# Duwamish-Green (WRIA 9) 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\_\_1962/37322/watershed\_restoration\_and\_enhancement\_-\_wria\_9.aspx*](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37322/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_9.aspx)

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

## Meeting Information

Monday, October 29, 2018

1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Tukwila Community Center

## Agenda

|  | **Topic** | **Time** | **Action** | **Handouts** | **Lead** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Welcome** | 1:00 pm | None | * Agenda | Chair |
|  | **Introductions** | 1:10 | None |  | All |
|  | **Overview of Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) and Committee Purpose** | 1:30 | Presentation and discussion | * Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) Overview * ESSB 6091 map * WRIA 9 map | Chair |
|  | **Break** | 2:30 |  |  |  |
|  | **Breakout session: share expectations for Committee and Plan** | 2:35 | Activity and discussion |  | All |
|  | **Next steps** | 3:30 pm | None | Documents distributed following meeting | Chair |
|  | **Public comment** | 3:45 | None |  |  |

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

## Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lisa Tobin | Auburn | Chris Searcy (alternate) | Enumclaw |
| Mayor Dana Ralph | Kent | Mike Mactutis (alternate) | Kent |
| Mark Hoppen | Normandy Park | Councilmember Rick Forschler | SeaTac |
| Don Robinett (alternate) | SeaTac | Kathy Minsch | Seattle |
| Ryan Larson (alternate) | Tukwila | Josh Kahan | King County |
| Joan Lee | King County | Matt Everett | Highline Water District |
| Rick Reinlasoder | King County Agriculture Program | Jennifer Anderson | Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties |
| Trish Rolfe | Center for Environmental Law and Policy | Stewart Reinbold | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| Larry Fisher (alternate) | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife | Stephanie Potts | WA Department of Ecology |

Committee Members not in attendance: Muckleshoot Tribe

## Other Attendees

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Matt Goehring | WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum | Megan Kernan | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| Andrew Graham | HDR | Greg Volkhardt | Tacoma Water |
| Stacy Vynne | WA Department of Ecology | Ria Berns | WA Department of Ecology |
| Ingria Jones | WA Department of Ecology | Mary Verner | WA Department of Ecology |
| Will Stelle | Washington Water Trust |  |  |

## 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 |
| --- | --- |
| Those who attend the meeting download meeting info to future attendees/reps | Membership/attendance/involvement drops over time |
| King County will share permit-exempt well data | Lack of voting authority of those who attend meetings |
| We will consider potential economic impact on small developments (i.e. 5 packs) | Unincorporated areas are not well represented |
| Where are areas that expect growth without city or PUD water? | Need a better understanding of how the Howard Hanson Dam will impact Green River flows (Tacoma Water and Army Corps) |
| Define level of outreach to public and interests not represented on the cmte – how often, format, etc. | What if cmte “fails” and can’t find projects to offset use |
| What is public comment period on the plan (and entire process) | How much time to review? how much influence on products |
| Look at water quality as well | Feasibility for top priority projects |
| Limit scope to requirements of legislation | Narrow scope of planning process and not accounting for cumulative impact on water resources |
| Define level of resource commitment | Inconsistency with other WRIA-wide planning processes (i.e. salmon recovery) |
| Close coordination with other committees/efforts | What happens after “20 years”? |
| Use sound science to identify project areas/offsets | Getting to consensus |
| Consistency re: policy for rural hook-ups (exempt well vs public water) | Funding availability for non-water projects |
| Promote projects that have multiple benefits | Adequate representation of rural interests |
| Mitigation is possible | Place at the table for large municipal water suppliers |
| Group decisions require compromise | Long term monitoring of plans – adaptive management |
| Focus on water quantity and water for water projects | Workload of monthly meetings |
| non-water projects included to benefit salmon | Is there much consumptive use to offset in WRIA 9? Magnitude of issue |
| Share information between WRIA Committees | Wells are not metered. How do we know how accurate our projections for consumptive water use are? |
| Can get population projection info from King Co. | How can we quantify benefits from given projects? Do we have existing data/analysis? Is funding available for this? |
| Understanding the magnitude of potential development. What does the past look like? | How will this affect larger water providers? |
| Keep providing water to customers | What are the opportunities for getting credit for decommissioning wells? For preventing development through land acquisition |
| Projects in plan are implemented | Climate change considerations |
| Understand existing water resources constraints | Preserve existing municipal water rights |
| Understanding habitat conservation plan (HCP) nexus. Maybe separate accounting process (e.g. credit/offset where project also required under HCP) |  |
| Understanding instream flows |  |
| Storage management and habitat |  |

## 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. Projects in basins undergoing planning and basins with endangered fish species are also prioritized for funding. The first grant round closed on October 31, 2018. For the first round, the focus was on “wet water, shovel ready” projects in the priority basins.

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. During the December meeting discussion on Operating Principles, the Committee will discuss whether to allow cities to opt-in to joining the Committee later in the planning process.

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 9 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 9.

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.

Department of Ecology includes Vashon Island in the Kitsap watershed (WRIA 15), however Vashon is included in WRIA 9 for salmon recovery planning. During the December meeting, the WRIA 15 Committee will discuss whether to include Vashon in their plan or recommend for inclusion in the plan for WRIA 9. The hydrogeology of Vashon is similar to the Kitsap watershed, so it could make sense for them to remain in WRIA 15.

In WRIA 9, in-time and in-place mitigation could be challenging. Many of the jurisdictions participating on the Committee that have potential projects are downstream from where rural development will occur. The legislation states that the plan must meet two standards: (1) offsetting the quantity of water from new permit-exempt domestic wells and (2) an overall net ecological benefit for the watershed. Offsets that are in-time and in-place is the goal, but the legislation allows flexibility for offset projects that are in a different time or place than the impact. Non-water/habitat restoration projects are important to reach the net ecological benefit standard when in-time, in-place mitigation cannot occur.

The Committee will decide in early 2019 whether to delineate sub-basins within the Duwamish-Green watershed.

We will talk more about the Howard Hanson Dam and impact on instream flows at a future meeting

## 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!

### Flipcharts from breakout sessions

