

## Meeting Summary Planning Unit

### Little Spokane River – Middle Spokane River Local Watershed Plan March 24, 2004

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

Lloyd Brewer, <i>City of Spokane</i>	Steve Skipworth, <i>Vera Water</i>	Jane Cunningham, <i>The Lands Council</i>
Ty Wick, <i>Spokane Aquifer Joint Board</i>	Walt Edelen, <i>Spokane County Conservation District</i>	Stan Miller, <i>Spokane County</i>
Susan McGeorge, <i>Whitworth Water</i>	Matt Zupich, <i>Pend Oreille Conservation District</i>	Reanette Boese, <i>Spokane County</i>
Tom Hargreaves, <i>Friends of the Little Spokane Valley</i>	Mary Wren, <i>City of Liberty Lake</i>	Bill Gilmour, <i>Spokane County</i>
	Doug Allen, <i>Dept. of Ecology</i>	

**Consultants that attended the meeting were:** Sarah Hubbard-Gray of Hubbard Gray Consulting and Marcia Sands of Golder Associates.

**Guests that attended the meeting were:** Ginny Darrell, Washington Department of Health.

**Introductions :** Sarah Hubbard-Gray called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Committee members introduced themselves. Sarah asked for comments or corrections to the February 18, 2004 meeting summary. No comments were provided.

**Middle Spokane Instream Flow Update:** Stan Miller gave an update on the meeting held with project contractor Tim Hardin, of Hardin Davis, on February 25, 2004. At the meeting an update on the work elements for both Avista and the Planning Unit were provided, and included:

- The studies of rainbow trout life stages and flow considerations, which have shown that juvenile rainbow trout need 200 cfs of flow at Barker, which requires additional flow at Post Falls to achieve this flow.
- Stan has provided comments and requested that they look at a longer period of record for correlating Barker flows with Post Falls flows. Avista's work group has also provided comments.
- Revised report is due around March 25, 2004, and Stan indicated that he will get it to the Planning Unit members.

A variety of questions were identified and issues discussed following Stan's update, including:

- Should a flow recommendation be provided for Post Falls?
- Would these results replace the current minimum flow value?
- If there was 200 to 300 cfs at Barker there would be a much higher flow at the lower Spokane gage.
- The Spokane at Spokane gage was not part of the Hardin Davis study, and more information is needed for this lower section.

**Status of Supplemental Funding for Multi-Use Storage:** Stan Miller passed out the multi-use storage scopes of work for both the Little Spokane River and Middle Spokane River. He explained that these scopes provide an overview of what will be done and that more detailed scopes have been developed to help guide the efforts. He explained that the emphasis for the Little Spokane is more on groundwater storage and the

emphasis for the Middle Spokane is more on surface water storage. Stan also explained that there may not be enough time to spend all of the funds, and it was requested that as much get done as possible. Some of the possible storage scenarios were then discussed.

**Model Scenario Discussion:** Reanette Boese explained that it was impossible to update the model to the 2003 version due to technical problems, so Golder made improvements to and re-calibrated the original model. She passed out a handout on the Model Status Report and reviewed the preliminary results of the scenarios and explained that the results should be ready by the next Planning Unit meeting.

**Review of Water Rights and Claims Issues and Recommendations Not Previously Confirmed:** The water rights and claims issues and recommendations that were sent back to the work group and had not previously been confirmed by the Planning Unit were reviewed and the following decisions were made:

V.C.01. What are the approaches for reducing summertime water use by those with water rights during low flow years? (Approved 2/18/04; Confirmed 3/24/04)

*V.C.01.a.* When the Department of Ecology sends out warning letters to interruptible water rights holders before the stream falls below the minimum flow, ask them to include information requesting users to adopt conservation measures. (DE workgroup reworded 1/12/2004) (Approved 2/18/04; Reworded 3/24/04; Ecology requested to provide clarification on if/when they send out letters)

*V.C.01.b.* When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, all water right holders should be contacted asking them to voluntarily conserve water. (Reviewed and Sent back to Work Group 2/18/04; Reworded and Confirmed 3/24/04)

