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# Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Ingria Jones *(WA Dept. of Ecology)*

Stacy Vynne McKinstry *(alternate-WA Dept. of Ecology)*

Daryl Williams *(Tulalip Tribes)*

Matt Baerwalde *(Snoqualmie Indian Tribe)*

Denise Di Santo *(King County)*

Cynthia Krass *(Snoqualmie Valley WID)*

Brant Wood *(Snohomish PUD)*

Keith Binkley *(alternate - Snohomish PUD)*

Kirk Lakey *(WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife)*

Lindsey Desmul *(alternate - WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife)*

Emily Dick *(Washington Water Trust)*

Bobbi Lindemulder *(Snohomish Conservation District)*

Linda Lyshall *(alternate - Snohomish Conservation District)*

Dylan Sluder *(MBA of King and Snohomish Counties)*

Mike Wolanek *(City of Arlington)*

Michael Remington *(City of Duvall)*

Jim Miller *(City of Everett)*

Matthew Eyer *(City of Marysville)*

Jamie Burrell *(City of North Bend)*

Elissa Ostergaard *(Snoqualmie Watershed Forum ex-officio)*

Elizabeth Ablow *(City of Seattle ex-officio)*

Steve Nelson *(City of Snoqualmie)*

Terri Strandberg *(Snohomish County)*

Brooke Eidem *(alternate - City of Snohomish)*

Cory Zyla *(alternate - Snoqualmie Watershed Forum ex-officio)*

Rich Norris *(City of Gold Bar)*

Ann Bylin *(alternate - Snohomish County)*

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Not Attendance\*

City of Lake Stevens

Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum (*ex-officio*)

City of Carnation

Town of Index

City of Monroe

Other Attendees

Susan O’Neil *(ESA) (facilitator)*

Angela Pietschmann *(Cascadia) (info manager)*

Joe Hovenkotter *(King County)*

Stephanie Potts *(WA Dept. of Ecology)*

John Covert *(WA Dept. of Ecology)*

Paulina Levy *(WA Dept. of Ecology)*

Kevin Lee (*WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife*)

Bridget August (*GeoEngineers*)

Yorik Stevens-Wajda (*Snohomish County*)

Ann Harie (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*)

# Introductions and standing business

Susan welcomed the group, began introductions, and reviewed the agenda. *No revisions to the agenda. The April meeting summary was approved without further changes.*

**Ecology updates:**

* **COVID-19**: At this time, Ecology does not anticipate any extension to WREC deadlines and have been instructed by program management to continue with meetings. Planning deadlines were set by the legislature and Ecology is not planning to put forward agency request legislation to request an extension. Chairs and program managers are tracking participation (please let Ingria know of any changes to capacity to participate). Snohomish Forum is unable to participate at this time.
* The **2020 Streamflow Restoration Grant** application period closed April 30, 2020. Ecology received 63 applications from across the state (six projects from WRIA 7), which are now under review. Ecology anticipates the final list of grant awards will be ready in September. Ingria emailed out a [summary of applications received](https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/2011082.pdf).
* **WRIA 1 Rule**: On May 27, 2020, Ecology adopted a rule amendment for chapter 173-501 WAC. The adopted rule was developed considering the feedback received on the preliminary and proposed drafts of the rule. Ecology’s responses to comments received during the draft comment period are available in the Concise Explanatory Statement (CES). The CES, as well as other supporting documents, are also available on Ecology’s [website](https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Laws-rules-rulemaking/Rulemaking/WAC-173-501). If you have any questions please contact Kasey Cykler, Streamflow Restoration Rulemaking and Policy Lead, at [Kasey.Cykler@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Kasey.Cykler@ecy.wa.gov) or (360) 255-4386, or Annie Sawabini, Rulemaking Lead, at [Annie.Sawabini@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Annie.Sawabini@ecy.wa.gov) or (360) 407-6878.

