

Meeting Notice

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

Time: 10:00 am (Note: An Initiating Agency meeting will be held at 9:00 am)
Date: Wednesday, December 18, 2002
Place: Conference Room
Spokane County Conservation District
210 N. Havana Spokane, WA

Initiating Agency Meeting – Agenda

(Note: Planning Unit members are welcome to attend)

9:00 am Discuss plan recommendation decision making, City of Spokane position, Memorandum of Agreement, and options for moving forward

Planning Unit Meeting – Agenda

10:00 am **Call to Order: Introduction of Committee Members**
Discuss and Approve November 20, 2002 Meeting Summary
Facilitator Lead

10:10 **Follow Up on Plan Recommendation Decision Making**
Initiating Agencies

10:30 **Discuss Non-Aquatic Biota Instream Flow Elements for the Little Spokane River**
(Note: Please review the enclosed memo from Stan Miller prior to the meeting)
Develop objectives for overall flow evaluation
Develop criteria for establishing flow for aesthetics/recreation, water quality, and power production
Stan Miller and Facilitator Lead

11:45 **Other items of Public or Committee Concern**
Facilitator Lead

11:55 **Wrap Up of Session: Facilitator summarizes information presented**

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 18, 2002

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen	Ty Wick	Megan Harding
Lloyd Brewer	Steve Skipworth	Rachael Paschal Osborn
Harry McLean	Ann Murphy	Tom Hargreaves
Jane Cunningham	Susan McGeorge	Bruce Howard
Ken Kuhn	Terry Liberty	Stan Miller
Jim Wilson	Walt Edelen	Reanette Boese
Julia McHugh	Rick Noll	

Consultants that attended the meeting were: Sarah Hubbard-Gray of Hubbard Gray Consulting and Bryony Hansen of Golder Associates.

Guests that attended the meeting were: Chip Brown.

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah asked if there were comments on the November 20, 2002 Meeting Summary. There were no comments or requested corrections.

Follow up on Plan Recommendation Decision Making: Stan Miller summarized the outcome of the Initiating Agency meeting held at 9:00 am on December 18, 2002. He explained that the Initiating Agency members recognize the difference between the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and the Planning Unit recommendation for plan recommendation decision making. But, they also recognize that both decision making processes rely on consensus building as the first and primary step. Since the City of Spokane representative, Lloyd Brewer, has indicated that the City of Spokane staff do not support amending the current MOA, and since reaching consensus is the primary goal, the Initiating Agencies decided to move forward with the following process for developing plan recommendations:

- Step 1: Work to reach consensus with all of the Planning Unit members (including the Initiating Agencies) on plan recommendations – which is consistent with the current MOA. If consensus of all members can't be reached move to step 2.
- Step 2: Work to reach consensus with all of the Initiating Agencies, and conduct a vote of the Planning Unit members (including the Initiating Agencies) to identify if a majority supports the plan recommendation. The plan recommendation would be carried forward if there is a majority support and consensus of the Initiating Agencies – which is consistent with the current MOA. If there is not consensus of the Initiating Agencies, move to step 3.
- Step 3: If there is not consensus of the Initiating Agencies on a proposed plan recommendation, revisit the option of modifying the current Initiating Agency MOA to allow for a process similar to the one the Planning Unit recommended at the September 18, 2002 Planning Unit meeting.

Planning Unit members asked a variety of questions, discussed the process and had a variety of comments, including:

- Should have a set process established at the onset.
- Make sure the new City of Spokane Valley and Liberty Lake are invited and encouraged to participate.
- The current MOA is illegal and exceeded the Initiating Agencies authority and the process will not work out in the end.
- The Planning Unit can move forward in an effort to develop a plan through consensus or waste more time getting nowhere.

Non-Aquatic Biota Instream Flow Elements for the Little Spokane River: Stan Miller provided an overview of the memo that was sent out with the meeting notice and explained that the Little Spokane River (LSR) instream flow scope requires the Planning Unit to 1) develop objectives for overall flow evaluation, and 2) develop criteria for establishing flow that consider aesthetics/recreation, water quality, and power production.

Sarah Hubbard-Gray went over the objectives previously identified by the Planning Unit for each of the four elements, which include:

Overall: Identify key flow measurement locations on the Little Spokane River (LSR). Assure an understanding of flow needs in selected tributaries.

Aquatic Biota: Assure an understanding of flow needs in the Lower LSR (Below Dartford) for aquatic / terrestrial flora and fauna. Assure an understanding of flow needs in potential spawning reaches of the LSR to provide for fish propagation.

Water Quality: No objectives previously identified.

Recreation & Aesthetics: Assure an understanding of flow needs in the Lower LSR (Below Dartford) for recreational use.

Power Production: No objectives previously identified.

The group was then asked to move into four small groups and identify additional potential objectives for LSR overall flow evaluation. The small group suggestions were then presented to the large group. They included:

Overall:

Group 4 – Objective should be to do no harm. Should evaluate possibility of removing private river designation.

No additional objectives were suggested by the other small groups.

Aquatic Biota:

No additional objectives were suggested by the small groups.

Water Quality:

Group 1 – Should consider sediment contribution to the Spokane River and Lake Spokane; temperature, DO, pH, fecal coliform, and nutrients.

Group 2 – Should consider status of river quality for beneficial uses; impact of Colbert water; and effect of flow on agricultural and animal runoff.

- Group 3 – Should evaluate if Deer Park’s wastewater system affects LSR quality. Should consider point source discharges to the LSR, such as Kaiser and dairies; how land ownership and associated LSR access affects water quality; nutrients from fertilizers; current and ongoing flora and fauna studies; and vegetation.
- Group 4 – Criteria should stress no degradation. Should evaluate if LSR flow is adequate for current discharges. Should consider impact of erosion on water quality.
- Addition suggestion provided during the small group presentations: Should consider the effect of septic systems discharges to the LSR.

Recreation and Aesthetics:

- Group 1 – Should consider natural areas, boating, fishing, and public access.
- Group 2 – Should consider the legal status of public access and use; and the amount of public use.
- Group 3 – Agreed with the objective previously identified.
- Group 4 – Should consider the potential recreational uses and the flow needed for each use.

Power production:

- Group 1 – Should not be included in evaluation.
- Group 2 – Determine the value of the LSR flow to the Spokane River power production, and evaluate the future value of low head hydro power production in the Little Spokane River.
- Group 3 – If water storage in the LSR system is determined to be necessary for water needs in the summer, then consider value of low head power.
- Group 4 – Evaluate the impact of LSR flows on Spokane River power production, and Evaluate potential for individual power production without negative environmental impacts.

The Planning Unit members were then asked to individually think about and write down criteria for establishing flow recommendations for each of the four instream flow elements. They wrote their suggestions on post-it-notes and placed them on a flip chart under each associated element. They provided lots of suggestions, along with a variety of questions and comments.

Sarah Hubbard-Gray explained that the objective and criteria suggestions will be translated into potential objective and criteria statements and presented and considered at the January 15, 2003 Planning Unit meeting.

Other items of Public or Committee Concern: Rachael Paschal Osborn informed the Planning Unit that Idaho had decided to continue issuing water rights in the Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer and that in the decision they had referenced the WRIA 55/57 effort; she read the statement.

Bryony Hansen presented the new WRIA 55/57 web page that is being developed and showed how it will look and function on the screen. Stan Miller explained that there will be a link to the new web page from the County’s web page.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm. The next meeting was set for Wednesday January 15, 2002 at 10:00 am at the Spokane County Conservation District.