



AGENDA

Snohomish (WRIA 7)

Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee meeting

September 10, 2020 | 12:30pm – 3:30pm [WRIA 7 Committee Webpage](#)

Location

WebEx Meeting Link

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll

+1-206-207-1700 United States (425) 466-6005

Toll (Seattle)

Access code: 133 229 4071

Committee Chair

Ingria Jones

Ingria.Jones@ecy.wa.gov

(425) 466-6005

Handouts (electronic)

Draft August Meeting

Summary

Operating Principles –

Suggested Revisions

Project Development Tracking

Document

Draft Policy Chapter

Draft Adaptive Management

Chapter

Template for NEB Chapter

Introductions and Standing Business

12:30 p.m. | 15 minutes | Facilitator | **Decision**

- Introductions
- Review agenda
- Approve August meeting summary
- Updates

Operating Principles

12:45 p.m. | 15 minutes | Facilitator & Committee | **Decision**

- Objective: Review the proposed amendments to the Committee's operating principles; chair proposes decision to amend & seek 2/3 majority support to amend; seek approval from all Committee members for proposed amendments
 - Review proposed revisions
 - Decision to amend operating principles
 - Seek approval for proposed amendments

Projects

1:00 p.m. | 50 minutes | Ecology & Committee | Questions and Discussion

- Objective: Understand status of Committee's project list
 - Project Subgroup meeting re-cap
 - Recommendations from Project Subgroup
 - Additional habitat project recommendations
 - Review project list

Break

Adaptive Management & Policy Recommendations

2:00 p.m. | 50 minutes | Facilitator & Committee | Questions and Discussion

- Objective: Understand level of support for policy proposals in draft policy chapter; Seek feedback on draft adaptive management chapter
 - Review draft policy chapter
 - Review draft adaptive management chapter

WRE Plan

2:50 pm | 20 minutes | Chair, Facilitator & Committee | Questions and Discussion

- Check in on draft plan review
- Share comments received to date on draft plan and get Committee input on how to address comments
- Discuss the optional NEB chapter

Public Comment

3:10 p.m. | 10 minutes | Facilitator

Next Steps and Action Items

3:20 p.m. | 10 minutes | Facilitator & Chair

- Next WRIA 7 Committee meeting: Thursday, October 8, WebEx

To request ADA accommodation, visit <https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility>, call Ecology at 360-407-6831, Relay Service 711, or TTY 800-833-6384.



DRAFT Meeting Summary

Snohomish (WRIA 7)

Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee meeting

August 13, 2020 | 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. [WRIA 7 Committee Webpage](#)

Location

Webex

Committee Chair

Ingria Jones
Ingria.Jones@ecy.wa.gov
(425) 466-6005

Handouts

Draft June Meeting
Summary
Project Development Tracking
Draft policy chapter template
Comments on WRE Plan
Chapter 1-3

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates *

Ingria Jones (*WA Dept. of Ecology*)

Daryl Williams (*Tulalip Tribes*)

Matt Baerwalde (*Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*)

Denise Di Santo (*King County*)

Cynthia Krass (*Snoqualmie Valley WID*)

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

Emily Dick (*Washington Water Trust*)

Mike Wolanek (*City of Arlington*)

Michael Remington (*City of Duvall*)

Jim Miller (*City of Everett*)

Matthew Eyer (*City of Marysville*)

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

Steve Nelson (*City of Snoqualmie*)

Terri Strandberg (*Snohomish County*)

Brooke Eidem (*alternate - City of Snohomish*)

Ann Bylin (*alternate - Snohomish County*)

David Levitan (*City of Lake Stevens*)

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

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

William Stelle (*alternate - Washington Water Trust*)

Bobbi Lindemulder (*Snohomish Conservation District*)

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

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

Megan Darrow (*City of Monroe*)

Committee Representatives and Alternates Not in Attendance

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

City of Carnation

Town of Index

City of Gold Bar

City of North Bend

Snohomish PUD

Other Attendees

Susan O'Neil (*ESA*) (*facilitator*)

Angela Pietschmann (*Cascadia*) (*info manager*)

John Covert (*WA Dept. of Ecology*)

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

Bridget August (*GeoEngineers*)

David Hartley (*NHC*)

Introductions and standing business

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

Ecology updates

- The **City of Lake Stevens** has designated two new representatives: David Levitan and John Stevens.
- Ecology's upcoming **furlough** dates are: 8/31, 9/25, 10/30, and 11/30.
- Ecology is on schedule to award **2020 Streamflow Restoration Grants** in fall 2020. Ingria will share the list when it's ready.
- The committee expressed interest in updating the WRIA 7 **operating principles** to (1) address remote approval of WRE plan and (2) outline a process for entities withdrawing from the committee.

Projects

The Project Subgroup has met several times this summer (June 24, July 9, July 22, and August 5) and proposed projects to include in the WRE plan, including: (1) water right acquisition projects; (2) water offset projects; and (3) habitat projects. The group also discussed stormwater projects and managed aquifer recharge (MAR) projects. In addition, a series of "Coffee Klatch" meetings were held (June 17, June 22, July 15, July 16, and July 29) to recommend priority habitat projects to include in the WRE plan.

GeoEngineers has developed a work plan to gather information on 10-30 projects and develop more detailed analysis of 10 for water offset projects: **Phase 1:** Initial identification and project development; **Phase 2:** Project Workgroup identifies and recommends to the Committee priority projects for further analysis; **Phase 3:** Committee selects projects for WRE Plan. GeoEngineers has developed preliminary project descriptions for 12 projects and gathered information about several other potential project sites and project concepts. GeoEngineers will finalize project descriptions once the committee agrees to include them in the plan (i.e., filling critical gaps in project descriptions and adding rough order of magnitude cost estimates). The water right acquisitions profiles developed by Washington Water Trust (WWT) are sufficient to include as project descriptions in the plan. GeoEngineers also has capacity to develop up to 15 habitat project descriptions but looking for project sponsor help when possible.

Projects in the Plan are expected to have varying levels of information: some will be fully developed and ready to build and some will be project concepts without a project sponsor identified yet. Our goal to create a robust project list to address those uncertainties. We can also address project uncertainties through adaptive management process and plan implementation recommendations. The plan must offset the impacts of new consumptive permit-exempt well water use and achieve a net ecological benefit to the watershed.

Resources

- [Project Development Tracking Document](#)
- [Project Information & Project Descriptions folder](#)

Discussion

- **David Hartley** asked whether the Committee had agreed to an offset target.
- The WRIA 7 Committee's approved consumptive use offset estimate is 797.4 acre-feet per year (AFY). The Committee has not agreed to add a safety factor/offset target, however some committee members have expressed interest in striving for additional offset if possible.
- **Tulalip Tribes** noted that the Committee can consider a project-level safety factor and aim for a higher acre-foot total offset for the Plan.
- **Next Step:** The Project Subgroup will discuss tiering project list according to certainty and final water offset recommendations for recommended projects.

The Project Subgroup recommended eight water offset projects to the Committee for inclusion in the WRE Plan, and is continuing discussions on several additional water offset projects. GeoEngineers and Ecology provided an overview of the eight recommended projects and the Committee discussed each project. The total estimated water offset from the eight projects recommended at the meeting is ~822 acre-feet per year.

Lake Stevens Outlet Modification

- **City of Arlington:** supports project but observed its estimated offset is over 60% of the total needed to offset estimated Consumptive Use for the WRIA. Consider diversifying portfolio to reduce risk.
- GeoEngineers noted that there are more projects under consideration.
- Ecology reiterated that it was coincidental that these 8 projects are close to the 800 AF/Y CU estimate and additional water offset projects are still being discussed by the Project Subgroup.
- **Next Step:** Finalize project description for inclusion in the Plan.

Lake Shoecraft Outlet Modification

- **Tulalip Tribes:** have not compared Lake Shoecraft's elevation to Lake Goodwin but believe they are at the same (Lake Goodwin could potentially be added to water storage total).
- **Ecology:** estimated 62.5 AFY would result from modifying the weir, not increasing level of lake itself.
- **Next Step:** Meeting with WDFW, Tulalip, GeoEngineers Team & Ecology to fill any critical gaps in project description and consider additional offset potential with Lake Goodwin storage.

Lochaven Source Switch

- **WWT:** supports developing an offset estimate based on consumptive portion of use.
- **Next Step:** Finalize project description for inclusion in the Plan. Project Subgroup recommend offset estimate to include in the Plan.

Lower Pilchuck 1 and Lower Pilchuck 11

- **City of Everett:** recommends removing this water right from project list due to low offset potential. Everett considers Pilchuck subbasin is lowest priority for identifying projects based on the City's interest in considering out of subbasin water.
- **Snoqualmie Valley WID:** confirm these rights are not interruptible if junior to instream flow rule.
- **King County:** rights may be substantially higher than conservative estimate included in plan (consumptive portion only).
- **Tulalip Tribes:** although a small project, would like to keep at a lower priority given potential for salmon production improvements, especially Chinook. Pilchuck has a TMDL for temperature. Adding more water could potentially reduce temperatures.
- **Snoqualmie Tribe:** criteria for ranking projects by subbasin extends beyond offsetting PE well impacts (NEB).

Raging River 1

- **King County:** doing a preliminary prospectus on a water right at one of the parcels; interested in long-term irrigation possibilities for the property and water rights.
- **Next Step:** Include in the Plan.

Patterson 1

- **City of Arlington:** fish propagation is a significant component of water right; recommend Committee consider any NEB concerns.
- **Next Step:** Snoqualmie Valley WID to make initial contact and facilitate outreach. Include in the Plan.

Patterson 4

- **Next Step:** Snoqualmie Valley WID to make initial contact and facilitate outreach. Project Subgroup recommend offset estimate to include in the Plan.

GeoEngineers and Ecology provided an update on water offset projects still *under discussion* by the Project Subgroup. The total estimated water offset from the eight projects recommended at the meeting *and* the projects that are still under discussion is ~3,000 acre-feet per year. The Project Subgroup will continue to discuss and provide recommendations to the Committee on September 10.

Managed Aquifer Recharge

- GeoEngineers developed project descriptions and offset estimates for five MAR sites based on local geologic mapping and estimated infiltration rates. Could have large offset benefit. MAR facility could be constructed as a buried infiltration gallery or an above-ground infiltration basin. GeoEngineers used a USGS analytical tool to estimate the timing of the benefits to streamflow.
- **Tulalip Tribes:** believe MAR offsets are overestimated and would like to take a closer look.
- **Next Steps:** Project Subgroup will discuss timing of benefits. WWT has expressed interest in serving as a project sponsor for MAR sites in WRIA 7. GeoEngineers has started outreach to some landowners and WWT is able to help with additional outreach.

