

## 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: June 20, 2001**  
**Place: Conference Room**  
**Spokane County Conservation District**  
**210 N. Havana Spokane, WA**

**Note: The meeting summaries for the April and May meetings are attached.**

### Agenda

- 9:30 am Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members**  
Facilitator Lead
- 9:35 Work Group Update**  
Spokane County WQMP staff
- 9:45 Presentation and Discussion of Model**  
Golder Team: Discussion of model elements, pros, cons, costs, etc. outlined in the memo dated May 29, 2001.  
Facilitator Lead: Committee selection of model
- 10:45 Phase 3 Grant Application Scope of Work**  
Facilitator Lead: Review draft developed by work group  
Decide if any final changes are needed for June submittal to Ecology
- 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 May 16 meeting summary.**  
Facilitator  
Note: there will be no Planning Unit meetings in July or August – enjoy the summer!
- 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](mailto:smiller@spokanecounty.org)

## Meeting Summary Planning Unit

Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan  
June 20, 2001

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

Lloyd Brewer	Reanette Boese	Rachael Paschal Osborn
Steve Skipworth	Stan Miller	Steve Silkworth
Terry Liberty	Sarah Hubbard-Gray	Megan Harding
Gary Fergen	Chris Pitre	Doug Allen
Tom Hargreaves	Bryony Hansen	

**Introductions:** Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 9:35 am and gave an overview of the agenda and goals for the meeting.

**Work Group Update:** Reanette Boese, Spokane County WQMP, updated the committee on the Water Rights and Claims work group. The work group has indicated that the 4 acre feet per acre that is being used in the analysis seems high. Chris Pitre of Golder Associates responded to the question by explaining that if 3 acre feet per acre were used it would not change the result much (i.e., 1%). Chris also indicated that they are using what they consider to be realistic estimates in the evaluation, not the Ecology water claims figures. The committee also expressed concern that not using actual water rights in the model does not represent the amount of water allocated to existing water rights holders. This could lead to recommendations to keep water use at current levels rather than allow for use of full water rights. Chris responded by explaining that actual use is being plugged into the model, that water rights are being considered, and that seasonal variations are included. There was additional discussion regarding the number of irrigated acres, the Marshal Lake project approach, and coordination with farmers.

**Consultant Presentation:** Chris Pitre, Golder Associates, provided an overview of the May 29, 2001 memo regarding the watershed model selection criteria and the review of the various model/software options. Chris explained why they are recommending the MIKE suite of models; that it is already integrated, includes hydraulic continuity, can simulate the affects of dams, can assess comparative impacts, is technically defensible, has presentation capabilities, has widespread acceptance, is cost effective, can be paid for through existing budget/grant funds, etc.

The committee discussed various aspects of the model and model selection. Discussion points included 1) purchase approval process, 2) identification of other projects with groundwater/surface water that are using MIKE, 3) researcher comments on MIKE, 4) how the model will be used and the value of MIKE for that purpose, 5) structure of the license fee for MIKE, 6) the limited ability to customize MIKE for detailed and fine tuned studies, 7) the upgrades provided, and 8) other projects and entities that could use the MIKE model. The ability to use the MIKE model to evaluate the proposed Idaho generating projects impacts was discussed. Chris indicated that since the projects are outside the geographic area covered in this study that you could only run a “what if” scenario which would not be considered accurate or defensible.

All of the voting member of the WRIA 55 and 57 Planning Unit present at the meeting expressed support and approval for selecting and purchasing the MIKE suite of models for this study.

**Phase 3 Planning Unit Grant Application:** Stan Miller explained that seven or eight planning unit representatives attended the May 30<sup>th</sup> meeting to refine the draft grant application. They decided to apply for everything available, however, they agreed that the water quality element was a lower priority. Doug Allen explained that the state legislature was still working on the budget and that the base funding and special funding for instream flow may be the only funds approved. He also indicated that the watershed planning grant funding process had been audited and that it may be changed to a voucher or reimbursement system.

The committee members present offered the following comments on the draft application that was mailed prior to the meeting:

- Page 1 – change “No Tribal lands lay within” to “No Tribal lands lie within”
- Page 8 – there was a question regarding motor pool costs and Stan explained that County staff are required to use the motor pool vehicles for County work, Stan also clarified that the Initiating Agency Support budget is intended for reimbursement of travel costs
- Page 12 – change “watchdog” to “monitoring plan implementation”

Stan Miller explained that he would need new letters of commitment from the initiating agencies.

**Other Items Discussed:** Steve Silkworth, Avista Utilities, provided an update on the Avista Spokane River hydroelectric facilities re-licensing efforts. He explained that the process will officially start in July 2002, that the FERC re-licensing application must be filed by July 2005, and that either a traditional or alternative process can be used. Steve explained that the alternative process requires stakeholders to work together up front as a group, and that with this process the studies would begin in 2002, and that changes would begin sooner. Avista will hold another stakeholder meeting this fall to gather input. If the alternative process is used, a process plan would be developed and a public comment period offered prior to FERC approval. The planning unit members present at the meeting expressed support for the alternative process. Stan Miller and Doug Allen asked Steve to give another, more detailed, presentation to the planning unit at a future special meeting.

The two new power plants proposed in Idaho that would use 17 millions gallons of aquifer water per day were discussed. Rachael Paschal Osborn explained that she is working with groups that are protesting the plant approvals and will be submitting letters of protest. Stan Miller indicated that he would ask Rachael to keep the planning unit briefed on the status of these proposed power plants.

The May 16, 2001 meeting summary was reviewed and Bryony Hansen, Golder Associates, recommended that the last sentence of the first paragraph under Consultant Presentation be deleted since Golder has and is using much more data than referenced.

The next meeting was set for September 19, 2001 at 10:00 am.