



Meeting Summary

WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Meeting

June 13, 2019 | 12:30 p.m.-3:30p.m. | [WRIA 7 Committee Webpage](#)

Location

Brightwater Facility
22505 State Route 9 SE,
Woodinville

Committee Chair

Ingria Jones
Ingria.Jones@ecy.wa.gov
(425) 649-4210

Handouts

Agenda
May Meeting Summary
Consumptive Use
Discussion Guide

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates *

Steve Nelson (*City of Snoqualmie*)
Kirk Lakey (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Lindsey Desmul (*alternate*) (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Jaime Bails (*alternate*) (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Brant Wood (*Snohomish PUD*)
Brooke Eidem (*alternate*) (*City of Snohomish*)
Jaime Burrell (*City of North Bend*)
Mike Wolanek (*City of Arlington*)
Jordan Ottow (*City of Monroe*)
Richard Norris (*city of Gold Bar*)
Matt Baerwalde (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*)
Julie Lewis (*alternate*) (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*)
Jim Miller (*City of Everett*)
Amanada Smeller (*City of Carnation*)
Morgan Ruff (*Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum*)

Perry Falcone (*Snoqualmie Watershed Forum*)
(*ex officio*)
Elissa Ostergaard (*alternate*) (*Snoqualmie Watershed Forum*) (*ex officio*)
Dylan Sluder (*MBA of King & Snohomish Counties*)
Daryl Williams (*Tulalip Tribes*)
Matthew Eyer (*City of Marysville*)
Leah Everett (*City of Lake Stevens*)
Janne Kaje (*King County*)
Michael Remington (*City of Duvall*)
Cynthia Krass (*Snoqualmie Valley WID*)
Emily Dick (*alternate*) (*Washington Water Trust*)
Bobbi Lindemulder (*Snohomish CD*)
Terri Strandberg (*Snohomish County*)
Ingria Jones (*WA Dept of Ecology*) (*chair*)

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Not Attendance*

Town of Index

Other Attendees

Susan O'Neil (*ESA, Facilitator*)
John Covert (*WA Dept of Ecology*)
Angela Pietschmann (*Cascadia*) (*info manager*)
Amy Moosman (*WA Dept of Ecology*)
Alexa Ramos (*Snohomish County*)
Beth Liddell (*Snohomish County*)

Yorik Stevens-Wajda (*Snohomish County Council Staff*)
Kevin Lee (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Bridget August (*GeoEngineers*) (*Tech Consultant*)
Tad Schwager (*Hart Crowser*)

*Attendees list is based on sign-in sheet.

Welcome

Susan O'Neil welcomed the group, began introductions, and noted that Amanda Smeller is the new representative for the City of Carnation.

Meeting Agenda and Meeting Summary

Susan reviewed the agenda. The Committee is not meeting in July, so the goal for the meeting is to leave with an understanding of what progress has been made and will continue before the Committee meets again in August.

No revisions to the agenda.

Ingria did not receive any corrections to the meeting summary.

The meeting summary was approved.

Updates and Announcements

Ingria provided updates from Ecology.

- Ecology has begun preparation for the next round of grant funding has begun. We anticipate publishing the draft grant guidance in August for public comment, and final grant guidance in October of this year. Then we plan to hold statewide technical assistance workshops to provide an overview of the grant application process and to answer questions. We anticipate accepting grant applications in February and March of 2020. See [Streamflow Restoration webpage](#) for more information (under “grants program”).
- Ecology hosted a [projects overview webinar](#) on May 30. The Committee will learn more about projects this August and begin project discussions this fall. Ingria received suggestions to visit the Lower Tolt floodplain reconnection project, the proposed Haffner-Barfuse side channel reconnection project, and projects implemented or proposed by Snoqualmie Valley WID or Snohomish Conservation District, both of which received Streamflow Restoration Project Grants.
- GeoEngineers developed a Draft Data Acquisition Plan. This outlines desired data, its purpose for the WRE technical analyses, and the anticipated sources of that data. Ecology will review work plans for each WRIA to identify whether there are any critical data gaps that are necessary for completing the minimum requirements of the planning process. Ingria asked technical workgroup members to provide feedback via email by June 18th. Committee members can email Ingria if they would like a copy.
- The Committee approved adding the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum at the May 9th meeting. The Forum has signed the operating principles and is now an ex-officio member.

