

**Meeting Summary**  
**Planning Unit**  
Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan  
November 8, 2004

**Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:**

Lloyd Brewer, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water</i>	Reanette Boese, <i>Spokane County</i>
Ty Wick, <i>Spokane Aquifer Joint Board</i>	Keith Holliday, <i>Washington Department of Ecology</i>	Rob Lindsay, <i>Spokane County</i>

**Consultants that attended the meeting were:** none.

**Guests that attended the meeting were:** Richard Rivers, Greg Sweeney, and Tom V. Luce.

**Introductions:** Rob Lindsay called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm. Committee members and guests introduced themselves. Reanette asked for comments or corrections to the October 26, 2004 meeting summary. No comments were provided.

**Discussion of New Recommendations approved at 10/26/2004 meeting:**

Recommendation I.C.01.d. Research possible water reuse and reclamation opportunities. (Added from public comment. Approved 10/26/2004, confirmed 11/8/2004)

Recommendation II.E.01.a. After the Avista HED license application is filed, the Spokane River / Lake Spokane DO TMDL data gathering phase, and instream studies on rearing below Monroe Street HED are completed, integrate all of the recommended instream flows into one regime for the whole watershed. The flow regime will be submitted to the Department of Ecology for instream flow rule making. Ecology obligation. (Workgroup, 5/26/2004, approved 6/2/2004, confirmed 6/29/2004, reworded from 10/21/2004 meeting, approved 10/26/2004, confirmed with addition of “DO” 11/8/2004)

Issue V.A.02. How can water rights be acquired ~~to be used~~ to increase instream flow? (From public comment, Approved 10/26/2004, reworded and confirmed 11/8/2004)

Recommendation V.A.02.a. Encourage the use of the State Trust Water Rights Program to secure hold water rights for instream flow. (From public comment, Approved 10/26/2004, reworded and confirmed 11/8/2004)

Recommendation VI.A.01.f. ~~Discourage the destruction of existing forests and encourage reforestation~~ Encourage sustainable forestry practices that reduce runoff and increase infiltration in keeping with the forest practices act. (From public comment. Approved 10/26/2004, reworded and confirmed 11/8/2004)

Add new Recommendation VI.A.01.g. The idea of this new recommendation will be to encourage development of planning policies that limit clear cutting in new developments. Planners will be consulted for proper wording.

**Continued Discussion of Comments on the WRIA 55 & 57 Watershed Plan and development of the Responsiveness Summary:** (page numbers refer to the draft responsiveness summary dated 11/8/2004)

The next issue discussed was “Barker Road Flow” on page 7 of the Draft Responsiveness Summary. The response needs to say that we did change the recommended flow to 500 cfs at the Barker Road transect due to temperature considerations. Also, it was not Avista that requested the change to the recommendation.

For the issue of Instream flow for Water Quality (pg 8), the phrase “the Spokane River / Lake Spokane Dissolved Oxygen TMDL data gathering phase” was added to Recommendation II.E.01 so that instream flow to help water quality is considered in the final instream flow regime.

Aesthetic Flow in the Spokane River (pg.8): A potential response to comments regarding this issue was discussed and agreed upon in concept. The revised potential response is: A study of the flows for aesthetic purposes in the north channel of the Spokane River through Riverfront Park was beyond the limited resources provided by Watershed Planning. The Planning Unit acknowledges there should be additional study of this issue, but will rely on the current findings of Avista-funded study until resources, if any, are available to conduct additional study. There needs to be enough flow so that the north channel looks like a river and not a channel through a field of basalt. The Planning Unit recognizes that flow through the north channel and over the dam cannot be used for power generation and this is, therefore, an economic issue. We support the Avista RLUA workgroup if they are able to reach consensus and support a flow through the north channel of at least 300 cfs. Change Recommendation II.B.01.a: Use Support a consensus based agreement within the Avista Recreation, Land Use, and Aesthetics Work Group findings of at least 300 cfs in the north channel of the Spokane River through Riverfront Park as the basis for aesthetic flows.

Recharge and Base flow Augmentation (pg. 9), Dam construction: Dam building is not our first priority and the Planning Unit is not currently moving forward with any dam projects. The Planning Unit felt that all possibilities to augment instream flows should be examined before dismissing any. Should a dam be considered, water quality (including temperature) and other environmental factors would be considered. Artificial recharge of the Aquifer (p. 10). Only one aquifer injection location was tried with the watershed model. Though that location did show the water entering the Spokane River too quickly to increase flow through the whole summer, there may be other locations or times where injection into an aquifer will help with stream flow or water supply. Recommendation VII.C.01a was included to show support for applying for the multi-purpose storage funding and has been done. It would be nice if conservation could meet all our future needs but we need to have some idea of possibilities if conservation isn't enough. Some of these studies may also apply to reclamation of water.

Eloika Lake / West Branch of the LSR (pg 10)

New Issue III.B.05. *Would a better understanding of flow in the West Branch of the Little Spokane River help water resource management in the watershed?*

New Recommendation II.B.05.a. Determine the feasibility of installing a gage(s) on the West Branch of the Little Spokane River.

Eloika Lake surface elevation (pg 11). The county (and other agencies(?)) will continue to look into the Eloika Lake water surface elevation. This issue may be considered later.

Beaver dams (pg 11). New Recommendation VI.A.02.d – Encourage the enforcement of existing laws protecting beaver dams. New Recommendation VI.A.02.e – Educate the public on the benefits of beaver dams. (WRIA 56 just worked on some wording for a recommendation about beaver dam education. We will have their wording at the next meeting.)

**Wrap Up:** The next meetings will be held November 17, 2004 from 9:00 am to noon and beyond at the Spokane County Conservation District upstairs conference room. Golder Associates will present the Storage Assessment and we will continue discussion of the comments on the draft Watershed Plan. We will order pizza for lunch.