floating, and fishing uses year-round in the lower reaches of the LSR (e.g., downstream of Dartford)?
- Are the flows sufficient to support aesthetic, educational, and cultural values of the LSR natural area?
- Are the flows adequate to achieve a healthy / normal channel formation and associated riparian vegetation?

Power Production

Objectives:

- Ensure that low-head hydro power development opportunities are not diminished.

Criteria:

- Would the proposed flow negatively impact the potential for low-head hydro power development?