Growth Projection Considerations

Purpose of the session was to understand the process for developing growth projection scenarios, progress the technical workgroup, counties, and GeoEngineers have made, and next steps.

Resources

- Growth Projections Discussion Guide
- Growth Projections Overview Presentation
- Dwellings and Capacity by Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) – Snohomish County

Ingria reviewed the Committee’s interest in seeing anticipated rural growth before initial subbasin delineations. The technical workgroup has focused discussions on growth projections methods and assumptions this past month. They will provide input on specific data sources and assumptions and the Committee will review high level decisions, such as which growth projection scenarios to use for consumptive use estimates.

Bridget August provided an overview of progress on growth projections since the May 9 Committee meeting.

- The technical workgroup agreed on a general approach to growth projections that uses a developable lands analysis and past building permit data (or as-built data for single-family residences) to determine where growth is likely to occur.
- King County and Snohomish County plan to do the developable lands analysis in house.
- The developable lands analysis analyzes maximum capacity for new homes relying on domestic permit exempt wells. It does not identify when growth is likely to occur.
- GeoEngineers created a Developable Lands Assumption Matrix to summarize key screening categories and assumptions that the counties are using in their analysis.
- GeoEngineers is conducting a spot check of the well logs mapped inside UGAs.
- If the Committee wants to see additional scenarios based on different assumptions and the counties are not able to analyze them, the counties will turn data that can be shared over to GeoEngineers to do the analysis.
- Snohomish County plans to estimate the amount of growth by subbasins, so the Committee will need to define initial subbasin delineations.
- The Committee can also decide to add a buffer or make a “non-zero” assumption to address some of the data gaps and uncertainty with the developable lands analysis.
- The technical workgroup will continue providing input on growth projections methods and population data sets to develop scenarios for the 20-year growth projections.

Emily Dick provided a report out from May 23 joint technical workgroup meeting with WRIAs 7, 8, and 9 the June 5th WRIA 7 technical workgroup meeting.

- The workgroups requested an analysis of low, medium, and high population projections, requested to look at projections beyond 20 years, and to buffer assumptions.
- The workgroups also discussed potential development of DNR lands and agricultural and forest production districts, and challenges with water service line data, aging infrastructure, and purveyor capacity.
- The workgroups agreed that the well log database is not the best data source for growth projections, but wanted to use the database to understand past trends of wells in UGAs.

Discussion

- King County believes it can meet the Committee’s timeline for completing growth projections.
- King County does not have a comprehensive data set for water service lines; it is examining past patterns of development inside and outside of water service areas to determine the likelihood of permit-exempt wells within water service areas.
- OFM provides historical population information for small areas, including by census county, census block, and WRIA, but does not provide forecasts for small areas. Forecasts are only available countywide, and do not separate urban and rural population.
- Cities discussed the likelihood of new wells in city limits and the assumption that new homes within 100 feet of existing water lines will hookup. Committee members should refer to the City Planning Table in the April meeting handouts.

Terri Strandberg presented Snohomish County’s analysis of developable lands and historical development of single-family residences by sub-watershed.

General Considerations

- Snohomish County calculated developable lands in its portion of WRIA 7 by updating the County's 2011 Rural Capacity Analysis to account for homes built since 2011 and homes connected to water systems versus on permit-exempt wells.
- Snohomish County documented where the developable lands analysis may be over or under counting the number of new homes relying on domestic permit-exempt wells. There is potential flexibility in the numbers assumed for the analysis.
- Snohomish County estimated there are total developable lands for 6,346 housing units relying on domestic permit-exempt wells in its portion of WRIA 7, and generated housing unit estimates and % of capacity by sub-watershed (12-digit hydrologic unit code).
- Snohomish County considered two scenarios for the number of new homes relying on domestic permit-exempt wells in its portion of WRIA 7 the next 20 years.
 - The first scenario forecasted 2,058 housing units, based on the past average annual increase of homes built over the past 10 years.
 - The second scenario forecasted 1,461 housing units, based on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan projections.
- Since January 2018 Snohomish County has tracked building permit fees associated with homes relying on permit-exempt wells. Between January 2018 and March 2019, 90 new permits paid the \$500 fee required under RCW 90.94.030, none within an unincorporated UGA.

