



Meeting Summary

WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Meeting

September 12, 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
August Meeting Summary
Project Subgroup Overview
Growth Projection Methods
Summary
King County PE Potential
Assessment

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates *

Brant Wood (*Snohomish PUD*)
Keith Binkley (alternate) (*Snohomish PUD*)
Mike Wolanek (*City of Arlington*)
Lindsey Desmul (alternate) (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Jordan Ottow (*City of Monroe*)
Matt Baerwalde (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*)
Julie Lewis (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*) (alternate)
Jim Miller (*City of Everett*)
Morgan Ruff (*Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum*) (*ex officio*)
Eric Ferguson (alternate) (*King County*)
Dylan Sluder (*MBA of King & Snohomish Counties*)
Elissa Ostergaard (*Snoqualmie Watershed Forum*) (*ex officio*)
Steve Nelson (*City of Snoqualmie*)

Richard Norris (*City of Gold Bar*)
Paul Faulds (*City of Seattle*)
Liz Ablow (alternate) (*City of Seattle*)
Daryl Williams (*Tulalip Tribes*)
Anne Savery (*Tulalip Tribes*) (alternate)
Matthew Eyer (*City of Marysville*)
Leah Everett (*City of Lake Stevens*)
Michael Remington (*City of Duvall*)
Cynthia Krass (*Snoqualmie Valley WID*)
Emily Dick (alternate) (*Washington Water Trust*)
Bobbi Lindemulder (*Snohomish CD*)
Terri Strandberg (*Snohomish County*)
Brooke Eidem (phone) (alternate) (*City of Snohomish*)
Stacy Vynne McKinstry (*WA Dept of Ecology*) (alternate)
Ingria Jones (*WA Dept of Ecology*) (*chair*)

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Not Attendance*

Town of Index

City of North Bend

Other Attendees

Susan O'Neil (*ESA, Facilitator*)
John Covert (*WA Dept of Ecology*)
Caroline Burney (*Cascadia*) (*info manager*)
Paulina Levy (*WA Dept of Ecology*)

Yorik Stevens-Wajda (*Snohomish County Council*)
Tad Schwager (*Hart Crowser*)
Kevin Lee (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)
Joe Hovenkotter (*King County*)

*Attendees list is based on sign-in sheet.

Welcome

Susan welcomed the group and began introductions.

Welcome, Introductions, and Standing Business

Susan reviewed the agenda.

No revisions to the agenda.

Ingria did not receive any corrections to the August meeting summary.

The meeting summary was approved.

Ingria provided updates from Ecology.

- The comment period on Ecology's [draft streamflow restoration project grant guidance](#) closed September 6. We are reviewing comments on the guidance and plan to issue the final grant guidance around October and hold statewide technical assistance workshops. We plan to begin accepting grant applications in February and March of 2020.
- Jacque Klug from King County presented on reclaimed water to the WRIA 8 Committee at their meeting last month. Because the committees can consider reclaimed water as a project type, the recording of the presentation is available. You can [watch a recording of the presentation](#) at the link. Some key points from that presentation are highlighted here for WRIA 7 committee members: There are four reclaimed water facilities in WRIA 7: Carnation Farm, King County-Carnation WWTP, Snoqualmie WWTP and Reclaim Facility, and WA State Fire Training Academy. These facilities are used for various purposes, including irrigation, wetland enhancement, and firefighting training exercises. Washington Department of Health has a [map](#) of these facilities and table showing their permit number, type of plant, design capacity, and reclaimed water uses.
- Snohomish Conservation District will host a tour of its Moga back-channel restoration project before the October 10 Committee meeting. Details forthcoming.

No additional updates from committee members.

Workgroup Updates

Emily Dick provided updates from the **Project Subgroup** meetings on August 20 and September 10.

- The project subgroup discussed its relation to the committee and the technical workgroup.
 - The project subgroup will begin identifying projects and assist in the development of project criteria to assist in filtering and prioritizing projects.
 - The technical workgroup will remain focused on growth projections, subbasin delineations, and consumptive use estimates.
- The project subgroup will continue to refine the WWT's project inventory and identify additional projects.
 - The subgroup agreed to change the project type categories to align with the NEB guidance.
 - GeoEngineers will manage the project inventory on BOX, a secure file managing program, for workgroup and Committee members to post and view project ideas in the future; until then please send projects to Ingria.
 - The subgroup will coordinate with the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum's 4-Year Work Plan update process to solicit additional projects.
 - The subgroup is developing a process to bring projects to the committee for review.