May Creek-Startup-Gold Bar Source Switch

- Rich Norris (City of Gold Bar) is sharing proposal with City Council. Cost and effort for extending pipe is high; difficult to determine how this project would pencil out without increase to ratepayers.

Sultan Source Switch

- Sultan – Rich Norris reaching out to Nate at Sultan to discuss. Snohomish PUD and Everett are not comfortable being potential project sponsors at this time – no sponsor identified. May not be a viable project given cost. However, infrastructure is already in place.

Little Bear Stormwater Project & Quilceda Stormwater Project

- **Next step:** Project Subgroup to discuss how to determine offset benefit; will report out at September Committee meeting.

Arlington Water Right Acquisition

- The City of Arlington expressed interest in selling their airport water rights to the Trust Water Rights Program to provide offset for the Plan and permanent streamflow benefit. GeoEngineers reviewed existing groundwater studies and conducted a desktop analysis to identify whether ceasing use of the City's airport wells would provide an offset benefit to WRIA 7. Their analysis found that a water right acquisition would primarily benefit WRIA 5 (Stillaguamish). The City

may still consider selling their water rights, however there is not an anticipated offset benefit for the WRIA 7 WRE Plan.

- **Next Step:** remove project from list of water offset options.

SVWID Comprehensive Storage Study

- SVWID completed their initial identification and ranking of potential storage sites in the Snoqualmie Watershed. A subset of Project Subgroup members met to discuss the results of the study.
- **Next Step:** Project Subgroup will continue discussions to identify whether to include water storage projects in the Plan.

Ingria provided an overview of the habitat projects recommended by the Project Subgroup (see [Project Development Tracking Document](#)). The Committee reviewed the Project Subgroup's recommendations for habitat projects to include in Draft WRE Plan. The list presented to the Committee includes projects that were identified as priority by the Subgroup *and* have a project sponsor or GeoEngineers dedicated to developing a project description for the Plan. The Subgroup is still discussing other habitat projects, and will bring a final recommendation to the Committee this fall.

Adaptive Management

The Committee identified the process for writing the adaptive management chapter of the Plan. The Facilitation Team will draft an Adaptive Management Chapter for review by a subset of Committee members, including Denise Di Santo (King County), Daryl Williams (Tulalip Tribes), Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Tribe), Liz Ablow (City of Seattle) and Mike Wolanek (City of Arlington) volunteered to review and refine the draft. Ecology will include an outline of this chapter in the Draft WRE Plan. The Committee will discuss the draft chapter during the September meeting.

Resources

- [Adaptive Management folder](#) on box (includes WDFW tracking proposal and common proposal)

Discussion

- **King County** will share the overriding climate change statement developed for WRIA 8's Adaptive Management Chapter with WRIA 7 Committee for consideration.
- **Snoqualmie Indian Tribe:** consider impacts of COVID-19 on housing migration patterns and PE well projections (i.e., increased teleworking options increase pressure in rural areas as people move out of cities). King County and Snohomish CD agree.
- **Ecology:** planning groups cannot add projects to WRE Plan after adoption (but can move projects around within the project list). Ecology has no statutory authority to reopen the plans after they have been approved. If a group decides to meet and adaptively manage their plan by bringing in new projects, there is nothing holding them back from doing that, but those projects cannot be considered part of an "adopted" plan.
- **Tulalip Tribes:** Suggested that if the committee is recommending an approach and process for Adaptive Management, perhaps a request to be able to add to the plans in the future should be part of the recommendation to the legislature.
- **Snohomish CD:** Interested in other projects that contribute to the goals of the plan but aren't specifically mentioned in the plan or formally tracked and how those should be considered in the future.

Policy Recommendations

A joint WRIA 7-8-9 Policy Workgroup meeting was held to discuss proposals put forward by committee members. The group discussed potential consolidation of policy proposals and noted it is up to policy leads to achieve consensus with other committee members. A cross-WRIA subgroup also developed (1) an outreach and education proposal and (2) statewide proposal policy (see links under Resources below). The Facilitation Team is drafting a Policy Chapter (to be included in Draft WRE Plan) based on the policy proposal write-ups that the policy leads have drafted.

The WRIA 7 Committee will review proposals as part of overall Draft WRE Plan review and highlight concerns and red flags, propose revisions, etc. The Committee can decide whether to include an appendix with detailed proposals. We will caveat this portion of the plan so that it is clear that these are still under review and consideration rather than formal recommendations from the Committee.

Committee members should thoroughly review the proposed policy recommendations and flag any serious concerns. Policy proposals that are not supported by the full Committee will not be included in the final plan.

Resources

- [Cross-WRIA Water Conservation Policy - Education and Incentives](#)
- [Cross-WRIA Water Conservation Policy - Statewide mandatory water conservation measures in unincorporated areas of the state during drought](#)
- [WRIA 7 Policy Tracker](#) (updated)

WRE Plan

Seven entities submitted comments on Draft WRE Plan Chapters 1-3. Ecology’s Streamflow Restoration Management team reviewed comments on Chapter 1 and incorporated suggested revisions into revised draft distributed on August 6. The Committee reviewed comments requiring further discussion.

Resources

- [WRE Plan Comment Tracker Ch 1-3 - Compiled Comments](#)
- [WRE Plan Draft Ch 1-3](#)

Discussion

The Committee discussed the following comments to draft Chapter 1-3 of the WRIA 7 WRE Plan and identified next steps to address the comments.

Comment	Next steps
Snohomish County: New homes within water retail service areas are not currently required to hook-up to water provider systems, and Group A systems are not always consulted before a new well is drilled. Group A systems do not "allow" a well to be drilled.	Terri Strandberg (Snohomish County) will draft updated language. Mike Wolanek (City of Arlington), Brant Wood (Snohomish PUD), and Eric Ferguson (King County) will review.
Snohomish County: Is there going to be any discussion about the relative impact from residential consumptive use on stream flow?	Terri Strandberg (Snohomish County) will draft updated language.

<p>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe: It is not clear how the plan provides a path forward for future planning. The text should state in broad terms how the plan provides a path forward for future water resource planning. Without more to back up the claim, this statement lacks credibility.</p> <p>Snoqualmie Valley WID: As a member of the out-of-stream user group, I would like more clarity on what is meant by "sets the stage for improved coordination of water resources." SVWID interprets "water resources" to mean for all purposes, with instream health being of paramount concern, but not the only purpose in the definition. SVWID would strongly support this plan setting the stage for successful improved coordination of water resources.</p>	<p>Drafted language: "While this watershed plan is narrow in scope and not intended to address all water uses or related issues within the watershed, by completing this plan, the WRIA 7 committee has achieved a success that it hopes could set the stage for improved coordination of water resources and overall health in the WRIA."</p> <p>Cynthia Krass (Snoqualmie Valley WID), Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe), and Mike Wolanek (City of Arlington) to wordsmith/revise together.</p>
<p>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe: The section "Coordination with Existing Plans" needs to be more transparent and specific. Coordination is more than communication. This section would be enhanced by discussing which policies, activities, and projects of the WRE Plan are concurrent, which are supplemental, and which are unique to the WRE Plan. This may not be able to be addressed in detail, but at least at a high level, this section should better describe how the WRIA 7 WRE plan "fits in" with the other planning efforts.</p> <p>Tulalip Tribes (comment at meeting): This planning process is designed to deal with issues related to permit-exempt wells/individual homes, but there are a lot of other out of stream uses including municipal, industrial, agricultural, and firefighting – the WRIA doesn't have any overall plan for all those users within basin. Recommend pointing out the need for creating a new overall plan covering all uses in the basin: tie everything together and look at how to support needs for future growth, leave water in streams for fish & wildlife, and a way to fund projects that have multiple benefits - besides just mitigating PE wells.</p>	<p>Approved changes to section 2.2.1 Coordination with Existing Plans: Throughout the planning process, the WRIA 7 Committee has coordinated closely with the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum. Staff from both entities actively participated in developing the plan, as including inviting both entities join the WRIA 7 Committee ex-officio members. and identifying opportunities to align the Committee's project list with the Snohomish Basin Salmon Conservation Plan and the Snohomish Basin Protection Plan.</p>

Public comment

There was no public comment.

Action Items for Committee Members

- **All Committee members:** clarify your entity's process for reviewing the draft plan. Set aside sufficient time to review draft plan from August 28 – September 28.
- Terri Strandberg (Snohomish County) will draft updated language to address comments on WRE Plan Chapters 1-3. Mike Wolanek (City of Arlington), Brant Wood (Snohomish PUD), and Eric Ferguson (King County) will review:

- “New homes within water retail service areas are not currently required to hook-up to water provider systems, and Group A systems are not always consulted before a new well is drilled. Group A systems do not "allow" a well to be drilled.”
- “Is there going to be any discussion about the relative impact from residential consumptive use on stream flow?”
- Cynthia Krass (Snoqualmie Valley WID), Matt Baerwalde (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe), and Mike Wolanek (City of Arlington) will draft updated language to address comments on WRE Plan Chapters 1-3:
 - “It is not clear how the plan provides a path forward for future planning. The text should state in broad terms how the plan provides a path forward for future water resource planning. Without more to back up the claim, this statement lacks credibility.”
 - “As a member of the out-of-stream user group, I would like more clarity on what is meant by "sets the stage for improved coordination of water resources." SVWID interprets "water resources" to mean for all purposes, with instream health being of paramount concern, but not the only purpose in the definition. SVWID would strongly support this plan setting the stage for successful improved coordination of water resources.”
- Project Subgroup discuss tiering project list, & finalize remaining water offset and habitat project recommendations for the Committee.

Action Items for Consultants and Ecology

- Ecology will draft updates to the WRIA 7 [operating principles](#) to (1) address remote approval of WRE plan and (2) outline a process for entities withdrawing from the committee.
- Ecology incorporate revisions to Chapter 1-3 and distribute draft plan & comment tracker.
 - The draft Policy Chapter will be prepared for inclusion in draft plan.
- GeoEngineers Team develop habitat project descriptions.
- Ecology finalize June meeting summary and send draft August meeting summary to Committee.
- GeoEngineers finalize project descriptions for water offset projects approved by Committee.
- The Adaptive Management draft will be sent to volunteers who offered to review and revise, and a meeting will be set up to discuss what to bring to the Committee in September.