# Timeline for Plan Development & Approval

Susan recapped topics from the April 9th committee meeting and provided a big picture overview of the committee’s progress to date. Ingria provided a target timeline for plan development and approval, based on target dates for draft plan, final plan, and accommodating committee member local review process:

* 08/14/20 – Ecology distributes draft plan for Committee review.
* 02/01/21 – Committee submits final approved plan to Ecology. Ecology will begin its review of the plan and NEB determination following submission of the plan by the committee.
* 06/30/21 –Ecology will complete its review and decision on whether or not to adopt the plan by the statutory deadline of June 30, 2021.

This timeline provides about four weeks for draft plan review and about 13 weeks for final plan review and approval by local decision makers (timeline does not provide time for revisions after the final plan is submitted to Ecology). Ecology’s expectation is that Committee members and decision makers will thoroughly review and provide feedback on plan components as they are developed. All comments will be reviewed and addressed during Committee meetings.

Ecology assumes the draft plan distributed in August will have some gaps (e.g., projects chapter, NEB chapter, and policy chapter may still be under development). While entities review the draft plan, the Committee will work to finalize these components and discuss comments on the draft plan.

**Resources**:

* [WRE Plan Approval Timeline](https://app.box.com/s/ai6siws6l7rkhamd08le6e6na7uoq3gb)
* [WREC Member Approval Process Table](https://app.box.com/s/npv4godjl2u3owqkipaje3kifjph5aht)
* [Meeting slides](https://app.box.com/s/mal0h7ozvb8ib2i75cg8e3m5g1n68n7w) (6-11)

**Discussion**:

Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe) expressed concern with the proposed timeline, requesting that Ecology yield more time for committee review and approval. Matt noted the current timeline may not leave sufficient time for tribal council review of draft plan components, and noted that he requested Ecology ask the legislature for more time when COVID-19 hit.

* Daryl Williams (Tulalip Tribes) also expressed concern about the limited time after the comment deadline for the draft and release of the final plan for approval. If there are major concerns from individual entities, there may not be enough time to make appropriate changes.
  + Matt Baerwalde shares this concern.
  + Denise Di Santo (King County) shares this concern as not all entities are able to fully participate in the process due to COVID-19 impacts on staff (posing a risk that the plan will not be approved by the full committee).
* Emily Dick (Washington Water Trust) noted it is hard to tell where the committee will need more time and supports using adaptive management to push things out if needed.
* The committee will strive to meet proposed timeline while building consensus.
  + The timeline was developed based on the target dates for the draft plan and final plan. October 12, 2020 – January 18, 2021 are planned for local review processes.
  + Ecology is reviewing eight plans and wants to provide committees with assurance that their plans will be reviewed by the deadline (if received by February 1, 2021). This timeline does not preclude Ecology from reviewing plans received after February 1. Ecology will do everything we can to review locally approved plans that are received after February 1,but cannot guarantee they will complete their full review by June 30, 2021.

**Water rights acquisitions**

Ecology worked with Washington Water Trust (WWT) to finalize a list of 15 water rights to develop project profiles for, which can serve as project descriptions if the Committee chooses to include these projects in the Plan. Emily Dick (WWT) provided an overview of these projects and an example project profile for Lower Pilchuck 11. WWT will develop a final report by June 30, 2020 with the (1) 15 project profiles; (2) memo on methodology; and (3) an outreach toolkit to establish the appropriate and strategic entity to approach specific water right holders.

Ecology has capacity to pick up where the WWT work leaves off and continue preliminary investigation and possible outreach on a limited set of water rights to support their further development for inclusion in the plan.

The City of Arlington expressed interest in selling their airport well municipal water rights to support water offset for the Plan. These water rights could provide up to 320 acre-feet and 780 gallons per minute. Ecology has also been doing an initial review of commercial and industrial water rights in WRIA 7 to see if additional opportunities arise for our planning process. Ingria will provide an update on these at a future meeting.