- Technical consultants are developing draft project criteria for fatal flaws to filter identified projects that do not meet the intent of the WRE Plan. They are developing additional criteria to assist with project prioritization that the committee can tailor.
 - The project subgroup will review the draft project criteria at their next meeting and provide recommended changes to the committee.

Reference Materials

- Project Subgroup Overview

Discussion:

The committee asked for clarifications about developing the committee's project list.

- The committee must identify projects and actions intended to offset impacts associated with new consumptive water use.
 - The committee's project list may include existing projects as well as potential new projects that need additional work to develop.
 - The committee approves the project list as part of the WRE Plan.
 - The [Final NEB Guidance](#) explains how the WRE Plan must describe and evaluate projects and actions for their offset potential and provides project examples.
 - The [Streamflow Restoration Policy Interpretive Statement](#) provides more information about acceptable projects and actions.
- Projects developed by Snohomish Conservation District or the Snoqualmie Valley WID with the support of Streamflow Restoration Implementation Grants (SR grant) can be included on the committee's project list.
- WWT's project inventory started the process of identifying projects for potential inclusion in the committee's plan.
 - The project inventory includes projects from existing project lists in the watershed, including Snohomish Basin Near-Term Actions, the 4-year Work Plan, and others. It includes information on 259 projects in WRIA 7, but the majority of these projects were developed for salmon recovery funding and other purposes besides water offsets.
 - The inventory still needs to be filtered to remove projects that do not meet the intent of the WRE Plan.
 - The inventory still needs to be further built out to include water offset projects.
- The water right acquisitions scope of work will support the identification of acquisitions projects that could be included in the committee's project list.
- Committee members and other entities can support the identification of projects for inclusion in the committee's plan.
 - Projects on the committee's project list do not need to be on the 4-Year Work Plan.

The committee discussed funding projects identified in the WRE Plan.

- While the committee is soliciting projects to develop its project list, Ecology is accepting applications for SR grants (anticipated this February). The SR grant funding rule outlines funding priorities in [WAC 173-566-150](#). The Snohomish Basin is a priority basin for funding. Some of the projects identified in the WRE Plan may be eligible for SR grant funding, but there is not sufficient funding to support all projects in all WRE Plans and watershed plan updates.
- The project inventory discussed above is not part of the SR grant funding process, and this committee is not expected to identify appropriate projects for funding or show local support at this stage in plan development.

- While some entities participation on the committee may be project sponsors applying for SR funding; they should seek review and local support from the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, rather than the WRE committee for this round of grant funding.

The committee had questions about the 4-Year Work Plan process.

- The Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum supports local salmon recovery planning, monitoring, and adaptive management. Every other year, the Forum develops a 4-Year Work Plan, which includes a list of projects to put forth for salmon recovery funding. The Forum staff runs a process solicits projects from project sponsors to be considered for inclusion on the list.
- The project subgroup is coordinating with the Forum to encourage project sponsors to consider whether their project may have streamflow benefits, in addition to salmon habitat benefits.
 - Project sponsors typically highlight the fish habitat benefits of their project. The committee is encouraging project sponsors to clearly identify potential streamflow benefits or potential water right acquisitions associated with projects.
 - These projects could supplement the committee’s existing project inventory, however the committee will still need to identify additional water offset projects.
 - Coordinating with the Forum should not place an excessive burden on project sponsors or change the current 4-Year Work Plan process.
 - Not all WRE projects need to be included on the 4-Year Work Plan. This is just one way that the Committee is reaching out to project sponsors in the basin to build out our project inventory.

Ingria provided an update on water right acquisitions scope of work.

- Ecology developed a draft scope of work to support the committee in identifying potential water right acquisitions based on discussion at the August committee meeting and feedback from the technical workgroup.
 - Washington Water Trust (WWT) will support this scope of work under its existing contract with Ecology. GeoEngineers (NHC as sub) will provide additional technical support, as needed.
 - Ecology staff, like Kelsey Collins who presented at the previous meeting will still support development of water right acquisitions.
 - WWT will work with the project subgroup and committee to identify priority areas for focused water rights assessment. The assessment will identify potential water right acquisitions within priority areas, including potential purchase (full, partial, shortened season or shifted season of use), source switches, storage and release, aquifer recharge, irrigation efficiency, or other unique water right acquisitions. All projects identified through this process would go through a similar vetting process as any other project in the plan prior to inclusions.