Next Steps

- Next Project Subgroup Meeting: Wednesday, August 26, 2:00 – 4:00 pm.
- Next Committee meeting: Thursday, September 10, 12:30 – 3:30 pm.

Discussion Guide: Proposed Operating Principle Revisions

WRIA 7 Committee Meeting September 10, 2020

Purpose of Discussion

The committee can periodically review the operating principles and make amendments as needed. Unanticipated circumstances have raised the need for the chair to bring forward a recommendation for an amendment regarding: remote participation in the final approval of the plan and addressing members that stop participation in the committee.

Background

The WRIA 7 Operating Principles were approved for signature by all committee members on March 4, 2019 and effective as of March 14th, 2019. The operating principles state “The Committee may review the operating principles periodically. Any member of the Committee may bring forward a recommendation for an amendment to the operating principles. Amendments will be brought for discussion when a quorum (2/3 of the membership) is present and take effect only if decided on unanimously by the full Committee for inclusion in the operating principles.” (pg 1)

The chair recommended revisions to the operating principles at the August 13, 2020 committee meeting and committee members supported an amendment.

Considerations for the Committee

It is unlikely that the committee will meet in person for a final plan approval vote due to the global pandemic. Therefore, the committee may want to consider a revision to the operating principles to formalize and clarify the allowance of remote participation and voting. In addition, to reduce complications during a final plan approval vote, the committee may want to consider a revision to account for members that stop participating in the committee process or those that would like to resign ahead of a final plan approval vote.

Below, the current related sections of the operating principles are shown in *italics*. The suggested revisions to the sections on remote participation and final approval of the plan are shown in red underline. The proposed revisions are also included at the end of this document as revisions to the full operating principles.

Suggested Revisions

Remote Participation

Although it should not be routine, remote participation can be accommodated when necessary to facilitate Committee member participation and when possible given the technology available. It may be difficult for Committee members participating remotely to fully participate in discussion. If there are difficulties with technology, the priority will be to continue the meeting with the in-person participants and not delay the meeting to address technology challenges. Representatives participating remotely may take place in voting. Items requiring a vote will be identified on the agenda, which will be

distributed at least a week in advance of the meeting. Representatives are strongly encouraged to attend in-person.

The Committee chair will allow for remote participation (e.g. via phone, web, video conference) if:

- Notice is provided to the chair or facilitator at least 1 week in advance of the meeting (except in the case of emergency), AND
- Representative and alternates are not available to attend in person, AND
- Meeting room accommodates remote participation. (pg. 2)

If extraordinary events, such as a pandemic or natural disaster, require the committee to meet remotely, all meetings will be held remotely and the operating procedures will remain in force, except portions that assume in-person versus remote participation.

Final approval of the plan

RCW 90.94 (3) states that “... all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption.” This means that each committee member gets a vote (quorum is not applicable for final approval) and that all committee members must vote “yes” in support of a plan in order for it to be approved and provided to Ecology for “net ecological benefit”¹ review and potential adoption.

The vote on the final plan approval will be shown as follows:

Voting:

- Thumbs up – approval
- Thumbs down – disapproval

The final plan approval may also be given verbally when in person participation is not possible:

- Approve
- Disapprove

The facilitator will record all decisions. (pg. 9)

Withdrawal/Resignation

NOTE: *The operating principles do not currently contain a section on members that stop participating in meetings or a process for resignation. The proposed revisions are included after the Alternates and Latecomers sections:*

Only one representative from the entity shall sit at the table and participate in a vote. Representatives may call on alternates that attend the meeting at any time to speak.

¹ Per RCW 90.94, Ecology shall review the watershed restoration and enhancement plan to ensure it meets net ecological benefit. Ecology shall provide the Committee with a definition and guidance of net ecological benefit.

If the primary representative cannot attend a meeting, they should, if possible, send the designated alternate and notify the Committee chair and the facilitator as early as possible. It is the responsibility of the primary representative to brief the alternate on previous meetings and key topics arising for discussion in order for the alternate to participate productively.

If the primary representative and alternates are no longer able to attend (staffing change, ongoing scheduling conflicts), the government or organization shall work with the chair to quickly identify a new representative from the same government or organization. If no alternate representative is available from the government or organization, an alternate entity that can represent the same interest is allowed and shall be brought forward to the chair for approval. Replacement members are subject to latecomer provisions.

Ecology has invited all governments and organizations identified in RCW 90.94.030 to participate on the Committee. It is in the best interest of this Committee that all invited entities join the Committee and participate in meetings starting no later than March 14, 2019. Invited entities that choose not to participate in the committee shall provide written acknowledgement that they are forfeiting their seat within thirty days following final notice for participation. In the case that an entity is nonresponsive or an entity is selected to replace another entity after March 14, 2019, the following latecomer conditions shall apply:

1. The entity cannot veto, request a re-vote, or revisit items previously decided on by the Committee;
2. The entity signs an intent to participate, provides a primary and alternate Committee member; and
3. The entity agrees to and abides by the operating principles.

Presumed Withdrawal from the Committee

Entities must participate in the committee process for the six month period prior to the final plan approval in order to vote on the final draft plan. ("Participate" means partaking in a minimum of one full committee or workgroup meeting, engaging over email or phone. It does not mean presence at every committee meeting with the understanding that entities may need to occasionally miss committee meetings.) If an entity does not respond to communication over email or phone, or does not attend committee or workgroup meetings, during the six month period prior to the vote on the final plan, it is assumed that they have withdrawn from the committee. The chair will send an electronic notice to all entities providing this information no later than September 31, 2020. The chair will send electronic notice to all entities providing this information at least two months prior to the anticipated vote on the final plan and no later than January 31, 2021.

Resignation from the Committee

If an entity no longer wishes to participate in the committee process or the final plan approval, they should send written notice (electronic or mailed notice) to the chair as early as possible prior to their resignation. Advance notice will support the chair and facilitator in managing consensus building and voting procedures.

Questions for the Committee

1. Does the committee feel that it is necessary to make the changes highlighted below to the operating principles?
2. If so, do we have 2/3 of membership present and in full agreement?
3. Are there other revisions that committee members see necessary to make at this time or for consideration at a future meeting?

FULL OPERATING PRINCIPLES WITH PROPOSED REVISIONS ARE INCLUDED BELOW

Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee

Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 7

Operating Principles

Approved Version March 4, 2019

Effective this 14th day of March, 2019

SECTION 1: PURPOSE

The purpose of the operating principles and charter is to establish the watershed restoration and enhancement committee, as authorized under RCW 90.94.030, for the purpose of developing the watershed restoration and enhancement plan. The document sets forward a process for meeting, participation expectations, procedures for voting, structure of the Committee, communication, and other needs in order to support the Committee in reaching agreement on a final plan.

SECTION 2. AGREEMENT AND AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATING PRINCIPLES

The formal establishment of an agreement to the operating principles will take place via a member vote, with all members of the watershed restoration and enhancement committee (Committee) approving the operating principles. Committee members include those entities specified by the legislature who have responded, indicating their commitment to participate. Participants will work in good faith to participate productively in the development of the operating principles. By approving the operating principles, members of the Committee agree to uphold the principles as outlined in this document.

The Committee may review the operating principles periodically. Any member of the Committee may bring forward a recommendation for an amendment to the operating principles. Amendments will be brought for discussion when a quorum (2/3 of the membership) is present and take effect only if approved unanimously by the full Committee for inclusion in the operating principles.

Nothing contained herein or in any amendment developed under the Agreement shall prejudice the legal claims of any party hereto, nor shall participation in this planning process abrogate any party's authority or the reserved or other rights of any member, including tribal governments, except where the obligation has been accepted in writing.

SECTION 3. EXPECTATIONS AND GROUND RULES

Participation expectations

Each entity invited by Ecology to participate on the Committee, and which has responded indicating their commitment to participate, shall identify a representative and up to two alternate Committee members from their organization or government. Committee members shall provide to the chair, in writing, the designated representative and alternates; and shall inform the chair in writing of any

changes to the main representative or alternates. Committee members will, in good faith and using their best professional judgement:

- Actively participate in Committee meetings;
- Review materials in preparation for the meetings;
- Review materials following the meetings;
- Engage in workgroups (if applicable);
- Come prepared for discussions and to vote (when applicable); and
- Commit to implementing the Committee ground rules (see below).

The chair will consult with the Committee to ensure that adequate time is given for review of materials. Meeting materials will be provided at least 7 days before meetings, with additional time given for longer documents. The chair also understands that Committee members may need to discuss decisions with their organizations prior to voting and will work with Committee members to establish reasonable review time for materials prior to calling for a vote.

Committee meetings will take place on a monthly basis for an initial period, with the interval of meetings being modified as needed to meet the deadlines (either more or less frequently). The chair will hold meetings at a convenient location in the watershed. Meetings are expected to last for approximately 4 hours, with the length modified as needed to meet deadlines.

The chair or facilitator will contact Committee members that miss meetings to brief them on the meeting outcome. The chair or facilitator will strongly encourage participation in Committee meetings.

Remote Participation

Although it should not be routine, remote participation can be accommodated when necessary to facilitate Committee member participation and when possible given the technology available. It may be difficult for Committee members participating remotely to fully participate in discussion. If there are difficulties with technology, the priority will be to continue the meeting with the in-person participants and not delay the meeting to address technology challenges. Representatives participating remotely may take place in voting. Items requiring a vote will be identified on the agenda, which will be distributed at least a week in advance of the meeting. Representatives are strongly encouraged to attend in-person.

The Committee chair will allow for remote participation (e.g. via phone, web, video conference) if:

- Notice is provided to the chair or facilitator at least 1 week in advance of the meeting (except in the case of emergency), AND
- Representative and alternates are not available to attend in person, AND
- Meeting room accommodates remote participation.

If extraordinary events, such as a pandemic or natural disaster, require the committee to meet remotely, all meetings will be held remotely and the operating procedures will remain in force, except portions that assume in-person versus remote participation.

Ground rules

Water management is inherently complicated and the Committee is striving for consensus on the watershed restoration and enhancement plan. Therefore, given the range of members' diverse perspectives, the Committee has established the following ground rules to ensure good faith and productive participation amongst its members:

Be Respectful

- Listen when others are speaking. Do not interrupt and do not participate in side conversations. One person speaks at a time.
- Recognize the legitimacy of the concerns and interests of others, whether or not you agree with them.
- Cooperate with the facilitator to ensure that everyone is given equitable time to state their views. Present your views succinctly and try not to repeat or rephrase what others have already said.
- Silence cell phones and refrain from using laptops during the meeting, except to take notes.
- Respect other communication styles and needs.