**Resources**:

* [Water right acquisition project – Lower Pilchuck example](https://app.box.com/s/tb8pmfahdybkwf72w2kvczeazqsslq9t)
* [Meeting slides](https://app.box.com/s/mal0h7ozvb8ib2i75cg8e3m5g1n68n7w) (12-25)

**Discussion:**

* Bobbi Lindemulder (Snohomish Conservation District) expressed concern with including water rights in the committee’s plan without first reaching out to the landowners to gauge willingness and notify them that their rights will be included in the plan.
  + WWT’s outreach toolkit will include direction and tools for conducting outreach but their contract and timeline do not allow for implementing outreach by the end of June.
  + If the committee selects a few rights to move forward, Ecology and committee members may be able to provide support.
* Cynthia Krass (Snoqualmie Valley WID) noted the level of uncertainty around water rights (e.g., history of beneficial use, landowner willingness to sell). In general, landowners are not interested in selling water rights. She would be uncomfortable counting on water rights in plan without some amount of certainty / cursory outreach to those landowners.
* Emily Dick (WWT) agrees that water rights acquisitions are more likely if conversations with landowners happen before the plan is released publicly.
* Cynthia suggested incorporating estimates of likelihood based on WWT’s experience.
  + The committee and project subgroup can consider this. Ecology’s NEB guidance includes suggestions for tiering the plan’s project list. Projects could be organized into groups or “tiers” that reflect the likelihood that individual projects will be implemented and/or the certainty that the benefits will occur.
* Brant Wood (Snohomish PUD) asked whether the outreach toolkit will include the estimated value (in dollars) of the water right to facilitate conversations with landowners.
  + It can take a significant amount of time to evaluate and negotiate these prices; not able to include in toolkit.
  + Emily noted that offers for water rights often happen after conversations with a willing seller.

# Non-acquisition water offset projects

GeoEngineers developed a three-phase workplan for developing water offset projects:

* Initial identification
* Prioritization and further analysis
* Development of project descriptions (1-2-page project description) for projects included in Plan (a separate template for habitat projects will be shared soon)

GeoEngineers has created a tool to track which projects are being developed and who is leading the project development. GeoEngineers will use the water offset project description template to share project information with committee and discuss with the project subgroup. The project subgroup will recommend projects for consideration by Committee for inclusion in the plan. Bridget August (GeoEngineers) and Ingria summarized the committee’s non-acquisition water offset projects:

