

Meeting Summary Planning Unit

Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan May 21, 2003

Committee members recorded on the sign in sheet were:

Doug Allen, <i>Dept. of Ecology</i>	Steve Skipworth, <i>Vera Water</i>	Walt Edelen, <i>Spokane County</i>
Lloyd Brewer, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water District</i>	<i>Conservation District</i>
Harry McLean, Jr., <i>City of Spokane Water</i>	Dave Jones, <i>Water Quality Advisory Committee</i>	Stan Miller, <i>Spokane County</i>
Julia McHugh, <i>SAJB</i>	Gus Koedding, <i>Spokane Homebuilders Association</i>	Reanette Boese, <i>Spokane County</i>
Rick Noll	Jane Cunningham, <i>The Lands Council</i>	Bill Gilmour, <i>Spokane County</i>
Karin Divens, <i>Washington St. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</i>		Bruce Howard, <i>Avista Utilities</i>

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: Joshua Henenway (EWU student), Katherine Yerbich (EWU student), Toni Gilliam of Hubbard Gray Consulting

Introductions: Sarah Hubbard- Gray called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah asked for comments or corrections to the April 16, 2003 meeting summary. Two typographical errors were noted. No additional comments or corrections to the meeting summary were requested.

Report on Intermountain Province Subbasin Planning: Stan Miller and Kevin Robbinette handed out materials outlining the Intermountain Province (IMP) Subbasin planning process. This planning process will help direct where Bonneville Power Administration fish and wildlife mitigation money is spent in the future. The planning process is guided by an Oversight Committee, a Technical Ad-Hoc Committee provides technical recommendations, and a stakeholder component is being developed for the six subbasins within the IMP, referred to as Subbasin Work Teams.

Each Subbasin Work Team will develop a subbasin plan made up of three components; an Assessment, an Inventory and a Management Plan. Subbasin Work Teams are being created with representation from various interest groups. Six Subbasin Work Team meetings will take place from June 2003 to May 2004. Those interested in joining a work team can contact the IMP Coordinator, Allison Squire at alison@softridge.net or (509) 747-5804.

Update on MIKE Modeling:

Bryony Hansen from Golder Associates, explained that the modeling code is being converted from UNIX to Windows to make the model more user friendly.

Stan reported that a draft model report is now on the web page. The report includes the description of one calibration model based on current conditions. A second scenario which removes all human use except the dams will be added as an appendix to the current report. Stan also explained that the report has one error; a technical table was put in twice and is included in

the summary, rather than the summary table. Final documents will be complete in July and the report will then be downloadable. The draft document is available on CD Rom from Reanette Boese.

Update and Discussion of Model Scenarios: Reanette Boese passed out a table (dated 5-13-03) describing 14 proposed modeling scenarios. She reported that the modeling work group had met on May 13, 2003 to discuss the cost of running each scenario and estimates that Golder and Associates will have enough budget to run 5 or 6 scenarios with the available budget. Reanette explained that the Work Group had reviewed the scenarios and prioritized the top 6 as follows:

- Background Prediction Scenarios:
 - Turn off all pumping, surface water withdrawals, and artificial recharge to aquifers and rivers. Also remove dams.
 - Turn off all pumping and artificial recharge due to pumping
- Future Prediction Scenarios:
 - Pump water with 20-year population growth added at current water use levels.
 - Replace domestic exempt wells within an appropriate distance of a public water supply system with water pumped from the Hillyard Trough.
- Management Scenarios:
 - Turn off all wells near (within ½ mile) the river (in reaches where the aquifer is recharging the river).
 - Pump water out of the Spokane River during high flows and inject it into groundwater. May want to try several locations.
 - Raise the water level behind Upriver Dam (would we get the information we want by removing Upriver?)

Planning Unit Members reviewed the list of scenarios and requested that two additional scenarios be included in the overall list:

- Augment Spokane River flows during the summer with water from Lake Coeur d'Alene by releases at Post Falls Dam.
- Evaluate the impact of a new larger water user being permitted in Idaho.

Stan explained that no scenarios will be taken off the list, but may be shifted in priority. The County is buying the modeling program and training staff to run it which will make the program much more efficient to run and allow more scenarios to be run in the future. Golder is currently running the first modeling scenario (Turn off all pumping and artificial recharge). This information will help determine which models will be the most useful. Stan also explained that all of the scenarios may not show a significant change in flow, due to the model calibration, and that some of the models may be run concurrently. Stan said that the greatest source of potential error in the models is the ground water influx across the Idaho state line.

After discussion and review of the list, planning unit members were asked to prioritize the six most important scenarios. For the purpose of this task, it was assumed that every model run would cost the same. The facilitator asked the Planning Unit members to review the entire list of modeling scenarios and to identify their top three priority scenarios. The top three priorities of each member were tallied and the results of these priorities were reviewed. Following discussion the Planning Unit members decided that the following seven scenarios should be considered as having the highest priority, listed in priority order:

1. Pump water with 20-year population growth added at current water use levels.

2. Pump water out of the Spokane River during high flows and inject it into groundwater. May want to try several locations.
3. Turn off all wells near (within .5 miles) the river (in reaches where the aquifer is recharging the river).
4. Replace domestic exempt wells within an appropriate distance of a public water supply system with water pumped from the Hillyard Trough.
5. Pump all water rights and domestic exempt wells to their maximum.
6. Turn off all pumping, surface water withdrawals, and artificial recharge to aquifers and rivers. Also remove dams.
7. Augment the Spokane River flows during the summer with water from Lake Coeur d'Alene and the Post Falls Dam.

Golder Associates will run the top 4 priority scenarios, and move to the additional scenarios based on further discussions with the Planning Unit and as budget allows.

Other Items of Public or Committee Concern and Announcements:

- WRIA 54 Watershed Planning: Stan Miller reported that he has received three responses from WRIA 54 initiating agencies that indicated support for moving forward to start WRIA 54 watershed planning; these responses were from Stevens County PUD, Stevens County and Spokane Tribe of Indians. Lincoln County has not responded, but Spokane County will move forward with the development of the grant application.
- Little Spokane River Instream flow: Bryony Hansen indicated that Golder will have a draft report on the Little Spokane River instream flow work on May 30th and will distribute the draft to the Department of Ecology, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Spokane County.
- Middle Spokane Instream Flow: Bruce Howard gave an update on the Spokane River studies being conducted by Avista as part of their re-licensing efforts. Avista is focusing on how their dam operations may affect the river and how dam operation modifications might affect the river. Part of their work is looking at aesthetics of flow in downtown Spokane, white water flows for recreation; and the water quality, especially temperature and total dissolved gas. Bruce explained that Avista's scopes of work are not yet firmly set, and that there are some short-term opportunities to coordinate their efforts with the Planning Unit's instream flow efforts. Stan reviewed the river reaches involved in Avista's work and explained that there are some areas of overlap with Watershed Planning Unit work. Doug Allen expressed concern that there has not been enough coordination between the Planning Unit and Avista regarding their efforts, Avista explained that they have to work within specific time constraints, and it was agreed that opportunities for additional coordination would be discussed in the near future.
- Bryony indicated that updates have been made to the website and that it has been expanded. She also reported that the Level 1 Assessment Report will be finalized by the end of June 2003.

Wrap Up: The next Planning Unit meeting was set for June 18, 2003 at 10:00am at the Spokane County Conservation District.