Be Constructive

- Participate in the spirit of giving the same priority to solving the problems of others as you do to solving your own problems.
- Share comments that are solution focused. Avoid repeating past discussions.
- Do not engage in personal attacks or make slanderous statements. Do not give ultimatums.
- Ask for clarification if you are uncertain of what another person is saying. Ask questions rather than make assumptions.
- Work towards consensus. Identify areas of common ground and be willing to compromise.
- Minimize the use of jargon and acronyms. Attempt to use language observers and laypersons will understand.
- It is okay to disagree, but strive to reach common ground.

Be Productive

- Adhere to the agenda. Respect time constraints and focus on the topic being discussed.

Bring a Sense of Humor and Have Fun.

Conflict resolution

In the event a conflict arises amongst members or established workgroups of the Committee, individuals should take the following steps:

1. Communicate directly with the person or persons whose actions are the cause of the conflict.
2. If the circumstance is such that the person with a conflict is unable or unwilling to communicate directly with the person or persons whose actions are the cause of the conflict, the person shall speak with the Committee chair and facilitator.

3. The conflict should first be brought up verbally. If this does not lead to satisfactory resolution, the conflict should be described in writing to the chair.
4. If such matters are brought to the chair and facilitator, the chair in consultation with the facilitator, will address the conflict as appropriate and may seek outside or independent assistance as needed.

SECTION 4. ALTERNATES, EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS AND NEW MEMBERSHIP

Alternates

Only one representative from the entity shall sit at the table and participate in a vote. Representatives may call on alternates that attend the meeting at any time to speak.

If the primary representative cannot attend a meeting, they should, if possible, send the designated alternate and notify the Committee chair and the facilitator as early as possible. It is the responsibility of the primary representative to brief the alternate on previous meetings and key topics arising for discussion in order for the alternate to participate productively.

If the primary representative and alternates are no longer able to attend (staffing change, ongoing scheduling conflicts), the government or organization shall work with the chair to quickly identify a new representative from the same government or organization. If no alternate representative is available from the government or organization, an alternate entity that can represent the same interest is allowed and shall be brought forward to the chair for approval. Replacement members are subject to latecomer provisions.

Latecomers

Ecology has invited all governments and organizations identified in RCW 90.94.030 to participate on the Committee. It is in the best interest of this Committee that all invited entities join the Committee and participate in meetings starting no later than March 14, 2019. Invited entities that choose not to participate in the committee shall provide written acknowledgement that they are forfeiting their seat within thirty days following final notice for participation. In the case that an entity is nonresponsive or an entity is selected to replace another entity after March 14, 2019, the following latecomer conditions shall apply:

4. The entity cannot veto, request a re-vote, or revisit items previously decided on by the Committee;
5. The entity signs an intent to participate, provides a primary and alternate Committee member; and
6. The entity agrees to and abides by the operating principles.

presumed withdrawal from the committee

Entities must participate in the committee process for the six month period prior to the final plan approval in order to vote on the final draft plan. ("Participate" means partaking in a minimum of one full committee or workgroup meeting, engaging over email or phone. It does not mean presence at every committee meeting with the understanding that entities may need to occasionally miss committee meetings.) If an entity does not respond to communication over email or phone, or does not attend committee or workgroup meetings, during the six month period prior to the vote on the final plan, it is assumed that they have withdrawn from the committee. The chair will send an electronic notice to all

entities providing this information no later than September 31, 2020. The chair will send electronic notice to all entities providing this information at least two months prior to the anticipated vote on the final plan and no later than January 31, 2021.

resignation from the committee

If an entity no longer wishes to participate in the committee process or the final plan approval, they should send written notice (electronic or mailed notice) to the chair as early as possible prior to their resignation. Advance notice will support the chair and facilitator in managing consensus building and voting procedures.

Ex-Officio and Ad-Hoc Members

The Committee may decide, by a super majority (2/3), to invite an additional entity to join the Committee as an *ex officio* non-voting member. *Ex Officio* members are invited to sit at the Committee table, participate actively in discussions and review of documents, but shall not vote on any items.² *Ex-officio* members are expected to participate as regular members—and adhere to the operating procedures—except that they do not vote.

The Committee may decide, by a super majority (2/3), to invite an individual or organization to participate in select meetings or agenda items where additional expertise or perspective is desired. Ad hoc members will be invited by the chair to sit at the Committee table, participate actively in discussions, and review of documents for the specified agenda items. They shall not vote on any items.

Workgroups and Advisory Groups

The Committee may establish workgroups or subcommittees as it sees fit. Workgroups may be temporary, established to achieve a specific purpose within a finite period, or a standing workgroup addressing the goals of the Committee. The decision to form a workgroup is a procedural decision, as it is not required by the legislature, and may be developed at the discretion of the Committee or the chair in order to support Committee decision making. All Committee workgroups are workgroups of the whole, meaning their role is to support the efforts of the Committee and all Committee members are welcome to participate in any workgroup formed by the Committee. The chair or Committee may also engage established workgroups in the watershed or invite non-Committee members to participate on the workgroups if they bring capacity or expertise not available on the Committee. No binding decisions will be made by the workgroups; all issues discussed by workgroups shall be communicated to the Committee as either recommendations or findings as appropriate. The Committee may, or may not, act on these workgroup outcomes as it deems appropriate.

SECTION 5. ROLE OF THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE SUPPORT

RCW 90.94.030 (2b) states, “The department shall chair the watershed restoration and enhancement committee...” Ecology’s Streamflow Restoration Implementation Lead chairs the Committee on behalf of the agency. In the event that the chair is unable to attend a scheduled meeting due to illness or other unanticipated absence, Ecology will designate an interim chair to avoid cancelling the meeting. The interim chair may vote on decisions coming before the Committee.

² Ecology leadership has determined that additional voting members will not be invited to join the committees in order to stay true to the legislation and keep the Committee size manageable. However, the Committee may decide to include non-voting members if they choose.

The chair shall vote on all items coming before the Committee.³ The role of the chair is to help the Committee complete the plan with the goal to attain full agreement from the Committee members. If full agreement cannot be obtained, the chair shall ensure all opinions inform future decision making for the final plan.

The chair, with assistance from Ecology technical staff, contractors, members of the Committee, and/or workgroups, shall prepare the watershed restoration and enhancement plan for the Committee's review, comment, and approval.

Ecology may provide the Committee a facilitator. The role of the facilitator is to focus on process and support the Committee in productive discussions and decision-making. Ecology will provide administrative support for the Committee as well as technical assistance through Ecology staff and consultants.

Ecology may provide the Committee with technical support in the form of Ecology staff or hired consultants. Ecology will seek input from the Committee on consultant selection prior to entering into contract.

SECTION 6. DECISION MAKING

This planning process, by statutory design, brings a diversity of perspectives to the table. It is therefore important the Committee identify a clear process for how it will make decisions. The Committee shall always strive for consensus, and when consensus cannot be reached, the chair and facilitator will document agreement and dissenting opinions. The reason why the Committee will strive for consensus is that the authorizing legislation requires that final plan itself must be approved by all members of the Committee prior to Ecology's review (RCW 90.94.030[3] "...all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption"). Therefore, it follows that consensus during the foundational votes, or decisions, upon which the plan is constructed, will serve as the best indicators of the Committee's progress toward an approved plan.

Quorum

A quorum of the Committee members – 2/3 of Committee members – must be in attendance to vote. Representatives participating remotely are counted for the purposes of establishing a quorum and may take part in voting. The chair will round up when determining whether a quorum is established. The Committee may not vote unless a quorum is established. Each member of the Committee receives a single vote. Ex Officio members do not influence the determination of a quorum and do not receive a vote.

³ RCW 90.94 (3) states that "the department shall prepare and adopt a watershed restoration and enhancement plan for each watershed listed under subsection (2) (a) of this section, in collaboration with the watershed restoration and enhancement committee. Except as described in (h) of this subsection, all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption." Based on input from the Attorney General's office, because Ecology is a member of the Committee and must ultimately vote on whether or not to approve the plan, Ecology shall vote on all items coming before the Committee.

Voting on items leading up to the final plan approval

The Committee will strive toward consensus.⁴ The levels of consensus include:

- I can say an unqualified "yes"!
- I can accept the decision.
- I can live with the decision.
- I do not fully agree with the decision; however, I will not block it.

If consensus cannot be reached, facilitator or chair will call for a vote. Committee members shall abstain from voting if they have a personal vested financial interest in a specific decision.

In recognition that consensus can be difficult to achieve and in some cases decisions need to be made quickly to stay on track to meet the plan deadline, decisions leading up to the plan (e.g. growth scenarios, inclusion of individual projects, etc.) may be approved by 2/3 majority of the Committee members in attendance. This is intended to keep the process moving forward, and is put forth with the recognition that by having dissenters to interim decisions, we may encounter a potential challenge when we reach a final plan approval. Ecology staff and facilitators will clearly document where there is agreement and disagreement on components of the plan. A "parking lot" may be used to capture ideas that the group cannot agree on or would like to return to at a later date for further discussion; however, this will not jeopardize meeting deadlines by postponing issues that must be resolved so deliberations can move forward. Committee members will work together to establish schedules and deadlines to ensure that final plans can be completed on time.

Voting:

- Thumbs up – approval
- Thumbs down – disapproval
- Thumbs sideways – ambivalent to approve, but will not disapprove
- Five fingers – abstain

The facilitator will record all votes and, where there are dissenting or ambivalent votes, will record all, if any, Committee members that dissent and the reasons for the dissent or remaining concerns. The chair or facilitator will approve the vote if 2/3 of those voting are either thumbs up or thumbs sideways. Members abstaining will be counted as present for purposes of the quorum, but abstentions will not be included in calculating the 2/3 majority.

⁴ Definition of Consensus: Consensus is a group process where the input of everyone is carefully considered and an outcome is crafted that best meets the needs of the group as a whole. The root of consensus is the word consent, which means to give permission to. When members consent to a decision, they are giving permission to the group to go ahead with the decision. Some members may disagree with all or part of the decision, but based on listening to everyone else's input, all members agree to let the decision go forward because the decision is the best one the entire group can achieve at the current time.