| **Project Type** | **Projects** | **Status / Updates** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Water storage and retiming** | SVWID Small-Scale Storage Study | The most promising constructed storage sites identified were in closed basins, but projects that were originally considered as “natural storage” are being examined for their ability to become controlled storage. The three sites identified all feed Cherry Creek, which is not closed year-round. |
| SVWID Comprehensive Storage Study | Anchor QEA working this spring to develop a ranked list of potential sites; results coming by end of June. Anticipate holding a meeting to discuss results and see if any may be a good fit for including in the Plan. |
| Snohomish CD Small Farm Water Storage Pilot | Snohomish CD received streamflow restoration funding to identify and implement two pilot water storage projects. They are still in the process of selecting sites. Snohomish CD can present to both the project subgroup and the committee once opportunities are identified. |
| Ecology identified MAR sites | John Covert identified seven possible sites in WRIA 7 on public land. GeoEngineers reaching out to City of North Bend, WA State Parks, DNR and WDFW to gauge interest. |
| Snoqualmie ASR Project | The City of Snoqualmie applied for streamflow restoration funding for an Aquifer Storage and Recovery project to take surface water and inject it into the aquifer for streamflow benefit and water supply for the City. They are interested in proposing this project for the WRIA 7 project list. Aspect Consulting is providing the technical services for this project and are working on filling out a project description for the project subgroup to discuss. |
| **Stormwater** | Stormwater projects - conceptual | The Conservation District is talking with the consultants about some highly conceptual ideas to see if there are opportunities to improve upland stormwater management to achieve streamflow and agriculture resilience benefits. |
| Quilceda stormwater project (Enhancing Streamflow in the Allen/Quilceda Sub-Basin) | Snohomish CD has identified locations to retrofit existing stormwater ponds near Marysville to add infiltration and LID/paving. Also looking at rainwater capture and reuse for rural area just east of Marysville, infiltration retrofits for existing undersized stormwater ponds, and LID/paving retrofits along SR529 corridor. The CD applied for streamflow restoration funding for this project. |
| Little Bear stormwater projects | Project is located in the WRIA 8 surface water boundary but provides groundwater benefits to WRIA 7. Project came from Little Bear Creek plan. |
| **Modification of existing reservoir operations** | Lake Shoecraft | Changing the outlet operations at the lake could provide water offset benefits and benefits to Tulalip Tribe’s hatchery. Consultants have gathered some information from Tulalip Tribes about the project and are optimistic about the benefits of changing the outlet operations at the lake. Reaching out to the Hatchery manager and contact at Lake Shoecraft. |
| Lake Stevens outlet modification | City of Lake Stevens is wrapping up a high-level alternatives analysis that shows promise for modified outlet control to modulate lake levels and increase summer lake level and outflows. Project would potentially help provide better management of lake levels to increase summer lake levels/outflows. |
| Lake Margaret | SVWID looking into potential project to improve lake level operations at Lake Margaret to provide water offset benefit. |
| Sultan Reservoir and/or Tolt Reservoir | Low priority (see April 9 meeting summary for details). |
| **Water right source switches** | City of Sultan seasonal source switch | City of Sultan currently has an intertie with Everett to use in summer for peak demand. Gauging Sultan’s interest in purchasing Everett water in the summer, instead of using their Lake 16 water to provide a seasonal benefit to Cascade Creek. |
| Discussion of drain tiles or remnant oxbow ponds | No projects identified to date. |
| **Conservation & efficiency** | No projects identified | At the April Project Subgroup meeting, John Covert shared considerations for conservation and efficiency projects, including challenges with counting these as water offset projects with certainty. Explained why acquisition of the “saved water” from efficiency upgrades is particularly challenging. There are currently no projects that fit this category within the inventory. |
| **Streamflow augmentation** | Streamflow augmentation using existing water rights | Working with the Snohomish PUD and City of Everett to (1) determine the location of existing transmission lines with respect to permit exempt well growth areas and priority streams; and (2) then identify potential parcels where an augmentation site could be constructed. |
| **Other** | Decommission groundwater wells | King County applied for streamflow restoration for a project to decommission groundwater wells. Anticipate about 17 properties in WRIA 7, but not yet identified. There may be potential for small water offset, but more discussion is needed. |

**Resources**:

* [Water offset project development tracking tool](https://app.box.com/s/ti1ijj37dh75hxwz8dqqcshrndv4f7ts)
* [Template for project descriptions - Water Offset](https://app.box.com/s/jej5hssthxlugvirsrh0aydeyofhoun7)
* [Meeting slides](https://app.box.com/s/mal0h7ozvb8ib2i75cg8e3m5g1n68n7w) (26-46)

**Discussion**:

* Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe) noted that for stormwater projects to count towards offset, the project needs convincing information about how they benefit streamflow.
  + Bridget August (GeoEngineers) explained that the technical consultants have reviewed the Little Bear stormwater projects in detail and modeling work was previously conducted.
  + Denise Di Santo supports looking at stormwater retrofit projects that contribute to benefits for streamflow. The project subgroup should review to ensure that these projects won’t negatively impact water quality (i.e., by increasing temperatures / introducing other contaminants).
* Denise Di Santo (King County) noted that the County is looking into the Ecology-identified MAR site in King County (Three Forks Park) to determine whether there are development restrictions. Hydrologic modeling will have to show that these projects have connectivity / streamflow retiming potential.

# WDFW water offset from habitat projects letter

Kirk Lakey (Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife – WDFW) provided an overview of the letter WDFW submitted to all committees regarding water offset from habitat projects. WDFW emphasizes support for inclusion of these projects in the plan to meet NEB but does not support accounting for offset values. See letter linked below for additional details. It is up to the committee to decide how they want to move forward and consider the other members’ voices in doing so.

