



Meeting Summary

Snohomish (WRIA 7)

Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee meeting

November 14, 2019 | 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. [WRIA 7 Committee Webpage](#)

Location

Brightwater Facility
Community Room,
22505 State Route 9 SE,
Woodinville

Committee Chair

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

Handouts

Glossary & resources
Subbasin delineation map and
draft memo
Local approval process form
Draft plan outline
Adaptive management
discussion guide

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates *

Brant Wood (<i>Snohomish PUD</i>)	Elizabeth Ablow (alternate) (<i>City of Seattle</i>) (<i>ex officio</i>)
Mike Wolanek (<i>City of Arlington</i>)	Amanda Smeller (<i>City of Carnation</i>)
Jordan Ottow (<i>City of Monroe</i>)	Daryl Williams (<i>Tulalip Tribes</i>)
Matt Baerwalde (<i>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe</i>)	Anne Savery (alternate) (<i>Tulalip Tribes</i>) (<i>phone</i>)
Julie Lewis (alternate) (<i>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe</i>)	Matthew Eyer (<i>City of Marysville</i>)
Denise Di Santo (<i>King County</i>)	Michael Remington (<i>City of Duvall</i>)
Dylan Sluder (<i>MBA of King & Snohomish Counties</i>)	Cynthia Krass (<i>Snoqualmie Valley WID</i>)
Jim Miller (<i>City of Everett</i>)	Will Stelle (alternate) (<i>Washington Water Trust</i>) (<i>phone</i>)
Elissa Ostergaard (<i>Snoqualmie Watershed Forum</i>) (<i>ex officio</i>)	Bobbi Lindemulder (<i>Snohomish CD</i>)
Jaime Burrell (<i>City of North Bend</i>)	Terri Strandberg (<i>Snohomish County</i>)
Andy Dunn (alternate) (<i>City of Snoqualmie</i>)	Glen Pickus (<i>City of Snohomish</i>)
Rich Norris (<i>City of Gold Bar</i>) (<i>phone</i>)	Stacy Vynne McKinstry (alternate) (<i>WA Dept. of Ecology</i>)
Paul Faulds (<i>City of Seattle</i>) (<i>ex officio</i>)	Ingria Jones (<i>WA Dept. of Ecology</i>) (<i>chair</i>)
Kirk Lakey (<i>WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</i>)	

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Not Attendance*

Town of Index	City of Lake Stevens
Snohomish Salmon Recovery Forum (<i>ex officio</i>)	

Other Attendees

Susan O'Neil (<i>ESA</i>) (<i>facilitator</i>)	Paulina Levy (<i>WA Dept. of Ecology</i>)
Angela Pietschmann (<i>Cascadia</i>) (<i>info manager</i>)	Yorik Stevens-Wajda (<i>Snohomish County Council</i>) (<i>phone</i>)
Bridget August (<i>GeoEngineers</i>)	Kevin Lee (<i>WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife</i>)
John Covert (<i>WA Dept. of Ecology</i>)	

*Attendees list is based on sign-in sheet.

Welcome, Introductions, and Standing Business

Susan welcomed the group and began introductions.
Susan reviewed the agenda.

No revisions to the agenda.

The meeting summary was approved without changes.

Ingria provided updates and follow-up from October 10 meeting.

- Ingria invited committee members to use BOX, a secure file sharing program where Ecology and technical consultants will share large files and working documents. Notify Ingria if you are having issues accessing files on BOX.
- Draft subbasin delineation [memo](#) and [map](#) are in on BOX. Committee members please send feedback to Ingria by November 25th.
- GeoEngineers developed growth projections by subbasin for the Technical Workgroup to review. GeoEngineers will develop a draft growth projections memo for the December 12 Committee meeting.
- Technical consultants developed the consumptive use calculator for WRIA 7 and completed the irrigated footprint analysis. The calculator and preliminary results are on BOX in the Consumptive Use folder. The technical workgroup will discuss and technical consultants will provide a draft consumptive use memo and overview presentation of results at the December 12 Committee meeting.
- The glossary and resources handout (hard copy and on BOX [here](#)) includes acronyms frequently used during our planning process, links to resources, and key terms from the NEB guidance.