*V.C.01.c.* When flows in the Little Spokane River and/or Middle Spokane River are expected to fall below the minimum instream flow during the summer, a media campaign should be launched to encourage additional water conservation measures. (New recommendation proposed and approved 3/24/04)

**Review of Conservation Issues and Recommendations Not Previously Approved or Confirmed:** The water conservation recommendations that had not previously been approved or confirmed by the Planning Unit were reviewed and the following decisions were made:

1.A.01.c. City and County governments will develop and implement a regional education and awareness program to promote wise and efficient use of the water supply with voluntary participation by water suppliers. (Work Group 12/04/03: Approved 1/21/04; Reworded and Confirmed 3/24/04)

1.A.01.d. Municipal water suppliers will develop water conservation programs, independently or cooperatively, in accordance with Washington State Department of Health regulations. Other water suppliers are encouraged to develop their own water conservation programs. (Work Group 12/04/03: Approved 1/21/04; Reworded and Confirmed 3/24/04)

*1.A.02.c.* Include options for xeriscaping in landscape requirements for commercial and industrial developments. (Work Group 12/04/03; Approved 1/21/04; Confirmed 3/24/04)

1.A.02.d. Encourage the xeriscaping option for urban open space in planned developments. (Work Group 12/04/03; Approved 1/21/04; Confirmed 3/24/04 and requested to check if consistent language with 1.A.02.c should be used)

I.A.02.f. Evaluate the benefits of retrofitting irrigation systems with automatic controllers and other high efficiency components for schools, golf courses, parks, cemeteries, and other large scale public irrigation projects. (Approved with request to rewrite 01/21/04; Work Group rewrite 1/27/04; Reworded and Confirmed 3/24/04)

I.A.02.g. Agricultural irrigators shall not receive increased allotments of water until all feasible irrigation efficiencies have been implemented (Staff 01/27/04)

- *PU sent back to work group to re-word and consider 1) changing “allotments” to “water rights”, encourage considerations rather than legal reference, and if a recommendation to the legislature to change the law should be included.*

I.C.01.c. Evaluate development of tax incentives, permitting, and/or regulatory credits for water reuse. (Staff 01/27/04; Reworded and Approved 3/24/04)

I.C.01.d. Provide public utility tax incentives to local governments to reuse water. (Staff 01/27/04)

- *PU requested that this recommendation be deleted.*

I.C.01.e. Establish enabling legislation that would allow local governments to provide discount programs for customer who reuse water, similar to the discounts provided to low-income seniors. (Staff 1/27/04)

- *PU requested that this recommendation be deleted.*

I.C.02.a. In so far as possible, encourage reclamation and reuse of wastewater within the watershed it was extracted. (PU requested rewrite 1/21/04 and 3/24/04)

- *PU requested that this recommendation be rewritten and 1) re-evaluate if “within” same watershed needed, 2) evaluate if should be under I.C.02, and 3) think about other or replacement recommendations.*

**Discussion of Middle Spokane Instream Flow:** Discussion began on the Middle Spokane Instream Flow issues and recommendations. Due to limited time action was only taken on the first issue and the following decision was made:

Issue II.A. Assure that instream flows for the Middle Spokane River meet the needs of rainbow trout and other ~~representative~~ representative-associated aquatic biota. (Work Group 12/4/03; Re-worded and Approved 3/24/04 with a request to consider if language should be changed to address “biota”.)

**Other Announcements:** It was announced that the Spokane Regional Chamber of Commerce is holding a Water Summit on April 13 and 14, 2004. Doug Allen announced that Ecology staff will be attending an April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting regarding changes in water rights transfer application.

**Wrap Up:** To be able to expedite the development of Plan recommendations, it was decided that an additional Planning Unit meeting will be held April 1<sup>st</sup> at 1:30 pm (location to be announced). The next regular Planning Unit meeting was set for April 21, 2004 at 9:00 am at the Spokane County Conservation District.