**Resources**:

* [WDFW water offset from habitat projects letter](https://app.box.com/s/ckl7rbrz05u64sesdxfa8ak1v6xdpnyn)

**Discussion**:

* Bobbi Lindemulder (Snohomish Conservation District) asked whether the committee can use the methodology GeoEngineers developed to estimate water offset for habitat projects.
  + Ingria Jones (Ecology) noted the intent of the methodology GeoEngineers developed was to have a conservative way to identify water offset benefits from habitat projects.
  + Kirk Lakey explained that from WDFW’s perspective, GeoEngineers’ calculations are a fairly simplified approach to a complex issue. The estimates generated may not accurately reflect real life situations.
* Daryl Williams (Tulalip Tribes) noted that habitat projects that do not have long-term maintenance and funding can be somewhat effective in the early years after implementation but lose effectiveness over time. The same concern applies to stormwater projects where the amount of water seeping into groundwater reduces over time.
* Denise Di Santo (King County) emphasized that water is needed in stream during critical low flow periods. Timing is a key piece of whether these projects will be beneficial / provide offset.

# Policy recommendations

The policy leads identified at the April 9 Committee meeting met in May to discuss their policy recommendations. Susan shared a template with the leads to help structure the proposals. Ecology is developing the structure for the chapter where each of the policy and adaptive management recommendations that the committee agrees on will be included.

At the November meeting, the Committee expressed an interest in addressing adaptive management in the Plan and the need for ongoing monitoring to ensure that projects are implemented. Both of the proposals below were shared across the eight WRE Committees and provide a potential way to coordinate a high-level adaptive management recommendation:

* WDFW has proposed an approach for tracking project monitoring. Tristan Weiss is part of the WDFW streamflow restoration team in Olympia and developed the proposal on project tracking that DFW shared across the Committees.
* Proposal to coordinate a high-level adaptive management recommendation across Committees (led by facilitation team).

**Resources**:

* Link to policy proposals on [Box](https://app.box.com/s/pgin3n9teynzxhb2uus9id2q7lt2xxnn)
* Link to adaptive management proposals on [Box](https://app.box.com/s/6gexo1dqi9rss8yn593kj12xmchj6c7c)
* [Meeting slides](https://app.box.com/s/mal0h7ozvb8ib2i75cg8e3m5g1n68n7w) (52-65)

**Discussion**:

* Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe) presented the following proposals:
  + Conservation policy statement
  + Increase water service connection and well decommissioning
  + Well log database changes
* Joe Hovenkotter (King County) presented a proposal to enable Ecology to fully and comprehensively administer state water laws.
* Bobbi Lindemulder presented a multi-WRIA proposal for outreach and education to permit-exempt well owners.
* Other proposals include:
  + Denise Di Santo – (Voluntary) metering of permit exempt wells. Work underway.
  + Jim Miller – Consider imported water from other subbasins. Sent to projects subgroup for consideration.
  + Mike Wolanek – Align permitting under a One Water program. Work underway.

There was limited time for Committee discussion of the proposals presented.

* Susan asked the committee how they would like to proceed with policy and adaptive management recommendations:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approach** | **Red dots (do not support)** | **Green dots (support)** |
| Consider and approve each proposal individually as they are ready | 9 | 1 |
| Bring forward a single package of policies at a later meeting | 1 | 5 |
| Send out a survey or other offline method | 0 | 8 |
| Combine all non-project recommendations as a draft chapter and ask for feedback | 1 | 4 |
| Other: Continue to check committee approval to “flag” trickier ones--treat these individually--combine easy ones into package | 0 | 5 |

# Public comment

*There was no public comment.*

# Action Items for Committee Members

* Review Chapters 1-3 and provide feedback via comment tracker by July 3.
* Notify Ingria if you anticipate changes in your capacity to participate on committee, or your capacity to vet committee decisions with relevant colleagues at your entity.

# Action Items for Technical Consultants and Ecology

* Bridget to reach out to Kirk Lakey about real estate contact at WDFW (MAR sites).
* GeoEngineers team to share more information on Little Bear stormwater projects and continue to develop additional details and water offset estimates for non-acquisition water offset projects.
* WWT to finalize 15 water right project profiles, report, and outreach plan.

# Next Steps

* Next WRIA 7 **Committee** meeting: Thursday, July 9 (webex)
* Next **Project Subgroup** meeting: Wednesday, June 24 (2:00PM – 4:00PM)