No additional updates from committee members.

Calendar and process

- Objective: Discuss evolution of process and discuss decision-making and timeline

Susan shared a process calendar with the key elements of the WRE Plan the Committee is developing this winter, spring, and summer.

- The calendar describes when we anticipate bringing elements of work to the workgroups and Committee.
- Original Committee calendar included many interim decisions, whereas the process calendar anticipates fewer, key interim decisions.
- The process calendar outlines four key parts: developing 20-year consumptive use estimates, identifying projects & actions, developing other plan elements, and writing the WRE Plan.
 - Consumptive use estimate: Anticipate a formal decision on consumptive use estimates by subbasin in February.
 - Supporting materials for the decision include subbasin delineation, growth projection, and consumptive use technical memos.
 - Identify projects and actions: The Committee will continue identifying projects and actions, including identifying new projects.
 - Develop other plan elements: The Committee will continue to develop recommended and optional plan elements this winter, spring, and summer.
 - At the September 12 meeting, the Committee broke into small groups to discuss recommended and optional elements of the Plan. The Committee will build off of the initial discussion.
 - This winter and early spring, the workgroups and Committee will develop recommendations for an offset target. Anticipate a formal decision on the Committee's offset target in spring.
 - Write the plan: The Committee is developing elements of the Plan throughout the planning process and reviewing technical memos as they are developed.
 - The WRE Plan is expected to be a short document with technical memos provided in appendices.

Reference Materials

- Committee process diagram (on BOX [here](#))
- Committee Brochure (on BOX [here](#))

Discussion and Considerations

- There were concerns that the calendar leaves important decisions for the end of the planning process. The calendar includes the minimum number of decisions that are seen as necessary for the final plan approval, but more can be added if warranted.
- Committee members want to be sure concerns and opinions are aired throughout the process and do not come as a surprise at the end of the planning process.
- There was a recommendation to begin discussions of policy and regulatory actions earlier, and a request to hear presentations on King County and Snohomish County's hook-up policies.
- Snohomish County Council budget review process takes place in October and November and it will be difficult to seek approval of the WRE Plan during this period.
- Committee members can send the chair recommendations for timing/sequencing of plan elements.

Ingria provided an overview of the plan local approval process form and requested voting committee members to return the completed form by February 7.

Reference Materials

- Local approval process form (on BOX [here](#))

Discussion and Considerations

- All voting members of the WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee must approve the plan before Ecology's review.
- The legislation does not require governments and organizations on the Committee to go through a formal internal approval process before approving the plan, however we recognize that as a representative of an entity you need time for your entity to review the final plan.
- Committee members should consult with their organization to determine their internal review process.
- Ingria may ask members to share information on internal plan approval processes and timelines at an upcoming committee meeting.
- There was a recommendation for a standard Plan overview presentation so all committee members are sharing consistent information.

Plan outline and adaptive management

- Objective: Review detailed plan outline and what adaptive management elements to include in WRIA 7 plan

Ingria provided an overview of the detailed WRE Plan Outline and requested feedback from Committee members by February 7.

Reference materials

- Detailed WRE Plan Outline (On BOX [here](#))

Considerations

- Detailed Plan outline fleshes out the required, recommended and optional Plan elements shared with the Committee on September 12.

- The same template will be shared across 203 Committees (WRIA 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15) and each Committee can tailor the outline and can add sections as more detail is developed for the recommended and optional components of the Plan.
- Ecology anticipates the 203 plans will look similar and have a similar structure and format, but Committees have the opportunity to tailor elements of the Plan content.
- The Plan is anticipated to be a short document with technical memos referenced in appendices.

Snohomish County provided an overview of PE well fee tracking.

- Snohomish County tracks building permits in an automated permitting tracking system called AMANDA.
- The tracking system can generate reports for fees collected for new homes relying on a PE well.
- Snohomish County has collected and tracked fees since January 2018.
- The County has the ability to track PE wells by subbasin, since they track parcel data associated with fees collected.
- Between January 2018 and September 2019, less than 100 new wells, with most in WRIA 7 and 8-9 wells in WRIA 8 (Bear Creek).

