Meeting Notes

**Snohomish (WRIA 7)**

**WREC Technical Workgroup meeting**

October 2, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. [WRIA 7 Committee Webpage](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37310/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_7.aspxhttps%3A/www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37310/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_7.aspx)

## **Location**

Coho Room,

Northwest Stream Center

600 128th St SE, Everett, WA

**Committee Chair**

Ingria Jones

Ingria.Jones@ecy.wa.gov

(425) 649-4210

**Handouts**

Agenda

1. King County PE Potential Assessment
2. Assumptions spreadsheet
3. Subbasin discussion guide
4. Preliminary growth projection map
5. Working subbasin delineations map & legend

# Participants

* Susan O’Neil (facilitator)
* Ingria Jones (Snohomish WREC chair)
* Paulina Levy (Ecology)
* Bridget August (GeoEngineers)
* Eric Ferguson (King County)
* Kirk Lakey (Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)
* Morgan Ruff (Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum)
* Colin Hume (Tulalip Tribes)
* Cory Zyla (Snoqualmie Watershed Forum)
* Elissa Ostergaard (Snoqualmie Watershed Forum)
* Denise DiSanto (King County)
* Souheil Nasr (City of Everett)
* Cynthia Krass (on phone) (Snoqualmie Valley WID)
* Matt Baerwalde (on phone) (Snoqualmie Tribe)

# King County PE Potential Assessment

* Objective: Understand how King County’s PE Potential Assessment relates to the 20-year growth projection
	+ Eric presented Version 2 of the PE Potential Assessment. This assessment functions as a validation on the 20-year growth projection by stream basin; it is a high-level look to see how available parcels and dwelling units can accommodate projected growth.
		- Version 1 examined building permits (public v. private water source) over the past ~20 years and projected 20 years into the future)
			* There is a 6% margin of error
		- Version 2 was an assessment of available parcels and Dwelling Units (DUs) that could be on a PE well by subbasin.
* Page 2 details King County’s parcel inventory within geographic areas. Short description of work:
1. Assessment of potential parcels by sub-basin, “inventory”
	1. Was also analyzed for subdivision potential (DU – see below)
2. The centroids of the parcels from each sub-basin were determined to be ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ water district boundaries.
3. Water Use projection by sub-basin;
	1. Within the water district – public water connections were calculated based on historic rates.
		1. Remaining number of parcels were assigned to be PE sourced
	2. PE sourced parcels were calculated based on “outside” district boundaries plus the remaining parcels from above
		1. Further parcel analysis included the DU, which represents the potential for subdivision.
* King County’s analysis of past permits (page 1 of handout 1) identifies the rate of hookup to public water by stream basin. In WRIA 7, hookup rates range from 0% (Coal Creek, Griffen Creek, and Miller River) to 75% (Ames Lake).
	+ Their analysis was not based on the location of existing water lines, since King County did not have this information readily available.
* Discussion
	+ The workgroup was interested in understanding growth patterns along the WRIA boundary where the groundwater boundary may vary from the surface water boundary. There was particular interest in growth near Patterson Creek, which is on the WRIA boundary and an area where some of the highest growth is projected.
		- King County and Snohomish County have developed growth projections by stream basin and HUC, respectively. King Conty’s map of [historical building permits](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/images/WREC/WRIA07/201907/WRIA7-buildingPermits-20190711%281%29.pdf) and Snohomish County’s map of [historical residential dwellings](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/images/WREC/WRIA07/201908/WRIA07-HistoricalResidentialDwellingsSnohomishCounty.pdf) show patterns of past growth within the stream basins and HUCs.
		- Although exact future well locations are not known, growth patterns along the boundary could inform coordination with the WRIA 8 WREC, including potential coordination on project identification.
	+ The workgroup discussed the high number of PE wells projected for Quilceda and Tulalip HUCs and potential impacts to Tulalip and Battle Creeks and Tulalip Tribes’ fish hatchery.
		- Quilceda: 289 PE wells projected.
			* 259 PE wells in unincorporated areas of Snohomish County.
			* 20 PE wells on Tulalip’s tribal owned lands.
			* Assumes half of the Quilceda HUC growth will use PE wells. Part of the Quilceda area has water provided by Marysville/City of Everett and part is within Seven Lakes water service area, which is unable to expand service at this time.
		- Tulalip: 468 PE wells projected.
			* 453 PE wells in unincorporated areas of Snohomish County.
			* 15 PE wells on Tulalip’s tribal owned lands.
			* Assumes all of the water service area growth forecast in the Tulalip HUC (249) will use PE wells to account for the Seven Lakes water system inability to expand service at this time.
* Next Steps
	+ Provide an update of the PE Potential Assessment to the committee. The assessment does not affect the overall 20-year estimate of 3,392 PE wells.
	+ Reallocate growth by subbasins (once agreed upon) and check that available DUs in each subbasin accommodate projected growth. If shortfall in DUs, GeoEngineers will work with counties to propose any reallocation of growth between subbasins for the Technical workgroup to review.

# Subbasin Delineation Recommendation

* Objective: Develop subbasin delineation recommendation for the committee

Overview

* Susan reviewed the updated subbasin delineation discussion guide
	+ The group wanted to see growth projections before delineation – now we have growth estimates in-hand.
* Although consumptive use will be estimated by subbasin and subbasins can inform project selection, Ecology does not anticipate the final funding guidance for 2020 will give priority to projects based on a local planning group’s subbasin.
* King County estimated the growth in the Snoqualmie River mainstem stream basin, if the basin were to be split where the Tolt enters the Snoqualmie.
	+ This splits the projected growth of 240 PE wells roughly in half.

