

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: December 6, 2000
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 Needs Discussion
Stan Miller, Spokane County WQMP / Golder Associates

10:20 Identification of Model User Needs
Facilitator Lead

What specific questions do we want to answer with the model?

Who will use the model output data? What data does each user need?

What level of output "polish" is needed? ie, How graphical doe the output need to be?

Who will operate and update the model?

11:40 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 and location
Facilitator Lead. January 17, 2001 is the third Wednesday – our "regular" meeting date.

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
December 6, 2000

Stan Miller called the meeting to order at 10:05

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Lloyd Brewer | Steve Skipworth | Tom Hargreaves |
| Michele Vazquez | Jani Gilbert | Ty Wick |
| Stan Miller | Rick Noll | Steve Roberge |
| Joel White | Terry Liberty | Sandy Mack |
| Susan McGeorge | Walt Edelen | Bryony Hansen, Golder |
| Doug Allen | Julia McHugh | Rachael Pascal Osborn |
| Leon Sproule | Gary Fergen | Kevin Robinette |

The meeting summary for the November 29 meeting was approved as corrected.

Stan Miller introduced Jani Gilbert from the Department of Ecology. Jani will facilitate the December and January meetings.

At the request of the facilitator, members present introduced themselves.

After a brief description of the current status of data collection presented by Stan Miller, the facilitator began a discussion of the four topic areas identified at the November 29th meeting. These are listed in the Agenda for today's meeting.

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).

What questions will the model answer? (*Note there are several comments about what the model can or should do rather than questions the model should answer.*)

Provide Ecology the information they need to make decisions *on water rights*.

Predict interchange between the River and the Aquifer.

Who will own the model and how will access be handled (*an early broaching a later question*)

How does climate / snowpack / level of Lake Coeur d'Alene / dams effect the flow of the river. Can the model incorporate this? To what extent do these effect summer low flow?

Possibly use to get to minimum instream flow id'd by Washington Fish and Wildlife.

There was considerable discussion on whether this was appropriate unless we do actual IFIM type assessment to provide better data than we currently have. On this and several other bullet items there was some discussion for alternative sources of funding to allow more in depth study to provide better information.

Determine how and where to mitigate for additional withdrawal. Need to know effectiveness of mitigation.

This could be the most important feature, as significant “new water” will likely need mitigation. We should probably have in mind some mitigation methods so we can use a model that will give us feedback on the methods.

How accurate is the model? Pick probability taking into account defensibility.

This again is going to be determined largely by cost. The key is to be sure that the model we use can be upgraded to produce a better product as new data is generated.

Want compatibility w/ARC info Ability to make shape files

Determine frequency and duration of low flows.

Timing and quantity of GW withdrawal effects on surface water

Who will use the data / model? What info do they need?

Planning Unit

Items under #1. Amount of runoff / recharge from hillsides, effect of land use / land cover on water use / runoff, how much interbasin exchange occurs via groundwater – 57 to 55 and 57 to 54.

Interest groups

Is there enough water (*for my use of interest*)? Will I be able to get a water right? What effect will mitigation efforts have on flow? Is the river going to be clean?

Purveyors

When are the low flow periods, how low does flow get? What is the overall water budget. What effect does withdrawal have on the river? What effect does the river have on aquifer quality?

Department of Ecology

Items in #1, Water for future water rights? Water Resources section: info to process water rights applications; determine mitigation scenarios; project needs.

There were some questions about the ability of the model to answer the specific questions needed for a water right. Generally Ecology will look at each application and judge it on its own merits weighed against the four criteria. The watershed plan can provide general guidance but not answer all questions.

Planning departments / Local govt. (Utilities depts., stormwater, roads)

Items in #1, effects of impervious surface on runoff volume, water balance; does water availability suggest where growth should be “directed;” is there enough water to meet the OFM population projections?; make decisions to help maintain summer low flows. *For example can we use stormwater to recharge ground water or treated waste discharge to maintain summer flow?*

General public

Items in #1 and other item above, possible change in policy on domestic exempt wells.

Development interests

Items in #1 depending on group some of these are discussed above, domestic exempt

Who will operate / update the model?

Spokane County will definitely develop the capability. *Ongoing operation of the model and planning will depend on community support for continued funding after the grant period. Because of the County's role as lead agency in Watershed Planning they have a responsibility to try to set up a long term process.*

City of Spokane - Ecology?? Would like to have use but may not be able to support the model.

Desire for access may depend on complexity and cost. *Many individuals felt their constituencies would like to use the model if it were simple enough to use.*

Need to define who needs access as this may determine which model we choose.

Driving force for selection should be information needs (first) and user friendliness (second).

There was considerable discussion about the various ways to broaden access to the model such as though web access, stand alone modules placed in libraries or at purveyors facilities, and providing maps and tables showing the output of the model for sever sets of conditions. The following comment is based on that discussion.

Need to control the number of “real” versions of the model so there is one version with the accepted assumptions and database that is used to develop conclusions. *Without some control, users could change the calibration of the model to get the results they want.*

(This item was identified as the main topic for the January meeting.)

What level of graphic output / user friendliness should the model have? *(This item came up for discussion with little time left, thus the cursory coverage. It was suggested that this be the topic of the February meeting.)*

Should be able to answer common questions about water use. Should link to GIS Maps.

Need products comprehensible to Commissioners and City Council.

Graphics can come from add on programs; they don't have to come from the “model” package. *In some cases it may be less expensive to use model output data to feed another program, like GIS, to get the output format we want.*

We need to decide how we want the model to interact with GIS.

When we know input data availability, we may be able to narrow model choices.

The facilitator summarized the items above and discussed action items. The group decided to focus on question 3 for January and Question 4 for February meetings.

Based on earlier discussion on instream flow for biota, the instream flow work group decided to meet later in December. The members will get together after the meeting to set a date and time.

The group concurred with the previously scheduled meeting for January 17th as the next meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05.