Electronic voting

In the case a decision is needed prior to the next Committee meeting, the chair can request an electronic vote via email or survey. This approach will only be used for time-critical items or when a quorum was not present to vote. The Department of Ecology will allow a minimum of 3 working days for responses. A non-response is considered an “abstention” vote.⁵

Informal Voting

From time to time, the chair or the facilitator may ask for an informal vote or straw poll to gather information on group needs. These informal votes do not need to follow the formal voting protocols of this section. Informal votes will be used solely for information gathering and will not result in a decision.

Letters of Support for Projects

The Committee may choose to submit a letter of support for streamflow restoration projects applying for funding through Ecology Streamflow Restoration Funding program or other sources. The decision to submit a letter of support shall follow the voting process as described above (2/3 majority). If the Committee does not approve a letter of support for a project, individual Committee representatives are not prohibited from submitting a letter of support from their organization or government. Requests for letters of support should be brought to the Committee with adequate time for review.

Voting on the final approval of the plan

RCW 90.94 (3) states that “... all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption.” This means that each committee member gets a vote (quorum is not applicable for final approval) and that all committee members must vote “yes” in support of a plan in order for it to be approved and provided to Ecology for “net ecological benefit”⁶ review and potential adoption.

The vote on the final plan approval will be shown as follows:

Voting:

- Thumbs up – approval
- Thumbs down – disapproval

The final plan approval may also be given verbally when in person participation is not possible:

- Approve

⁵ If an ‘out of office’ message is received for the primary representative, the alternate representative(s) will be contacted to cast their vote. The chair and facilitator will make at least 3 points of contact with each Committee member before marking their vote as an abstention (e.g. phone, email, text).

⁶ Per RCW 90.94, Ecology shall review the watershed restoration and enhancement plan to ensure it meets net ecological benefit. Ecology shall provide the Committee with a definition and guidance of net ecological benefit.

- Disapprove

The facilitator will record all votes.

SECTION 7. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

The agenda will provide time for public comment at each meeting. The chair and facilitator will determine the time and extent of the public comment period based on the agenda for each meeting, with input from the Committee. Members of the public may provide written comment to the chair at least three business days in advance of each meeting. At each meeting, Committee members may request that the chair or facilitator read one or more written comments received by the chair. While the Committee is not explicitly required to follow the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act, reasonable efforts will be made to post information and materials on the pertinent website in a timely manner to keep the public informed.

SECTION 8. COMMITTEE AND MEDIA COMMUNICATION

To support clear communication with the Committee, Ecology will:

1. Operate a list serve for Committee members and interested parties;
2. Develop and manage a website for members of the Committee to access documents such as agendas, meeting summaries, technical reports, calendar, and other items as requested by the Committee.

The facilitator and Ecology shall prepare a written meeting summary for each Committee meeting within 10 business days of the last Committee meeting. The chair or facilitator will distribute the meeting summary to the Committee via an email and post the summary on the Committee webpage. The summary, at a minimum, will include a list of attendees, decisions, discussion points, assignments, and action items. If comments are cited in such summaries, each speaker will be identified. Meeting summaries will capture areas of agreement and disagreement within the group. Committee members may provide the chair with recommended amendments to the draft meeting summary. Meeting summaries will be considered draft, and labeled as such, until they are approved by a vote of the Committee. The Committee will approve the meeting summary by a vote at the following meeting.

Communication with the media

When speaking to the media or other venues, the Committee members will clearly identify any opinions expressed as their personal opinions and not necessarily those of the other Committee members or the Committee as a whole. The Committee members will not attempt to speak for other members of the group or to characterize the positions of other members to the media or other venues. Comments to the media will be respectful of other Committee members.

Following significant accomplishments, the Committee may request Ecology to issue formal news releases or other media briefing materials. All releases and information given to the media will accurately represent the work of the Committee. Ecology will make every effort to provide the Committee with materials in advance for input, recognizing that media timelines may not allow for adequate review by the Committee.

SIGNATURES OF AGREEMENT

The Snohomish (WRIA 7) Watershed Restoration Enhancement Committee Operating Principles have been approved this 4th day of March, 2019 by the parties below.

WRIA 7 Project Development Tracking

Snohomish (WRIA 7) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee
v20200908

GeoEngineers Work Assignment includes supporting the identification and evaluation of projects and actions to offset streamflow impacts from permit-exempt well consumptive water use within the WRIA. The consumptive use estimate for WRIA 7 is 797.4 acre-feet per year (AF/YR). Projects proposed offset impacts to stream flows and/or contribute to achieving a Net Ecological Benefit. GeoEngineers scope allows for preliminary project descriptions for 10-30 projects, and the evaluation and more detailed analysis of a subset of two and up to ten water offset projects identified by the committee.

This document tracks project development and evaluation for WRIA 7, including projects currently being evaluated by the GeoEngineers technical consultant team. For some projects where Ecology has local knowledge and jurisdiction, Ecology technical staff will work directly with project proponents to analyze the project. Washington Water Trust has developed project descriptions (project profiles) for 15 water rights in WRIA 7. Water rights that have been discussed by the Project Subgroup and recommended to the Committee for including in the plan are also in the table below.

To-date, GeoEngineers has developed preliminary project descriptions for 12 projects and gathered information on several additional projects. Preliminary project descriptions include project status, location, nearest affected water body, mileage of affected river or stream reaches, potential benefits, etc. If the Committee identifies a critical need to identify additional water offset projects, Committee members are expected to identify projects and gather needed information. GeoEngineers has capacity to develop up to 15 habitat project descriptions for WRIA 7, drawing from existing information. Committee members and project sponsors are strongly encouraged to assist in development of habitat project descriptions where possible, and in reviewing project descriptions developed by GeoEngineers for accuracy and up-to-date information.

Additional analysis will include more detailed descriptions and analyses of offset benefits, consideration of ongoing operations and maintenance, approximate implementation costs, potential funding opportunities, etc. GeoEngineers will conduct additional analysis, where needed, on water offset projects the Committee decides to include in the Plan. Additional analysis will be conducted to fill critical gaps in preliminary water offset project descriptions.

Water Offset Projects

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Water Offset Estimate ¹ (AF/YR)	Status ¹	Project Development lead	Box Link
Little Pilchuck	Lake Stevens Outlet Modification	Water storage and retiming	~500 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers and Lake Stevens	link

¹ Project Subgroup and GeoEngineers are in the progress of developing alternative offset estimates for MAR projects, stormwater projects, and Lochaven Source Switch.

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Water Offset Estimate ¹ (AF/YR)	Status ¹	Project Development lead	Box Link
Tulalip	Lake Shoecraft	Modification of reservoir operations	~62.5 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers, Tulalip Tribes and DFW	link
Pilchuck	Lochaven Source Switch	Water right acquisition	29-42 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Ecology and PUD	link
Pilchuck	Lower Pilchuck 1	Water Right Acquisition	2.8 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan (lower priority)	WWT	link
Pilchuck	Lower Pilchuck 11	Water Right Acquisition	2.09 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan (lower priority)	WWT	link
Snoqualmie South	Raging River 1	Water right acquisition	126 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	WWT	link
Patterson	Patterson 1	Water right acquisition	27.9 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	WWT	link
Patterson	Patterson 4	Water right acquisition	71.6 AFY	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	WWT	link
Snoqualmie South	Three Forks Park MAR	Water storage and retiming – MAR	~307 AFY	Phase 2 Project Subgroup discussed; recommended change to offset estimate	GeoEngineers	link
Upper Snoqualmie	Middle Fork MAR	Water storage and retiming – MAR	~198 AFY	Phase 2 Project Subgroup discussed; recommended change to offset estimate	GeoEngineers	link
Upper Snoqualmie	NF 5700 MAR	Water storage and retiming – MAR	~307 AFY	Phase 2 Project Subgroup discussed; recommended change to offset estimate	GeoEngineers	link
Upper Snoqualmie	North Bend MAR	Water storage and retiming – MAR	~ 198 AFY	Phase 2 Project Subgroup discussed; recommended change to offset estimate	GeoEngineers	link
Snoqualmie North	Stillwater MAR	Water storage and retiming – MAR	~198 AFY	Phase 2 Project Subgroup discussed; recommended change to offset estimate	GeoEngineers	link
Snoqualmie North ²	Little Bear Stormwater	Stormwater	~27 AFY	Phase 2 - Project Subgroup discussed; Project Subgroup still considering offset estimate	Snohomish County and GeoEngineers	link
Quilceda-Allen	Quilceda stormwater project*	Stormwater	2.1 - 21 AFY/pond 0.6-7 AFY/depave	Phase 2 - Project Subgroup discussed; Project Subgroup still considering offset estimate	Snohomish Conservation District	link

² Project located in Little Bear subbasin, within WRIA 8. Offset benefits to Snoqualmie North subbasin, within WRIA 7.

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Water Offset Estimate ¹ (AF/YR)	Status ¹	Project Development lead	Box Link
Various	SVWID Comprehensive Storage Study	Storage – various types	TBD	Phase 1 – Project Subgroup to discuss September 24	Snoqualmie Valley WID	
Woods/Pilchuck/Lower-Mid Skykomish	Snohomish CD Small Farm Water Storage Pilot	Storage	TBD	Phase 1 – Project Subgroup to discuss in September 24	Snohomish CD	
Total Offset Potential			~3,060 AFY			
Offset Potential (Projects Recommended by Project Subgroup)			~822 AFY			

Notes:

AF/YR = Acre-feet per year

TBD = to be determined as part of project evaluation

¹Phases refer to project development phases described in GeoEngineers [Non-Acquisition Water Offset Project Identification Work Plan](#), dated April 4, 2020. Phase 1 = Initial Identification; Phase 2 = Prioritization and Further Analysis; Phase 3 = Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan.

*Project applied for 2020 streamflow restoration grant round.

