

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: April 25, 2001
Place: Conference Room
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Agenda

- 10:00 am** **Call to Order – Introduction of Facilitator. Introduction of Committee Members**
Stan Miller Lead
- 10:05** **Work Group Information Development**
Reanette Boese, Spokane County WQMP
- 10:10** **Consultant Presentation**
Golder Team: Bryony Hansen: Status of Data Compilation. DNR Aquifer cross section updates.
- 10:30** **Report on AVISTA meeting, NAWQA meeting and TMDL Modeling Study**
Stan Miller, Spokane County WQMP and others
- 11:00** **Develop outline for Phase 3 application**
Facilitator Lead

Summary presentation on application needs and process by Stan Miller/Doug Allen.
- 11:30** **Other items of Public or Committee Concern**
Facilitator Lead
- 11:45** **Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**
- 11:55** **Set next meeting date, time and location**
Facilitator: May 16, 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

April 25, 2001

Stan Miller called the meeting to order at 10:05

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer
Stan Miller
Doug Allen
Joel White
Dave Jones
Sarah Hubbard Gray

Steve Skipworth
Leon Sproule
Ann Murphy
Julia McHugh
Gary Fergen
Susan McGeorge

Reanette Boese
Ty Wick
Jim Wilson
Steve Silkworth
Bea Lackaff
Dick Price

Corrections per Planning Unit comments on May 15, 2001 are noted.

Introductions: Stan Miller called the meeting to order at 10:05 and introduced the new Planning Unit facilitator, Sarah Hubbard-Gray. Committee members introduced themselves.

Work Group Information Development: Reanette Boese, Spokane County WQMP, provided an overview of the committee work groups and their status. It was decided that the Water Use Work Group will meet on May 10th to review the Department of Ecology assumptions and water right scoring that John Covert has developed from review of the existing water rights and claims. Reanette Boese and Doug Allen will coordinate the meeting and get the details to interested committee members. Golder will also review the water right scoring information from Ecology.

Consultant Presentation: Bea Lackaff, Spokane County WQMP, provided an overview of the agreement between the County and Golder and the status of the data the County has gathered, developed, and provided to Golder. The County has conducted research, mapped data, and developed new GIS layers of data for climate, plant coverage, and septic tank locations. They also developed aquifer cross sections from data developed by CH2M Hill for the Wellhead Protection Program and refined by DNR. The cross sections show aquifer storage dimensions at 29 aquifer locations. Reanette Boese developed cross sections for the Little Spokane River aquifer. Copies of the cross sections were passed out and reviewed by the committee members.

It was asked when Golder would be coming back to the Planning Unit to talk more about the model selection. Stan Miller said it would be a major discussion item for the May meeting.

Report on Avista Meeting: Steve Silkworth, Avista, provided an overview of the FERC re-licensing meeting that was held on April 17, 2001. Avista's Spokane River hydroelectric facilities FERC licenses expire in 2007 and they are beginning a collaborative process of working with area stakeholders to develop an agreement and conduct studies prior to 2007. This is a process similar to the one used to re-license the Clark Fork River hydroelectric facilities. Ninety people attended the meeting and most supported this collaborative process.

Committee members asked how the Planning Unit would be represented in the process and if Stan Miller was going to attend the Avista re-licensing meetings on behalf of the Planning Unit. Stan indicated they he may need to represent the County separate from the Planning Unit. Discussion included the need for Planning Unit members to have their own representation as separate stakeholder groups (i.e., water

purveyors) and that Avista is a representative on the Planning Unit committee. Steve Silkwood agreed to keep the Planning Unit informed of the process and issues. It was decided that the Planning Unit should continue discussions on representation as the Avista process continues.

NAWQA meeting and TMDL Study: Stan Miller provided an overview of the North American Water Quality Assessment meeting held April 18, 2001. Approximately twenty people, plus USGS staff, attended the meeting. USGS staff provided information on recent studies that USGS has conducted that EPA may not be aware of. They include invertebrate studies, Spokane River/Aquifer interchange study, and water quality sampling. Since the river flows are so low this year and they will not be able to gather the scheduled typical high spring flow data, Stan indicated that he would like the Planning Unit to offer to pay for a portion of the study so it can be extended and they can collect the data during the 2002 high spring flow.

Stan Miller informed the committee that the Department of Ecology will be holding a meeting on the Dissolved Oxygen (DO) Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) development and associated DO model in mid June of early July.

Phase 3 Planning Unit Grant Application: Stan Miller provided an overview of the Phase 3 grant application process; applications are due at the end of June 2001. Sarah Hubbard-Gray facilitated discussion of the scope of work items the committee would like to consider including in the application. See the attached sheet, Phase 3 Scope of Work Discussion Topics, for a summary of the items discussed.

Other Items Discussed: The committee discussed in-stream flows, that Avista will likely conduct an in-stream flow study for their re-licensing, and that Golder will recommend optimum in-stream flows for beneficial uses. The metals and PCB contamination in the Spokane River were also discussed. One committee members noted that some of the data on the Little Dear Creek map developed by the County appears inaccurate; more wells than septic tanks. It was explained that the data sets came from different sources. The need for the data to be reviewed by committee members was then discussed.

The next meeting was set for May 16, 2001 at 9:30 am to allow additional time for the topics. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Phase 3 Scope of Work Discussion Topics

The following general areas were identified as potential “tasks” for the Phase 3 Scope of Work during the April 25 meeting. These are provided to stimulate thinking for the discussion at the May 16 meeting.

Public Involvement Program

Issues and Ideas

When to start meetings for plan development.
Number and distribution of meetings.
Process for collecting input, distribution of information.

Data collection for areas of deficiency identified in assessment phase

Issues and Ideas

Additional information needed in Little Spokane Basin to bring the level of sophistication of our analysis there to the same level as for the SVRP Aquifer.

How do we use ongoing data collection efforts to provide new information for “updating the model” in Phase 3?

In stream flow studies

Issues and Ideas

Should we seek supplemental funding for this topic?
Should we pursue fish flow studies? In one or both basins?
Is a cooperative effort involving AVISTA possible?
Cooperative efforts with EWU, WDFW and others

Support continuation of NAWQA River - Aquifer work

Issues and Ideas

How much funding should we dedicate to the effort to collect data during a high flow period?
Does the current 15,000 cfs “count” given the low level of the aquifer when we got the elevated runoff?

Spokane County will inherit most of the wells installed along the River after the USGS is finished. How should we try to use them? How do they relate to the other wells we have?

Supplemental Funding

Issues and Ideas

Should we seek supplemental funding for water quality? Storage? In stream Flows?
What priority do we put these in?
How much should we commit to on these topics using only the base funding for Phase 3?