Reference Materials

- WRIA 7 Acquisitions Assessment

Discussion:

- The Snohomish Conservation District is developing an [Agriculture Resiliency Plan](#). Through the process, they identified interest in developing watershed improvement districts (WID), similar to the Snoqualmie Valley WID in the Snohomish County portion of WRIA 7.
 - If opportunities for direct purchase of agricultural water rights are identified, the committee will take into consideration specific concerns.

- The committee discussed the level of detail available for identifying priority reaches.
 - Growth projections are by subbasin, not exact locations of future wells.
 - Physical Habitat Simulation Models (PHABSIM) have not been developed for all of the streams in WRIA 7, but Department of Fish and Wildlife has information on priority streams and Ecology has information on streamflow and streams with known flow issues.
- The committee discussed Ecology’s well consolidation law ([RCW 90.44.105](#)), which allows the holder of a valid right to withdraw public groundwaters to consolidate that right with a groundwater right exempt from the permit requirement under RCW [90.44.050](#), without affecting the priority of either of the water rights being consolidated.
 - Committee members were interested in decommissioning PE wells when water service is provided without expanding the water provider’s water right, and in identifying existing homes on PE wells and incentivizing connections to municipal water supply.
 - Committee members were also interested in larger water systems (Group A systems) serving smaller (Group B) water systems, then putting the Group B water system’s water rights into Ecology’s trust water rights program. Larger water systems typically add these water rights into their portfolio.

Ingria provided an update from the **August 26 technical workgroup** meeting.

- The technical consultants recommended a 20-year growth projection to the technical workgroup based on Snohomish and King County’s past trends analysis and the estimated potential of new PE wells in UGAs.
 - GeoEngineers adjusted Snohomish County’s past trends analysis to account for PE well potential near Seven Lakes Water Association.
 - GeoEngineers added a 6% error to King County’s past trends analysis to account for parcels analyzed by the County that did not identify the water source.
 - GeoEngineers estimated 3,357 new PE wells in WRIA 7 over the planning horizon: 2,059 in Snohomish County (not including estimates for Tulalip tribal owned lands) and 983 in King County.
- The technical workgroup agreed to recommend the technical consultant’s 20-year growth projection to the committee and include estimates for Tulalip tribal owned lands.

Reference Materials

- Growth Projection Methods Summary
- King County PE Well Potential Assessment

Discussion:

- Tulalip Tribes has examined the potential for new PE wells on tribal owned lands.
 - Tulalip Tribes have fewer than 200 acres of undeveloped land owned by tribal members, in addition to primary forest areas that are very unlikely to be developed.
 - Tulalip estimates 10-15 new PE wells in Quilceda HUC-12 and 15-20 new PE wells in Tulalip-Frontal Procession Sound HUC-12 watersheds.
- The committee recommended adding 35 PE wells to the 20-year growth projection (3,357) for a total of 3,392 new PE wells. No concerns were raised.
- The committee discussed a “full buildout” scenario that looks beyond the planning horizon.
 - King County presented their initial PE well potential assessment for WRIA 7. They estimate 1,103 parcels served by PE wells, assuming one dwelling unit (DU) per parcel.
 - Committee members are interested in seeing the maximum density allowed per zoning to consider as an offset target.

- King County developed the PE well potential assessment to identify whether there is a sufficient number of parcels in the unincorporated area to accommodate the 20-year PE well projection based on past trends. They do not consider the PE well potential assessment a “full buildout” scenario.
- King County does not support the assumption that “full buildout” will occur in the unincorporated area, but does support improving streamflow in the basin.
- The technical workgroup will continue discussions of King County’s PE well potential assessment.

Net Ecological Benefit Guidance and Plan Outline

Ingria presented on the final Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) guidance and elements of the WRE Plan.

Reference Materials

- NEB Presentation
- [Final NEB Guidance](#)

General Considerations

- The Streamflow Restoration law, codified as Chapter 90.94 RCW, requires the Department of Ecology to determine whether a Net Ecological Benefit will result from the implementation of watershed restoration and enhancement plans developed under the law before Ecology can adopt them.
- The Final NEB guidance describes the standards Ecology will apply when reviewing the WRE Plan to determine whether it meets NEB.
- Ecology is developing a template WRE Plan outline to assist the committee in developing the Plan. The committee can tailor the template to meet local needs.
- Ecology gives considerable deference to the planning groups to decide what NEB means for our watershed. This committee knows this watershed best; Ecology is depending on our local expertise to put together a plan that meets the requirements of the law and enhances our watershed.
- Adaptive management is not required, however it is strongly recommended (see section 3.2.3 of NEB Guidance).
- An NEB evaluation is not required, however it is strongly recommended (see section 3.2.4 of the NEB Guidance). The NEB evaluation includes a clear statement of the committee’s finding that the combined components of the plan do or do not achieve NEB.