Habitat Projects

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Quilceda-Allen	Coho Creek Relocation and Enhancement Project(2018-0400) = (07-USR-064)	Riparian	Restore fish habitat along 650 feet of Coho Creek, a type 3 tributary to Quilceda Creek. Tulalip Tribes propose to relocate and restore stream habitat conditions along approximately 650 feet of Coho Creek (WRIA #07- 0048), a type 3 tributary to Quilceda Creek, on the Tulalip Reservation.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Skykomish Mainstem	Snohomish Confluence Project (2018-0799) + Left Bank Floodplain reconnection at RM 1.5	Floodplain & Acquisition	Tulalip Tribes and partners propose to restore and enhance floodplain connection, abandoned side channels and connections to Riley Slough at and just upstream of the junction of the Skykomish and Snoqualmie rivers that we describe as the Snohomish Confluence Project.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link
Raging	Lower Raging River Floodplain Reconnection (07-MPR-196)	Floodplain	Remove up to 1500 feet of levee and revetment along the lower Raging River.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link
Raging	Raging River Left Bank Mouth Levee Removal (Bernard Memorial Park)	Floodplain	Remove up to 500 feet of levee along the left bank of the Raging River at Bernard Memorial Park at the confluence with the Snoqualmie River reconnecting 6 acres of floodplain habitat.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link
Raging	Raging River Bridge to Bridge Acquisitions (07-MPR-204) + Raging River Bridge to Bridge Floodplain Restoration	Floodplain & Acquisition	Acquire riverfront properties from willing landowners between rivermile 0.5 and 328th Way SE at rivermile 2. The intent of these acquisitions would be for future floodplain restoration projects. Remove and setback 4000 feet of levee along the right bank of the Raging River at rivermile 1.0 restoring 35 acres of floodplain.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link
Patterson	Patterson Creek Floodplain Restoration (Sub-Watershed 2C) (07-RSR-038) + Patterson Creek Floodplain Acquisitions	Floodplain, Acquisition, & Reconnection	Restore up to 30 acres of floodplain through riparian restoration and increased channel complexity; Acquire 18 acres along Patterson Creek at mile 7. Completes several phases/ projects in a stretch of creek.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	GeoEngineers	link

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Pilchuck; Woods; Estuary/Snohomish Mainstem; Little Pilchuck	Living with Beavers Program**	Beaver restoration	This project will implement beaver pond expansion and education & outreach in the Pilchuck River, French Creek, Woods Creek, and Lower Skykomish River subbasins.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Snohomish CD	
Pilchuck; Woods; Estuary/Snohomish Mainstem; Little Pilchuck	Wetland Restoration**	Riparian	This project will implement wetland restoration/riparian planting in the Pilchuck River, French Creek, Woods Creek, and Lower Skykomish River subbasins.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Snohomish CD	
Woods	Woods Creek Riparian Restoration Partnership (07-RPR-022) + Snohomish Conservation District Wetland Restoration + Action Plan approach for East Fork or West Fork	Riparian, ELJs, culvert replacement	New combination project. Plant 45 acres or riparian forest along mainstem of Woods Creek. See Woods Creek Habitat Condition Report and Sponsor's action plan.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Snohomish CD	
Sultan	Expansion of Sultan River Side Channel Network (Sultan River Floodplain Activation)*	Floodplain	This project would divert / redirect flow from the main channel of the Sultan River into off-channel areas currently used for solely for grazing. The project would tie into a remnant channel. This project would build upon similar efforts conducted in 2012.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Snohomish PUD	link
Upper Skykomish	Lower Miller River Alluvial Fan Restoration	Floodplain	Remove 0.5 miles revetment and levee along the left bank of the Miller River reconnecting 58 acres of floodplain habitat in the alluvial fan and restoring 7 acres of riparian area.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	King County	

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Skykomish Mainstem	East Monroe Heritage Site Acquisition	Acquisition	The East Monroe Heritage Site consists of 43 acres of undeveloped and vacant land. The site is located on the lower main stem of the Skykomish River in Snohomish County in Monroe. The goal is that once the property is acquired several other phases of the project will take place: riparian restoration of the nearly one-mile long oxbow channel, reconnect the river to its floodplain at the east end of the property and improve fish access to off-channel habitat.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	City of Monroe	link
Quilceda-Allen	Jones Creek Relocation and Wetland Enhancement (07-USR-034)*	Floodplain & Riparian	700 ft. channel relocation; .13 miles instream habitat treated; 5 acres riparian planting; LWD installed; Water Quality/Quantity improvements, instream habitat, flood control	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	City of Marysville	
Skykomish Mainstem	Shinglebolt Slough (07-MPR-137)	Acquisition & Floodplain	4000 ft. off channel habitat; 5 acres invasive plan control and plantings	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	Snohomish County	link
Upper Snoqualmie	South Fork Snoqualmie River Levee Setback Project (07-HRA-004) (Nintendo Project)*	Floodplain	Remove and setback 2500 feet of levee and restore 25 acres of floodplain.	Phase 3 - Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the Plan	North Bend	link
Skykomish Mainstem	Haskel Slough Connectivity (#20-11140)	Floodplain	Tulalip Tribes will complete designs, outreach and implement restoration on Haskel Slough, an approximately 2.4-mile-long (71 acre) side channel of the Skykomish River near Monroe.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	Tulalip Tribes	link

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Lower Mid-Skykomish; Upper Skykomish; Raging; Upper Snoqualmie	Tulalip Tribes Beaver Reintroduction Program	Beaver	The Tulalip Tribes will use a previously developed habitat suitability model (HSM) and site scoring card to select sites in the Snohomish watershed that are suitable & unoccupied habitat for beaver and in need of restored hydrological function. Nuisance beavers will be trapped from Snohomish, King, and Skagit County lowlands and beavers will be relocated to selected sites. Tulalip Tribes will map changes in in-stream habitat and water storage at relocation sites.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	Tulalip Tribes?	
Snoqualmie South	Fall City Floodplain Reconnection Design and Construction (2018-0296) - Left Bank and Right Bank	Floodplain	The two adjacent floodplain reconnection projects are located along the lower Snoqualmie River at rivermile 34.5. The Barfuse project will remove and set back 2000 feet of levee which will reconnect and restore up to 45 acres of floodplain habitat. The Hafner project will remove and set back 1000 feet of levee which will reconnect and restore up to 55 acres of floodplain habitat.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Snoqualmie North	Camp Gilead Levee Removal Phase 2	Floodplain	Remove 1800 feet of levee on the left bank of the Snoqualmie River at rivermile 23	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Snoqualmie North	Carnation Farm Levee Removal	Floodplain	Remove and setback 2200 feet of levee on the left bank of the Snoqualmie River at rivermile 21.5 reconnecting 48 acres of floodplain.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Snoqualmie North	McElhoe-Pearson Restoration Project (07-MPR-321)	Floodplain	Channel Connectivity/Rehabilitation/Creation - Floodplain Restoration 2,500 Linear Feet	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Snoqualmie South	Lower Tolt LB Floodplain Reconnection (SR 203 to confluence) (07-MPR-259)	Floodplain	Feasibility study to determine options for fully or partially removing existing levee/revetment in order to improve floodplain connection within a 20 acre area.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Patterson	Patterson Creek Floodplain Restoration (Sub-Watershed 2C) (07-RSR-038) + Patterson Creek Floodplain Acquisitions	Floodplain & Land Acquisition	Restore up to 30 acres of floodplain through riparian restoration and increased channel complexity; Acquire 18 acres along Patterson Creek at mile 7. Completes several phases/projects in a stretch of creek.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Estuary/Snohomish Mainstem	Thomas' Eddy Hydraulic Reconnection (07-MPR-030)	Floodplain	1,400 linear feet of levee removal, Creosote pile removal, 33 acres of plantings	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	
Skykomish Mainstem	Haskel Slough Connectivity (#20-11140).	Floodplain	Tulalip Tribes will complete designs, outreach and implement restoration on Haskel Slough, an approximately ~2.4 mile long 2.4-mile-long (71 acre) side channel of the Skykomish River near Monroe, Washington. The slough provides critical spawning and rearing habitat for Chinook salmon and other listed fish species.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	GeoEngineers	link
Pilchuck	Snohomish Floodplain Acquisitions Phase 1 (NEW)	Floodplain & Land Acquisition	Waiting for short description.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	Tulalip Tribes?	

Subbasin	Project Name	Project Type	Brief Description	Status	Project Development Lead	Box Link
Pilchuck	Pilchuck River City of Snohomish Acquisition (Pilchuck Dam Property) (07-MPR-265) / City of Snohomish Pilchuck River Property Acquisition (2018-0425)	Land Acquisition	This project includes the acquisition of a 25 acre property adjacent to the Pilchuck river and an associated off-channel wetland complex. Acquisition of the largely forested parcel will protect the property from degradation associated with future development, and will protect habitat currently being restored through dam Restoration for listed species including chinook, steelhead, bull trout, and other salmonids.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	Tulip Tribes?	
Cherry-Harris	NEW Combo Project: Cherry Creek Restoration/Cherry Valley Initiative - process-based floodplain restoration.	Floodplain & Riparian	New project combines several existing projects focused on process-based floodplain restoration. Multiple sequenced phases and sponsors, includes: Cherry Creek Restoration Phase II (07-RPR-036), Phase III (07-RPR-037), Cherry Creek Levee Setback Floodplain Restoration, etc. Multiple sequenced phases and sponsors, includes: Cherry Creek Restoration Phase II (07-RPR-036), Phase III (07-RPR-037), Cherry Creek Levee Setback Floodplain Restoration, etc. Floodplain, riparian, ELJs.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	SVWID?	
Raging	Raging River Upper Preston Reach Acquisitions (07-MPR-072)	Land Acquisition	The Raging River Upper Preston Reach Acquisitions project will acquire 7 acres on the right bank of the Raging River at rivermile 5.	Phase 2- Project Subgroup recommends for inclusion in the plan	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum	

Notes:

Additional habitat projects are under discussion by the Project Subgroup. Several Subgroup members are verifying whether project sponsors can develop project descriptions.

*Project applied for 2020 streamflow restoration grant round.

**Project received streamflow restoration funding in pilot grant round.

995 **Chapter Six: Policy Recommendations, Adaptive**
996 **Management, and Implementation**

997
998 **6.1 Plan Implementations and Adaptive Management**

999 *[Comment 9: Including an adaptive management plan in the watershed plan is optional but*
1000 *recommended by Ecology’s Final NEB Guidance. The facilitation team drafted this adaptive*
1001 *management chapter template. The WRIA 7 Committee is still developing the adaptive*
1002 *management plan.]*
1003

1004 The WRIA 7 Committee supports an adaptive management process for implementation of the
1005 WRIA 7 watershed plan. Adaptive management is an iterative and systematic decision-making
1006 process that aims to reduce uncertainty over time and help meet project, action, and plan
1007 performance goals by learning from the implementation and outcomes of projects and actions
1008 (Ecology 2019). Adaptive management will help address uncertainty and provide more
1009 reasonable assurance for plan implementation. To the extent possible, each of the
1010 recommendations put forth by the committee include a funding mechanism.”

