

Meeting Notice

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

Time: 9:30 am
Date: May 16, 2001
Place: Conference Room
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Note: The meeting summary for the April meeting will be available at the meeting. We will review and approve the summary at the end of the meeting.

Agenda

- 9:30 am Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members**
Facilitator Lead
- 9:35 Work Group Information Development Update**
Spokane County WQMP staff
- 9:45 Consultant Presentation**
Golder Team: Status of Data Compilation
Model Selection
- 10:45 Develop outline for Phase 3 Application Scope of Work**
Facilitator Lead
Continue the discussion of items to include in the Phase 3 scope of work
Copies of the Application form will be available at the meeting
- 11:35 Other items of Public or Committee Concern**
Facilitator Lead
- 11:45 Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**
- 11:55 Review and approve April 26 meeting summary.**
Set next meeting date, time and location
Facilitator: June 20, 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
May 16, 2001

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Lloyd Brewer	Steve Skipworth	Reanette Boese
Stan Miller	Leon Sproule	Ty Wick
Doug Allen	Ann Murphy	Jim Wilson
Joel White	Julia McHugh	Bea Lackaff
Dave Jones	Gary Fergen	Dick Price
Sarah Hubbard-Gray	Susan McGeorge	Megan Harding
Erin Cunningham	Rick Noll	Frank L Boyle
Rachael Paschal Osborn	Bryony Hansen	Tom Hargreaves

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 9:35 am. Stan Miller introduced the new Spokane County Water Quality Program employee, Erin Cunningham. Committee members introduced themselves.

Work Group Information Development: Reanette Boese, Spokane County WQMP, updated the committee on the Water Rights and Claims work group meeting with John Colvert of the Washington Department of Ecology. Ecology will provide information from the water rights claims from 1994 since they have not changed much since then. The Water Rights and Claims work group will then review and compare the new information gathered through the watershed planning process with the 1994 Ecology data from John Colvert. The work group will also coordinate with Golder and provide the water rights information.

Consultant Presentation: Bryony Hansen, Golder Associates, reported that the data transfer from the County is almost complete and that they will identify in a report what additional data should/could also be transferred. Golder is currently creating GIS coverages for the data. Bryony showed an example of the data tables that establish the basis for each GIS coverage and explained that each data file can be used as input to the model. Golder has data from 50 monitoring wells and similar coverage from climate stations.

Bryony explained that Golder is still favoring the MIKE-SHE model because of its hydraulic connection elements, including branches of rivers, leakage, floodplain influence, etc. Committee members indicated that they were expecting more information on the models at this meeting and asked several questions about the model selection. Additional information was requested for the June 2001 meeting so the committee can be involved in the selection process. Stan Miller indicated that the model selection needs to be done in June since there will be no July or August Planning Unit meetings. Committee questions and comments regarding the model selection included:

- What is the cost and what part of the grant budget would pay for the model? Stan Miller indicated that it could be a pass through cost to the County who would ultimately own the model. Other various options were also discussed.
- Would prefer to have a model that can be re-run in the future. Stan Miller indicated that he would talk to Spokane County Planning to see if they could also use the Mike-She model and to see if a Planning Department representative can sit on the Planning Unit Committee. The Spokane County Water Quality Advisory Committee representative and the Spokane County Planning Commission representative expressed support for a model that can be owned by the County and used in the future.
- Why are other models not being as highly considered? Stan Miller and Bryony explained some of the limitations of the other possible models and the technical advantages of Mike-She.

Bryony indicated that she will provide additional information on the applicable models to the committee before the June meeting so that the committee can make an informed selection. She also indicated that the draft level one assessment should be complete in June 2001.

Phase 3 Planning Unit Grant Application: Stan Miller explained the possible grant funding elements (i.e., \$500,000 full basic grant, \$100,000 additional for in-stream flow, \$100,000 additional for habitat, and \$100,000 for water quality). The committee discussed a variety of ideas, asked questions, and provided opinions. The committee agreed with most of the ideas and suggestions on the list developed from the April 25, 2001 meeting that was sent with the May 16, 2001 agenda. Clarification to these items and addition items the committee decided should be incorporated into the grant application scope of work include:

- Fully fund the basic \$500,000 grant to cover the Phase 3 required watershed planning elements described in the state guidelines. Develop specific recommendations as part of the final implementation plan.
- Request additional funds for in-stream flow and storage/augmentation. Include in the basic grant some baseline storage/augmentation work with the additional funds working as a supplement (in case the additional funds are not provided).
- Include active public involvement elements and ensure that the public input process is adequate, documented, and considered in the planning process. Items suggested include:
 - Involve public in the plan development and describe the model results by evaluating and implementing effective public education and involvement techniques.
 - Hold a series of public meetings on priorities, alternatives and recommendations.
 - Communicate with stakeholders at the onset of the process.
 - Develop a public relations approach that could include publications, questionnaires, surveys, presentations, web page, media involvement/coverage, collaborating with other groups/events.
- Request funds for the following data collection elements:
 - Gather and incorporate new data (i.e., from USGS, Conservation District) into the model.
 - Define what types of data to add to be able to keep the model updated/current. Identify needs/reasons/justifications for keeping model updated/current. Develop

an element of the plan that describes how the model will be kept updated/current and how it will be paid for.

- Request funds for in-stream flow studies in both basins. Use the funds for the Little Spokane River first and the Spokane River later so that it coincides with Avista's Spokane River work associated with their re-licensing efforts.

The committee decided that a work group should be formed to assist with the Phase 3 Grant Application development. The initiating agency representatives will be requested to attend a May 30, 2001 meeting at the Spokane Conservation District office from 10:00 am to 12:00 noon.

Other Items Discussed: The committee also discussed or provided the following comments/suggestions 1) evaluate if one of the universities can maintain and update the model, 2) concern was expressed about a new wastewater treatment plant adding pollutants to the Spokane River that could contaminate the aquifer, 3) Little Spokane River in-stream work done in late 1970's should be considered (some committee members indicated that it is not good quality work/data), 4) additional funds should be requested for more water quality work (Stan Miller indicated that the state statute requires numerous water quality elements to be completed and that the funds are not adequate to cover the required work. It was decided that the statute would be reviewed to further evaluate if the required water quality work could be completed with the available funds.)

The April 25, 2001 meeting summary was reviewed and the following comments provided, 1) the name of the work group in paragraph 2 should be Water Rights and Claims, 2) the paragraph three heading should not include Consultant since County staff made the presentation, and 3) the fourth sentence in paragraph three should read "The cross sections show aquifer dimensions at 29 aquifer locations."

The next meeting was set for June 20, 2001 at 9:30 am. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.