Discussion

* The technical workgroup applied the following general guiding principles:
	+ Snohomish Basin Protection Plan (Protection Plan) should be the starting point.
	+ Combine HUCs and drainage basins as much as possible where little growth is anticipated to occur.
	+ Keep separate basins where more growth is anticipated to occur.
	+ Consider important salmon habitat.
	+ Keep in mind subbasins important for salmon habitat where projects can be located, even if those subbasins are lumped.
* King County and Snoqualmie Tribe developed recommendation maps for the Snoqualmie portion of the basin. The workgroup discussed these and made the following recommendations:
	+ The North, Middle, and South Fork Snoqualmie stream basins should be grouped **(Upper Snoqualmie).**
		- Less growth anticipated and aligns with Protection Planning Unit.
		- The South Fork Snoqualmie should be considered for projects.
	+ The Raging River should be its own subbasin **(Raging River).**
		- Low flow issues and important for salmon.
		- Aligns with Protection Planning Units.
	+ Patterson (11% of growth) should be its own subbasin **(Patterson Creek)**
		- Closed basin, upstream so important for flow in mainstem, there is a temperature refuge created by the Patterson, steelhead population likes it there.
	+ The workgroup supported splitting the mainstem Snoqualmie subbasin into North and South due to the high amount of growth projected (19%).
	+ The South Fork Tolt, North Fork Tolt, and Lower Tolt stream basins should be combined with nearby stream basins Tokul Creek, Griffen Creek, and mainstem Snoqualmie South **(Snoqualmie South)**
		- Tolt has little growth projected and streamflow is regulated by the reservoir, buffering impacts. Important for Chinook and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum would like to highlight the Tolt for projects.
* Mainstem Snoqualmie North should be combined with Tuck Creek, Cathart drainages, and Ames Lake **(Snoqualmie North)**
* Cherry Creek and Harris Creek should be combined into one subbasin **(Cherry/Harris).**
	+ Harris is closed basin and Cherry Creek is an important salmon basin.
	+ Aligns with the northern portion of the Lower Mid-Snoqualmie Protection Planning Unit (Patterson Creek is the southern portion).
* The workgroup then discussed the Skykomish and Snohomish portion of the basin and made the following recommendations:
	+ The South Fork and North Frok Skykomish subbasins should be combined into one subbasin, since there is very little growth projected in these areas **(Upper Skykomish).**
		- This includes: Foss River, Miller River, Tye River, South Fork Skykomish River, Beckler River, Rapid River, Upper Beckler River, Lower South Fork Skyomish River, Lower North Fork Skykomish River, Middle North Fork Skykomish River, and Upper North Fork Skykomish River.
	+ Wallace River and Olney Creek should be combined **(Lower Mid-Skykomish).**
		- Wallace River important salmon habitat.
		- May Creek is closed.
		- Some growth anticipated in these HUCs.
		- Aligns with Protection Planning Units
	+ Upper Sultan, Middle Sultan, and Lower Sultan should be combined into one subbasin **(Sultan).**
		- Flow regulated system and less growth anticipated.
		- Aligns with Protection Planning Units.
	+ Elwell Creek-Skykomish River and McCoy Creek-Skykomish River should be combined **(Skykomish Mainstem).**
		- Similar to Protection Planning Unit.
	+ Woods Creek should remain on its own **(Woods Creek).**
		- Relatively higher growth anticipated (214 PE wells) and aligns with Protection Planning Unit.
	+ Upper and Lower Pilchuck River should be one subbasin **(Pilchuck).**
		- Upper and Lower Pilchuck one system, relatively higher growth anticipated (229 + 51 PE wells).
	+ Little Pilchuck should be separate **(Little Pilchuck).**
		- Little Pilchuck has 294 projected PE wells. Groundwater supports baseflow and stream already has flow and temperature issues.
		- Little Pilchuck and Catherine Creek are closed basins.
	+ Quilceda Creek should be its own subbasin **(Quilceda)** and include Allen Creek drainages.
		- Relatively high amount of growth projected (300 PE wells) and growth occurring within and around Tulalip Reservation boundaries.
		- The boundary between the Snohomish mainstem subbasin and the Quilceda subbasin should be Ebey’s Slough.
	+ The Snohomish River, Evans Creek, and French Creek should be combined **(Estuary/Snohomish Mainstem).**
		- Allen Creek and Quilceda should be in the same subbasin to align with existing management units where there are questions or discrepancies between the protection planning units and the HUCS.
	+ Tulalip Creek should be on its own **(Tulalip).**
		- Relatively high growth projected –most of any HUC or stream basin (473 PE wells) and growth occurring within and around Tulalip Reservation boundaries.
		- Low flow concerns in Tulalip and Battle Creeks, which support the hatcheries.
		- Aligns with northern portion of Puget Sound Drainages in Protection Plan.

# Next Steps and Action Items

* Elissa will present these recommendations to committee
* Next committee meeting
	+ WRIA 7: Thursday, October 10 from 12:30-3:30 at Willis Tucker Community Park, Snohomish
	+ Opportunity to tour Snohomish CD’s back-channel restoration site before committee meeting. Details forthcoming.
* Next Technical Workgroup Meeting: Date TBD; likely via WebEx