1011 **Existing Challenges**

1012 The WRIA 7 Committee identified the following challenges in the planning process and seeks to
1013 address these challenges through monitoring and adaptive management:

- 1014 • Challenge X
1015 • Challenge Y
1016 • Challenge Z

1017 The WRIA 7 Committee initially identified a list of potential recommendations. After iterative
1018 rounds of discussion, the Committee narrowed the recommendations in this section to those
1019 that both supported the goals identified above and had the support of the full Committee.
1020 Committee members identified as the implementing entity for each recommendation
1021 committed to investigating the feasibility of the recommendation.

1022 The WRIA 7 Committee supports the following:

1023 **Adaptive Management Recommendation #1 Name**

1024 Proposed implementing entity: [Identify entity who is expected to implement the
1025 recommendation]

1026 Recommendation: [Short description of the recommendation]

1027 Purpose: [Sentence to justify the recommendation. State the goal/purpose/desired outcome of
1028 the recommendation. Clearly identify what problem this is intended to solve and its
1029 relationship to 90.94. Short and succinct.]

1030 Funding source: [Identify the funding source: new funding request or use existing resources.]

1031 Additional information or resources (if applicable): [provide links to Committee webpage,
1032 reference the appendix, or other resources]

1033 6.2 Policy and Regulatory Recommendations

1034 *[Comment 10: Policy and regulatory recommendations are optional elements of the watershed*
1035 *plan. The following proposals were submitted by policy leads for consideration by the WRIA 7*
1036 *Committee and have been summarized by the facilitation team and/or policy leads for inclusion*
1037 *in the draft watershed plan. Committee members should thoroughly review the proposed policy*
1038 *recommendations and flag any serious concerns. The Committee has not yet indicated full*
1039 *support to include each of the following policy proposals in the watershed plan. Policy proposals*
1040 *that are not supported by the full Committee will not be included in the final plan.]*

1041 The Streamflow Restoration law lists optional elements committees may consider including in
1042 the watershed plan to manage water resources for the WRIA or a portion of the WRIA (RCW
1043 90.94.030(3)(f)). The WRIA 7 Committee included what they have termed “policy and
1044 regulatory recommendations” in the watershed plan to show support for programs, policies,
1045 and regulatory actions that would contribute to the goal of streamflow restoration. When
1046 similar concepts arose from multiple Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committees,
1047 the WRIA 7 Committee coordinated with those other Committees to put forward common
1048 language for inclusion in the watershed plans, when appropriate. Coordination also occurred
1049 for jurisdictions that cross multiple watersheds. All projects and actions the WRIA 7 Committee
1050 intended to count toward the required consumptive use offset or Net Ecological Benefit are
1051 included in Chapter 5: Projects and Actions.¹⁴

1052 As required by the NEB Guidance, the WRIA 7 Committee prepared the watershed plan with
1053 implementation in mind. However, as articulated in the Streamflow Restoration Policy and
1054 Interpretive Statement (POL-2094), “RCW 90.94.020 and 90.94.030 do not create an obligation
1055 on any party to ensure that plans, or projects and actions in those plans or associated with
1056 rulemaking, are implemented.”

1057 [To be included when appropriate] The WRIA 7 Committee initially identified a list of potential
1058 policy and regulatory recommendations. After iterative rounds of discussion, the Committee
1059 narrowed the recommendations in this section to those that both supported the goal of

¹⁴ “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.” Streamflow Restoration Policy and Interpretive Statement, POL-2094

1060 streamflow restoration and had the support of the full Committee. Committee members
1061 identified as the implementing entity for each recommendation are committed to investigating
1062 the feasibility of the recommendation. The identification and listing of these policy and
1063 regulatory recommendations is directly from the WRIA 7 Committee members and is not
1064 endorsed or opposed by Ecology.

1065 The WRIA 7 Committee supports the following recommendations:

1066 *[Comment 11: The following proposals were submitted by policy leads for consideration by the*
1067 *WRIA 7 Committee and have been summarized by the facilitation team and/or policy leads for*
1068 *inclusion in the draft watershed plan. The Committee has not yet indicated full support to*
1069 *include each proposal in the WRE Plan.]*

1070 **1. Well reporting upgrades**

1071 **Proposed implementing entity:**

1072 Ecology

1073 **Recommendation:**

1074 Change the Ecology well tracking system in the following ways, in order to efficiently and
1075 transparently track the number and location of permit-exempt wells in use:

- 1076 • Implement a web-based well report form that mimics the current well report forms, and
1077 that uploads directly to Ecology’s database with Ecology verification;
- 1078 • Require coordinates (latitude and longitude) of wells on well report forms, and
1079 implement an intuitive web tool for well drillers which automatically provides the Public
1080 Lands Survey (PLS) location and coordinates for a new well;
- 1081 • Identify permit-exempt wells on well report forms; and
- 1082 • Provide Well ID Tag numbers to older wells, and associate well decommissioning,
1083 replacement, or other well activities with the Well ID Tag.

1084 **Purpose:**

1085 Directly and efficiently address identified shortcomings in Ecology’s existing well tracking
1086 database and reporting protocols. Accurate tracking of the locations and features of permit-
1087 exempt wells will support the WRIA 7 Committee’s desire to engage in monitoring and adaptive
1088 management after adoption of the watershed plan.

1089 **Funding sources:**

1090 Leverage existing resources and efforts currently underway through the Ecology Well
1091 Construction Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and other departmental means. Additional
1092 funding from the Washington State Legislature or local permitting fees to increase capacity for
1093 Ecology to verify well reports may aid in implementing this recommendation in a timely
1094 manner.

1095 **Additional information or resources:**

1096 Ecology’s well report location accuracy studies

1097 [Note: we will add a link to this resource later]

1098 **2. Encourage conservation through connections to public**
1099 **water**

1100 **Proposed implementing entities:**

1101 County and city planning departments; public utilities and other water purveyors; Ecology;
1102 Department of Health.

1103 **Recommendation:**

- 1104 • Adopt and implement consistent and coordinated policies that reduce dependence on
1105 water use from PE wells and promote connections to municipal and regional water
1106 supplies.
- 1107 • Water purveyors and county/city land use planners explore opportunities to extend
1108 water distribution systems further into their individual service areas, particularly where
1109 rapid rural growth is anticipated.
- 1110 • Develop cost-benefit analysis and fiscal implications to (1) fund programs to support
1111 connections to public water systems and (2) gain political support.

1112 **Purpose:**

1113 Reduce uncertainty about future streamflow and aquifer impacts from PE wells. Encourage
1114 state/local policies and funding to support streamflow objectives within the watershed plan.
1115 Demonstrate the WRIA 7 Committee’s endorsement of encouraging conservation through
1116 promoting connections to public water systems.

1117 **Funding sources:**

1118 Fees collected through local permitting processes; pass-through fees associated with well
1119 maintenance services collected by service providers; state or local rate increases or taxes.

1120 **Additional information or resources:**

1121 [Policy lead can add links here if desired or delete]

1122 **3. Development and use of reclaimed water**

1123 *[Comment 12: Any recommendation for Ecology to undergo rulemaking is at the discretion of*
1124 *Director. Ecology would balance its available resources with potential other Program*
1125 *rulemaking efforts statewide. Rulemaking is a public process to develop new or amend/ repeal*
1126 *existing rule language and input from all entities is considered equally. Ecology cannot*
1127 *guarantee the outcome of a rulemaking process]*

1128 **Proposed implementing entities:**

1129 Washington State Legislature; Ecology.

1130 **Recommendation:**

1131 Enact and promulgate state laws, rules, and regulations that encourage the development and
1132 use of reclaimed water, for example:

- 1133 • Integrate reclaimed water into regional water quality and water quantity planning.

- 1134 • Reduce risks and disincentives in the Trust Water Rights Program for water right holders
1135 willing to switch to reclaimed water.
- 1136 • Address public concerns and enhance public education regarding the health and safety
1137 of reclaimed water and wastewater treatment.
- 1138 • Encourage the development of streamflow restoration projects that use reclaimed
1139 water.
- 1140 • Encourage developers to integrate rainwater and/or reclaimed water into their projects

1141 **Purpose:**

1142 Offset water that would otherwise be diverted from the finite supply in rivers and streams.
1143 Preserve natural high-quality instream flow. Reduce the amount of treated wastewater
1144 discharged into receiving water bodies. Create water supply options and enhance resiliency
1145 against drought and climate change.

1146 **Funding sources:**

1147 If Ecology does not have capacity do this work with existing staffing and resources, the WRIA 7
1148 Committee recommends the Washington State Legislature provide additional funding.

1149 **Additional information or resources:**

1150 [Policy lead can add links here if desired or delete]

1151 **4. Voluntary permit exempt well metering program**

1152 **Proposed implementing entity:**

1153 Ecology; King and/or Snohomish Counties; King and/or Snohomish Conservation Districts.

1154 **Recommendation:**

1155 Pilot a voluntary five-year program in one or more WRIA 7 subbasins to meter permit-exempt
1156 wells (indoor and outdoor residential use). Supplement the voluntary metering program with a
1157 robust education and community engagement program about water consumption and
1158 conservation.

1159 **Purpose:**

1160 Increase confidence in assumptions made regarding the average water use of individual PE well
1161 users to inform the adaptive management process and future water management and planning
1162 efforts. Data could inform (1) growth policies and patterns, (2) where to target incentives and
1163 education/outreach programs, and (3) where to place resources across subbasins to help
1164 improve streamflow, water levels, and temperature.

1165 **Funding sources:**

1166 General operation or appropriated funds from (1) the state, (2) counties, and/or (3)
1167 conservation districts related to water, habitat preservation (salmon recovery), or housing.
1168 Environmental grants.

1169 **Additional information or resources:**

1170 [Policy lead can add links here if desired or delete]

1171

1172 [Comment 13: Policy recommendations 5 and 6 were developed through a cross-WRIA
1173 workgroup and were tailored to WRIA 7 by the WRIA 7 policy lead.]
1174

1175 **5. Water conservation education & incentives program**

1176 **Proposed implementing entity:**

1177 Ecology and counties; with support from conservation districts and non-governmental
1178 organizations.

1179 **Recommendation:**

1180 Ecology partners with counties and conservation districts to develop and implement outreach
1181 and incentives programs that encourage rural landowners with PE wells to (1) reduce their
1182 indoor and outdoor water use through water conservation best practices; and (2) comply with
1183 drought and other water use restrictions.