King County provided an overview of PE well fee tracking.

- King County has collected and tracked fees since January 2018.
- King County tracked 22 new building permits for homes relying on PE wells, two from January through June 2018 and 20 from July 2019 through June 2019. Ten of those wells are in WRIA 7.
- The County has the ability to track PE wells by subbasin. The breakdown for the 10 PE wells in WRIA 7 between January 2018 June 2019 is as follows:
 - Cherry/Harris: 4
 - Patterson: 1
 - Snoqualmie North: 3
 - Snoqualmie South: 2

Ecology provided an overview of PE well fee tracking.

- Ecology sends a letter annually to counties and jurisdictions identified in RCW 90.94.020 and 030 outlining the requirements and requesting submittal of fees and number of new permits issued by WRIA for homes relying on PE wells.
- Ecology has collected fees twice so far, from January 2018 through June 2018 and from July 2018 through June 2019.
- Ecology requests information annually by WRIA and the water resources fiscal office tracks information by WRIA. Ecology does not request or track information at a finer scale.
- The City of Auburn, located in WRIA 9, is the only city that has remitted fees to Ecology as of June 2019.

Susan introduced the adaptive management discussion guide and the Committee revisited adaptive management considerations following September breakout group discussions.

Reference materials

- Adaptive Management Discussion Guide (On BOX [here](#))

Considerations

- The NEB Guidance strongly recommends committees include an adaptive management component in the WRE Plan.
- At this time, there is no funding for adaptive management. Consideration around adaptive management in the plan should identify potential funding sources.

- From the reports above, we know that King County and Snohomish County and Ecology will be tracking new permit-exempt wells which can form the minimum foundation of a monitoring and adaptive management section.
- Currently Ecology tracks the wells by WRIA, but the committee can request that Ecology request and provide information by sub-basin.
- This was an introductory discussion of adaptive management following up on some of the conversation generated in small groups in September, but will be revisited as part of plan development.

Discussion

- Committee members felt like it was hard to put specifics to an adaptive management program when we don't know who manages the Plan or what resources are available.
- The group suggested that Ecology develop a dashboard that could be used across WRIs. There was a recommendation for Ecology to use existing staff and consultant resources to jumpstart a dashboard tool that committees could use going forward. The dashboard would show new PE wells and projects by subbasin. The trends would show if projects are implemented where wells are going in.
 - Committee members generally agreed Ecology should manage and update the dashboard annually with data on new PE wells from the counties and data on the projects from Ecology.
 - Ecology should develop metrics for the streamflow restoration grant program to track project benefits and include metric tracking in the dashboard.
 - There is also interest in tracking decommissioned wells, along with new PE well information. Ecology currently tracks decommissioning logs in the [well log database](#).
- There was also interest in tracking or understanding habitat conditions by subbasin to inform the sequence or location of projects for more holistic management. The Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum (Snohomish Forum) was mentioned as both a venue to provide that information on habitat and potentially convene the discussion of adaptive management of the Plan.
- There was a suggestion that the committee may want to meet more frequently (annually) for the first few years and then taper off to less frequently (every 2-3 years). Using the Forum could reduce cost and time constraints; perhaps adding an hour to one of their meetings once per year for this topic and inviting jurisdictions that aren't formally represented on the Forum. It was noted that the Snohomish Forum representative wasn't present during this discussion, but members of that Forum seemed interested in this approach.
 - The committee could identify triggers in the Plan that would instigate a convening outside of the agreed upon frequency.
- Adaptive management of the project list could include a near-term shift in the sequence or prioritization of projects, and a longer-term adjustment to the actual project list.
- Determining habitat conditions and streamflow through existing or new monitoring efforts would require resources. Currently, the Snohomish Forum and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum prepare status reports that include an analysis of monitoring data every 5 or 10 years. The next Snohomish Forum Status Update will be released soon.
- Snohomish and King Counties also track streamflow in various locations but analyzing this data would likely require additional resources.
- The committee discussed the distinction between implementation monitoring and effectiveness monitoring.
 - It will be difficult to separate project effects from a climate signal or even determining before and after effects of the projects and wells.
- Key takeaways from the discussion:

- Interest in tracking the basic assumptions of the plan annually – number and location of new wells and projects, ideally using a dashboard that Ecology develops and maintains.
- Interest in convening after 2021 – annually at first and using existing structures.
- Committee members would like to know about existing monitoring efforts.