Discussion

- Snohomish County's 20 year projection of new homes relying on domestic permit-exempt wells based on homes built over the past 10 years accounts for about one third of the total capacity.
- The Committee discussed moving forward with a conservative estimate for growth projections and buffering assumptions instead of refining analyses further.
- The Committee discussed Snohomish County's 2009 code requiring rural cluster subdivisions within ¼ mile of water lines to hook up. The County tracks several subdivision applications that were granted before the code, have received extensions, and have not yet been built. Countywide, there have been three rural cluster subdivision applications since 2009.

The technical workgroup will continue discussions on population data for growth projections and initial subbasin delineations.

Introduction to Consumptive Use

The purpose of this session was to understand Ecology's recommendations for calculating consumptive water use and to seek initial Committee input on available local info that could help refine assumptions.

John Covert provided an introduction to consumptive use presentation.

Reference Materials

- Consumptive Use Discussion Guide
- Introduction to Consumptive Use Presentation
- Snohomish PUD Water Use Data

General Considerations

- Consumptive use is the portion of water pumped from a well that is not returned to the aquifer.
- Ecology needs a reasonable consumptive use calculation for the 20-year planning horizon.
- The Committee may use different assumptions than Ecology's, but they must be justifiable.

- Ecology estimates 60 gpd per capita indoor water use, 10% of which is consumptive (for homes on septic systems).
- Ecology estimates an 80% consumption rate for outdoor water use. GeoEngineers will estimate average irrigated lawn size by subbasin to calculate the outdoor portion of consumptive use.
- The Committee may set an offset target that is higher than the calculated consumptive use.

Discussion

- The Committee discussed application efficiency, how it is calculated, and Ecology’s assumption of 75% application efficiency, and the concern that some homeowners overwater. Application efficiency is the ratio of water applied to a crop (e.g. turfgrass) that is consumptively used by the vegetation versus the portion that is lost to inefficiencies (e.g. ens up on the sidewalk). Ecology’s estimates are based on the Washington Irrigation Guide (WIG), which Ecology uses when issuing water rights.
- Committee discussed how to address climate change impacts, including an extended irrigation season. Committees are not required to address climate change, but are encouraged to develop adaptive management strategies, such as including surplus offset projects and monitoring project implementation and benefits.
- Snohomish PUD examined water use data by parcel size and summer use versus winter use, as a proxy for outdoor water use. Water use data serves as local ground truthing. There were concerns that water use is higher in other water districts and higher for residents relying on permit-exempt wells than for customers who pay for water monthly.
- The Committee discussed using Ecology’s recommendations, adding a buffer to the calculated consumptive use, and moving forward with project identification.

The technical workgroup will continue discussions on consumptive use calculations.

Review Committee Calendar

Ingria reviewed the Committee’s accomplishments and path forward. The Committee convened in October, approved operating principles, developed a knowledge base, added three ex officio members, and began developing growth projections. This summer the technical workgroup will continue to develop subbasin delineations and growth projections while the Committee begins project discussions.

Public Comment

No comments.

Action Items for Committee Members

- Next meeting: August 8
 - Meeting at Brightwater Facility and project site visits. Hold the full day until Ingria sends the agenda.
- Email Ingria feedback on proposed project site visits and additional site visit ideas.
- Send specific water rights acquisitions questions or project ideas to Ingria.
- Watch the [recording](#) of Ecology’s May 30 projects overview webinar.

Action Items for Ecology

- Meet with DNR to understand how transfer of ownership may affect growth projections.