# Cedar-Sammamish (WRIA 8) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee DRAFT Meeting Summary

*Please send corrections to Stephanie Potts (*[*Stephanie.Potts@ecy.wa.gov*](mailto:Stephanie.Potts@ecy.wa.gov)*) by November 30th.*

Committee website: [*https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias\_\_1962/37321/watershed\_restoration\_and\_enhancement\_-\_wria\_8.aspx*](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37321/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_8.aspx)

**Next Meeting:** December 2018, Date and Location TBD

## Meeting Information

Wednesday, October 24, 2018

9:30 am to 12:30 pm

Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village

## Agenda

|  | **Topic** | **Time** | **Action** | **Handouts**\* | **Lead** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Welcome** | 9:30 am | None | * Agenda | Chair |
|  | **Introductions** | 9:40 | None |  | All |
|  | **Overview of Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) and Committee Purpose** | 10:00 | Presentation and discussion | * Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) Overview * ESSB 6091 map * WRIA 8 map | Chair |
|  | **Break** | 11:00 |  |  |  |
|  | **Breakout session: share expectations for Committee and Plan** | 11:05 | Activity and discussion |  | All |
|  | **Next steps** | 12:00 pm | None | Documents distributed following meeting | Chair |
|  | **Public comment** | 12:15 | None |  |  |

*\*all handouts are available on the Committee website*

## Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Councilmember John Stokes | Bellevue | Brian Landau (alternate) | Bellevue |
| Chris Hall (alternate) | Bothell | Bob York | Issaquah |
| Richard Sawyer | Kenmore | Matt Knox (alternate) | Kent |
| Andy Rheaume | Redmond | Ronald Straka | Renton |
| Danika Globokar | Sammamish | Michele Koehler | Seattle |
| Tom Beavers | King County | Jacqueline Reid | Snohomish County |
| Carla Carlson | Muckleshoot Indian Tribe | Matt Baerwalde | Snoqualmie Indian Tribe |
| Julie Lewis | Snoqualmie Indian Tribe | Kurt Nelson | Tulalip Tribes |
| John McClellan | Alderwood Water & Wastewater District | Melissa Borsting | King County Agriculture Program |
| Gina Clark | Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties | Dan Von Seggern | Center for Environmental Law and Policy |
| Stewart Reinbold | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife | Stephanie Potts | Washington Department of Ecology |

## Other Attendees

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jason Hatch | Washington Water Trust | Megan Kernan | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| David Hartley | Northwest Hydraulic Consultants | Jason Wilkinson | WRIA Salmon Recovery Council |
| Stacy Vynne | WA Department of Ecology | Ria Berns | WA Department of Ecology |
| Ingria Jones | WA Department of Ecology | Tom Buroker | WA Department of Ecology |

## Presentation on ESSB 6091/RCW 90.94

Presentation available on committee webpage.

## Breakout Session on Expectations and Concerns

Comments from breakout groups, with duplicate comments merged. Flip chart images included at end of document.

| Expectations | Concerns |
| --- | --- |
| Listening, understanding, compromise. Balancing goals | Understanding the scale of the impact – number and location of wells |
| Showing assumptions and methodology behind the water use estimates and project impact estimates | Operation and maintenance of projects. Long term effectiveness. Who monitors the projects after 5 years, 10 years, 20 years? |
| Sharing lessons learned and resources/tools from early planning Committees (WRIAs 1 and 11) | Gallons per day – do we need to offset the maximum allowed amount? (950 gpd) |
| Plan meets the goal of “streamflow restoration” – plan results in improvement to instream flows | Estimating consumptive use and the assumptions behind that estimate |
| Definition of scope of work. Keeping the committee within scope. Have a permanent “parking lot” for issues outside the scope. | Ensuring the plan is implementable |
| Nexus to county comprehensive planning | Time commitment, especially for those engaging in multiple committees |
| Ecology will provide good/clear definitions of plans and process and timeline/timescale | Groundwater boundaries vs. project and use boundaries |
| Plan is implemented and monitored (ongoing) | Unfunded (local) mandates |
| What is the projected consumptive water use in WRIA 8? Process could be simple in WRIA 8 | Uncertainty around funding for projects and types of projects |
| Ecology as process facilitator | Outside political influence |
| No Ecology director override used (because plan approved by consensus) | Committee cannot reach consensus and plan goes to Salmon Recovery Funding Board |
| Projects are “in-place” | What is the role of cities? Since citizens within the UGA get municipal water |
| Projects benefit salmon | Out of kind mitigation being seen as replacement for consumptive use offset |
| Reduce duplicate efforts with Salmon Recovery. Use existing info from other planning efforts. Don’t reinvent the wheel | Funding – will it be enough? What happens after the $300 million, 15 year grant program ends? |
| Address the water quantity data gaps in the Salmon Recovery Plan | Relative project cost. Location differences will impact costs (e.g. urban vs rural) |
| No double dipping. Offsets not considered mitigation | Consumptive use of water beyond the 20 year plan. Extension of sewer could change consumptive use estimates. |
| Define nexus between domestic wells and stormwater management, related to consumptive use | Impact to municipal water rights from new exempt wells |
| Understand role of local jurisdictions | Accounting for impacts back to January 2018 |
| Water conservation opportunities | Using EAGL for grants |
| More regional water to reduce impact to local streams | Diverse interests coming to consensus agreement |
| Evaluate streams without instream flows and determine whether they need them | Technical aspects – seasonality, hydrogeology, impacts on species |
| Funding opportunity for jurisdictions to continue restoration work, including land acquisition |  |
| Understand priority; maintain watershed focus |  |
| Relationships are maintained |  |