Projects

- Objective: continue discussions of the project inventory process and discuss takeaways from existing inventory

Ingria provided an overview of project considerations from the NEB Guidance and the roles and key steps to building the project inventory and identifying and evaluating projects for the Plan.

Reference materials:

- Projects and Actions: Needs for WREC (On BOX [here](#))
- Draft fatal flaw screening criteria (On BOX [here](#))
- [Project Inventory Overview](#) – presentation
- Projects by Subbasin Map (on BOX [here](#))

Questions and Discussion

- There was a question about how Ecology’s targeted application processing relates to the Committee’s project list and WWT’s work to identify potential water right acquisitions.
 - Ingria replied that Ecology does not see a connection between the planning process and targeted application processing in WRIA 7.
 - For our process, we are interested acquiring water rights to put into permanent trust for instream flows. A water right application is an application for withdrawal, but under an application water has not yet been put to beneficial use. Ecology cannot permanently acquire applications for the trust water rights program.
 - The WRE Planning process does not affect Ecology’s issuance of water rights permits, processing of change applications, or other permitting decisions.
- There was a comment there are two classes of projects: projects that provide water offset that can be calculated with a high level of certainty and other projects that have a high probability of improving streamflow, but where there is less certainty in quantifying the amount. If new studies and monitoring demonstrate streamflow benefits of habitat projects, the Committee may want to adjust project priorities and sequencing in the future.

Bridget provided an overview presentation of the WRIA 7 Project Inventory, fatal flaw filtering, and additional filtering completed by the technical consultants.

- There are 247 projects in the inventory. None of these are water offset projects.
- 117 of the projects in the inventory are programmatic or cover several WRIAs or subbasin and could not be tied to a specific subbasin.
- GeoEngineers filtered projects for the five following fatal flaw criteria:
 1. No Benefits to Streamflow or Habitat
 2. Already Required by Regulatory Obligation
 3. Inconsistent with Existing Rule/Law or Streamflow Restoration Policy
 4. Substantive Conflict with Another Watershed Plan
 5. Implemented Prior to January 2018
- 18 projects failed the fatal flaw filtering and 344 projects passed.
- GeoEngineers completed additional filtering and identified 100 habitat projects with water storage potential.

Questions and Discussion

- Committee members discussed the inverse relationship between the number of projects in each subbasin and projected growth.
 - Projects in the headwaters may provide a streamflow benefits for a longer reach of stream than projects located near the Estuary.
 - Protecting hydrologic processes in the headwaters provides resilience in the face of climate change.
 - There is still a need for streamflow benefits in portions of the lower watershed.
 - Tulalip Tribes noted the importance of improving streamflow to maintain the Tribes' hatchery.
- The Committee discussed the criteria "inconsistent with existing law" and whether projects were filtered due to inconsistency with the instream flow rule (See [WAC 173-507](#)).
 - No projects were filtered for inconsistency with the instream flow rule (ISF rule).
 - A project that involves an appropriation or re-timing of flows in a basin with a year-round closure would be inconsistent with ISF rule and would be filtered out.
 - The Committee may include recommended changes to the ISF rule in the Plan. All committee members must agree and approve the Plan.
- Technical consultants are identifying potential methods for quantifying streamflow benefits of habitat projects, such as floodplain reconnection or levee removal projects. They will share an overview with the Committee in the coming months.
- The project inventory includes projects from salmon recovery project lists, but does not include public works projects.

Susan proposed a water projects workshop in January to brainstorm water offset projects to diversify the Committee's project inventory.