Discussion and Additional Considerations

- The committee will discuss plan review and approval process this winter. Individual entities can begin to think about their local approval process for the WRE Plan.
- The [Streamflow Restoration Policy Interpretive Statement](#) describes the steps if the watershed plan is not adopted by Ecology by the statutory timeline. Ecology is coordinating with the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to identify their review process.
- The committee had questions about plan implementation, adaptive management, and funding for monitoring.
 - Adaptive management is a strongly recommended, but not required element of the WRE Plan.
 - The WRE Plan will be developed with implementation in mind. However, the Streamflow Restoration Law does not create an obligation on any party to ensure that the Plan, or projects and actions in the Plan are implemented.

- Environmental monitoring is eligible for SR funding. It is more likely to be competitive for funding when incorporated into a broader project proposal.

Group Discussions: Recommended Elements of WRE Plan

The committee had small group discussions of the recommended elements of the WRE Plan.

Group 1 (Paulina Levy & Ingria Jones, facilitators)

- Climate change
 - Consider climate change in the Plan
 - Consider added complexity and what is achievable
 - Identify opportunities to include in consumptive use estimates
 - Consider subbasin-scale impacts of climate change in relation to available climate change data
 - Consider climate change in project criteria
- Adaptive management/Implementation Strategy
 - Consider developing an adaptive management plan
 - Track PE well construction
 - Define adaptive management and monitoring criteria
 - Define metrics (streamflow, projects, PE wells, etc.), triggers, and course corrections
 - Identify funding needs and strategy
 - Understand adaptive management in other plans
 - Concern that plan will not be implemented
- Fee Increase
 - Careful consideration before including recommendation for rulemaking in the WRE Plan
- History of water use and anticipated future water use, beyond permit-exempt wells
 - Research illegal water use
- Other
 - Understand cost/benefit ratio of decommissioning wells and opportunities for incentives

Group 2 (Stacy Vynne McKinstry, facilitator)

- Climate Change
 - Take advantage of changing systems e.g. increased stormwaters
 - Interest in education and outreach actions
 - Understand water offsets of water conservation
- Funding Strategy
 - Understand current relevant funding opportunities
 - Identify additional funding sources being considered by other watersheds
 - Consider multiple benefits of projects, comparing work to other watersheds, and communicate project priorities to access funding
- Adaptive Management/Implementation Strategy
 - Consider developing an adaptive management plan
 - Consider long-term project performance and project benefits in project criteria and units of measurement for project benefits and outcomes
 - Define triggers for reconvening the committee
 - Incorporate project tiering/prioritization
 - Identify recommendations for rulemaking
 - Limit scope of review
 - Connect to climate change considerations

- Concern that the WRE Plan will not be implemented
- NEB Evaluation
 - Ecology is developing templates to assist committees when possible and allowing committees to tailor to their watershed when possible
- Other
 - Concern around competing goals and consequences of not agreeing on the WRE Plan

Group 3 (Susan O’Neil, facilitator)

- NEB Evaluation
 - Clarification that committee is recommended, but not required, to include an NEB statement.
 - Group was confused by the difference between an NEB evaluation and an NEB statement.
- Adaptive Management/Implementation Strategy
 - Include funding strategy
 - Consider pilot projects and studies to replicate if successful
 - Consider both project level and WRIA level adaptive management
 - Consider project metrics
 - Track PE well construction to see where growth goes over time
 - Identify triggers for adaptive management
 - Consider oversight needed to monitor project list, funding to support monitoring, and need for Ecology’s continued engagement
 - Consider legislation to pay for adaptive management
 - Are there current projects to use to determine the water offset benefits of habitat projects like floodplain reconnection?
 - Understand building permit fees and how they are being spent? Can those help fund adaptive management of the plan?
 - Unlikely that a fee increase would be broadly supported but committee members have interest in coordinating efforts to seek legislative support for more funding to implement the projects and manage the Plan after 2021.

Public Comment

No comments.

Action Items for Committee Members

- Next meeting: October 10 at Willis Tucker Community Park.
- Next Technical Workgroup meeting: October 2, 9:30-11:30, Northwest Stream Center.
- Send projects to Ingria.

Action Items for Ecology

- Post meeting materials to the Committee webpage.
- Send details about Moga back channel site tour.