## Discussion Summary

Concerns were expressed regarding duplicating efforts of existing committees. At the December meeting, we will talk more about coordination with Salmon Recovery Lead Entities (LE), Local Integrating Organizations (LIO), and other existing efforts. In the meantime, Ecology staff will continue discussions with LE and LIO staff. Ecology staff chairing the various Committees will coordinate when there is an issue that overlaps multiple WRIAs.

The $300 million in funding authorized for the next 15 years is a new statewide funding source. We expect that some projects will apply for funds from this new Streamflow Restoration Grant Program as well as other existing funding sources. Eligible projects include water projects and non-water projects, such as habitat restoration. Water projects are prioritized for funding. Basins undergoing planning and basins with endangered fish species are prioritized for funding.

Committee membership is based on the roster identified in the legislation. The legislation calls for all cities in the watershed to be invited to join the Committee. Ecology believes there is a role for cities, but a city may choose not to participate if they do not see a role for themselves. Cities may choose to caucus if that is a more appropriate approach given capacity limitations. The legislation is focused on permit-exempt wells constructed after January 19, 2018 and does not affect older wells or water right permitting for municipal water.

For the three interest areas (environmental, agricultural and residential construction), Ecology solicited nominations broadly for groups representing those interests and conducted a survey with the representative governments. Based on the survey results, Ecology invited representatives from organizations that had both the capacity to fill the seats and committed to representing the broader interest. For the WRIA 8 Committee these organizations include: King County Agriculture Program, representing agriculture interests; Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, representing residential construction interests; and the Center for Environmental Law and Policy, representing environmental interests. The Committee may choose to invite other groups that are not called out in the legislation as non-voting, ex officio members. The Committee may consider a subcommittee or workgroup structure to support development of draft products.

What is the scope of the problem? Since the watershed is very urban, the number of new projected wells could be small for WRIA 8.

Rulemaking would be triggered by the following: the Committee, by consensus, recommends a change to the $500 building permit fee or a change to the 950 gallons per day maximum annual average limit; or if the Committee does not approve the plan by consensus. The Committee can make recommendations to Ecology to change the instream flow rule, but Ecology is not required to engage in instream flow rulemaking and will consider this on a case-by-case basis.

Plans are adopted if the Committee approves them by full consensus and Ecology determines that they meet Net Ecological Benefit by June 30, 2021.

Suggestion for Ecology to create a map showing the water district boundaries and UGAs.

We received a question about including projects in the plan that are implemented after January 18, 2018 (when the bill was passed) but before plan approval. I am waiting on a response from the Ecology Water Resources policy team and will include the answer in the final version of the minutes.

## Action Items

* Ecology will send out a doodle poll to schedule the next meeting for early to mid-December. Starting in January, we anticipate having a set day of the month and a set location for future meetings.
* Ecology will continue conversations with Salmon Recovery Lead Entities and Local Integrating Organizations to discuss opportunities and concerns regarding formal/informal engagement in the planning process.
* The next meeting will focus on operating principles. Ecology expects committee members to review the draft document, provide input ahead of the meeting, and come prepared to discuss at the December meeting.
* Ecology will set up a number of trainings over the next few months to bring everyone up to a similar level of base knowledge to ensure we can have informed discussions and decisions going forward.
* Ahead of the December meeting, Committee members should consider:
  + Formal or informal engagement with other collaborations/committees (e.g. salmon recovery lead entities, local integrating organizations, etc.). What would engagement look like?
  + Should we come up with a new name for the committee? So the acronym isn’t WREC!

### Flip charts from breakout sessions