- The project inventory does not currently include any water right acquisitions or non-acquisition water offset projects. The inventory only includes habitat and other projects.
- A project workshop could focus on identifying non-acquisition water offset projects that retime high flow season waters, including managed aquifer recharge, source switches, streamflow augmentation, off-channel storage, or stormwater projects.
 - For an example of a stormwater project with water offset benefits, Ecology awarded funding to the [Albany Street Stormwater Pond](#) project in the Streamflow Restoration Pilot Grant Round In the Streamflow Restoration Pilot Grant Round. You can see the project on the list of [projects approved for funding](#) in the pilot grant round.
 - Ingria will coordinate with water quality staff at Ecology on any stormwater projects.
- There was a question about whether water conservation education could count as water offset. It is difficult to quantify water offset benefits of voluntary water conservation efforts or water conservation education.
 - Water conservation that included a policy change could potentially provide water offset.
 - The Streamflow Restoration Policy and Interpretive Statement states that "New regulations or amendments to existing regulations adopted after January 19, 2018, enacted to contribute to the restoration or enhancement of streamflows may count towards the required consumptive use offset and/or providing NEB."
- The Committee will make a decision in December about a project workshop.

Streamflow restoration grant guidance

- Objective: Provide committee with overview of 2020 streamflow restoration grant round

Paulina Levy, Ecology, presented on the streamflow restoration 2020 competitive grant guidance.

Reference materials:

- [Streamflow Restoration Competitive Grants](#) – Presentation
- [Streamflow Restoration 2020 Competitive Grant Guidance](#)

Considerations

- The grant program is statewide, but prioritizes projects in planning basins (including WRIA 7).
- The grant guidance is transparent in funding priorities and application expectations.
- The WRIA 7 Committee’s project selection process does not impact funding decisions for this grant round. There are no points for projects on our project list. For the 2020 grant round, only projects in an Ecology adopted plan or rulemaking process under RCW 90.94 receive points (currently only WRIA 1 and WRIA 11).
- The grant guidance could change in later rounds to have different priorities and different scoring criteria, and will be consistent with the funding rule.
- Projects in the Plan will need to receive funding from a variety of sources. There is not currently sufficient funds in the grant program to fund all projects identified in the watershed plans.
- The grant guidance does not reference subbasins.
- A project that quantitatively improves streamflow that will benefit instream resources is more likely to be competitive.

Questions and Discussion

- Impervious surfaces impact groundwater recharge. Can streamflow restoration grant funding be used to create a funding pool for local governments or conservation districts to build low impact development infrastructure as new developments are built?
 - Snohomish and King Counties already require low impact development for new homes. If there were additive elements of low impact development that are not already required, may be eligible.
- Projects that can quantify streamflow benefit will likely be more competitive.
- Projects above and beyond existing requirements (include an additive element) may be eligible.
- There was interest in land acquisition of properties with a permit-exempt well.
 - Land acquisitions involving decommissioning a PE well would be eligible for streamflow restoration grant funding, however PE wells cannot be acquired through the trust water rights program. Demonstrating that a land acquisition is strategic and quantifying any streamflow benefits will make it more competitive.
 - Land acquisitions are not considered water offset projects for the Plan because there is high uncertainty that growth is prevented through land acquisitions, since growth may still occur in a nearby location.
- There was interest in developing a credit program for drought tolerant landscaping and green infrastructure.
 - This type of project would need consider how benefits will continue in perpetuity.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action Items

- Committee members complete local plan approval process form and send to Ingria by February 7
- Committee members review detailed plan outline and send feedback by February 7
- Committee members send feedback on draft subbasin delineation memo by November 25
- Committee members identify potential projects from public works lists or other sources and develop new project ideas.
- Committee members contact Ingria if you have trouble accessing BOX

Next Steps

- Next WRIA 7 Committee meeting: Thursday, December 12, Willis Tucker Community Park, Snohomish
- Next Project Subgroup meeting: December 4, 1:00-2:30 pm, WebEx
- Next Technical Workgroup meeting: TBD