1184 **Purpose:**

1185 Raise awareness of the impacts PE well water usage has on (1) groundwater levels and (2) the
1186 connection to streams and rivers. Supplement water offset and restoration projects, especially
1187 in subbasins critical for fish and where water offsets were difficult to find.

1188 **Funding sources:**

1189 Potential funding sources could include: new funding from Washington State Legislature; grants
1190 (e.g., Ecology’s Streamflow Restoration Grant Program); allocation of Ecology resources; fees
1191 associated with new PE wells; contributions from local governments and tribes; part of county
1192 or conservation district ongoing education, outreach and incentive program.

1193 **Additional information or resources:**

1194 [Policy lead can add links here if desired or delete]

1195 **6. Statewide mandatory water conservation measures in** 1196 **unincorporated areas of the state during drought**

1197 [Comment 14: Any recommendation for Ecology to undergo rulemaking is at the discretion of
1198 Director. Ecology would balance its available resources with potential other Program
1199 rulemaking efforts statewide. Rulemaking is a public process to develop new or amend/ repeal
1200 existing rule language and input from all entities is considered equally. Ecology cannot
1201 guarantee the outcome of a rulemaking process]

1202 **Proposed implementing entity:**

1203 Washington State Legislature, Ecology, or counties.

1204 **Recommendation:**

- 1205 • Consider implementing mandatory water conservation measures for PE well users in
1206 unincorporated areas of the state during drought events. Measures would focus on

1207 limiting outdoor water use, with exemptions for growing food or for those participating
1208 in a FireWise program. Washington State Legislature could require Ecology or counties
1209 to implement water conservation policies.

- 1210 • Ecology could write a rule to require water conservation measures.
- 1211 • County councils and commissions could pass ordinances mandating water conservation.

1212

1213 **Purpose:**

1214 Reduce water usage from PE well users during drought. Reduce impacts on streamflows from
1215 PE well users and support net ecological benefit goals. Increase climate change resilience.

1216 **Funding sources:**

1217 Potential funding sources could include new funding from Washington State Legislature;
1218 allocation of existing Ecology resources; fees associated with new PE wells.

1219 **Additional information or resources:**

1220 [https://www.nfpa.org/-/media/Files/Public-Education/Resources/Safety-tip-](https://www.nfpa.org/-/media/Files/Public-Education/Resources/Safety-tip-sheets/WildfireRiskReductionSafetyTips.pdf)
1221 [sheets/WildfireRiskReductionSafetyTips.pdf](https://www.nfpa.org/-/media/Files/Public-Education/Resources/Safety-tip-sheets/WildfireRiskReductionSafetyTips.pdf)

1222

1223 *[Comment 15: Recommendation 7 was developed by the City of Arlington and was not discussed*
1224 *at the cross-WRIA policy group. Please provide your comments on this proposal in the comment*
1225 *tracker.]*

1226 **7. Correction of impediments to sustainable watershed**
1227 **restoration and streamflow enhancement**

1228 *[Comment 16: Any recommendation for Ecology to undergo rulemaking is at the discretion of*
1229 *Director. Ecology would balance its available resources with potential other Program*
1230 *rulemaking efforts statewide. Rulemaking is a public process to develop new or amend/ repeal*
1231 *existing rule language and input from all entities is considered equally. Ecology cannot*
1232 *guarantee the outcome of a rulemaking process]*

1233 **Proposed implementing entities:**

1234 Legislature

1235

1236 **Recommendation:**

1237 The WRIA 7 WREC watershed Plan has been successfully conceived because of the steadfast
1238 effort of its highly diverse membership. However, it is heartily agreed and resolved that
1239 successful implementation of the watershed plan will require the Legislature to specifically
1240 close regulatory loopholes and increase reliance on regulated utilities for integrated water
1241 management using basin water budgets. It must begin to overhaul RCW in serial or segmented
1242 fashion to:

1243

- 1244 • Increase reliance on public utilities for water supplies

- 1245 • Decrease difficulties utilities have for securing water supplies
- 1246 • Reduce proliferation of permit exempt wells
- 1247 • Align exemptions to water right permitting (e.g., as for individual domestic wells) with
- 1248 the whole of Washington water law
- 1249 • Revise its regulatory schema with a generous influx of integrated systems considerations
- 1250 such as: continuum of surface and groundwater flows; reconsideration of consumptive
- 1251 and non-consumptive use definitions; recycling and reuse; etc.
- 1252

1253 **Purpose:**

1254 The policy lobbies the Legislature to prevent consumptive water impacts from exempt wells,
1255 particularly by closing several loopholes observed by the Committee that served as
1256 impediments to completion of the Plan. One example is current law involving permit-exempt
1257 wells that allows the proliferation of permit-exempt wells in areas where Ecology and other
1258 basin stakeholders have found no water exists to be appropriated. The policy identifies that
1259 water management via more readily regulated utilities is preferred over the third-party (i.e.,
1260 Committee-based) mitigation of exempt well impacts through selective reduction of others'
1261 legal, beneficial uses of water.

1262

1263 **Funding Sources:**

1264 Would be identified by legislature.

1265

1266 **Additional information or resources:**

1267 [Policy lead can add links here if desired or delete]

6.2 DRAFT Adaptive Management Approach

Draft 20200908

[Comment: The facilitation team drafted this adaptive management section based on the previous discussions and input received during WREC meetings and input from a subset of committee members. A subset of committee members reviewed an earlier version and some met to discuss. The version below is a summary of those suggestions and discussions – not all suggestions were incorporated directly in order to accommodate format, consistent level of specificity, or due to a lack of consensus among small group. Please note that some new content may actually be policy recommendations and eventually move to that part of the plan if approved.]

The WRIA 7 Committee supports an adaptive management process for implementation of the WRIA 7 watershed plan. Adaptive management is defined in the Net Ecological Benefit Guidance as "an interactive and systematic decision-making process that aims to reduce uncertainty over time and help meet project, action, and plan performance goals by learning from the implementation and outcomes of projects and actions. [Note: the Committee can use the definition for adaptive management provided in Ecology's Final NEB Guidance or modify the definition]. Adaptive management will help address uncertainty and increase assurance of achieving plan objectives by identifying and integrating additional information, data, and research (including that related to climate change impacts on hydrology) that may assist with future design and implementation of projects. It will also support the improved coordination of water resources noted in Section 1.1. To the extent possible, each of the recommendations put forth by the committee includes a funding mechanism.

6.2.1 Existing Challenges

- Our global climate is changing. While the effects of climate change over the 20-year life of this Plan cannot be precisely known, shifts in climatic conditions will influence the hydrologic regime in the watershed and will impact instream flows. Rainfall, snowmelt, and evapotranspiration have been identified as the primary mechanisms driving changes in groundwater storage. These mechanisms will be affected by a changing climate. Air and water temperatures will increase and summer streamflows will be reduced. Groundwater pumping and indirect effects of irrigation and land use changes will impact groundwater resources and the availability for future water supply and instream flows. The Committee recognizes that a successful plan must acknowledge that climate is changing and include a mechanism to ensure that the statutory requirements to offset water withdrawals by new permit exempt wells and provide net ecological benefit will be met under future climatic conditions.
- Projects identified in the plan are expected to increase groundwater storage and augment instream flows as they are implemented and provide aquatic habitat benefits, but without significant investment in further detailed feasibility studies and identification of project sponsors, many projects remain highly conceptual.
- There is some uncertainty that offset and habitat projects will continue to function as designed, and generate streamflow benefit to offset PE well consumptive use and NEB under a changing climate.
- The adaptive management provisions of this plan should assist with identifying the importance of monitoring and assessing the validity of the estimated offset projections as the plan is implemented to determine whether projects are functioning as designed and as hydrologic

Commented [J1(1): For reference: WRIA 7 Committee expressed interest in the following committee meetings:
-Track projects and PE wells by subbasin – **addressed below**

-Review trends for new PE wells and projects to ensure projects are being implemented where new PE wells are being drilled – **addressed below**

-Track habitat conditions – **not addressed yet/may be addressed already**

-Meet periodically – **placeholder but needs work**

-Manage project list to shift in the sequence or prioritization of projects – **addressed below**

Leverage existing monitoring efforts – **addressed below**

Commented [J1(2): Does the Committee want to develop its own definition of adaptive management, or keep the definition from the Final NEB Guidance? The small group did not have specific changes or suggestions.

conditions change over time to allow for course corrections where; however, current policy does not allow for projects to be added after the plan is finalized and approved, nor is it clear who “owns” the implementation and adaptive management of the plan.

- Defining precise thresholds and trigger points for course correction or identifying an adequate response to adaptively manage when thresholds are reached is desired by the Committee, but may be beyond the capacity of the committee and plan development timeline.
- The Committee identified uncertainties associated with the PE well projection. One of these uncertainties is that the methods used to generate the PE well projection assumes that in the 2018-2038 period, growth and irrigation practices will mirror past trends and practices. New PE wells and irrigation patterns require monitoring to determine if the number of new PE wells and associated consumptive use exceeds the volume that was forecast for purposes of the Plan.

To address the above challenges, the WRIA 7 Committee recommends the following implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management strategies, and for each proposes an implementing entity, roles and responsibilities, funding mechanisms, and resulting actions.

6.2.2 Implementation Recommendations

The Committee developed the following implementation recommendations to address the challenges identified above. [To be included as appropriate]: The recommendations in this section have the full support of the Committee. Committee members identified as the implementing entity for each recommendation committed to investigating the feasibility of the recommendation.

The WRIA 7 Committee supports the following [Note: may move the first three to the policy recommendations section if approved]:

1. Funding for Adaptive Management

The WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee recommends that the legislature provide funding and a structure to monitor plan implementation (including tracking of new permit exempt wells and project implementation by subbasin) and develop a process to adaptively manage implementation if offsets and Net Ecological Benefit is not being met as envisioned by the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan.

2. Additional Funding for Project Implementation

The WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee recommends that Department of Ecology track the funds requested against available capital funding for the annual Streamflow Grant Program, and revise grant guidance or request additional funds from the legislature to fully implement the offset and NEB projects identified in each plan commensurate with the pace of development.

3. Adding projects to the plan

The WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee recommends that the legislature allow the Department of Ecology to accept, review, and approve addendums to the Plan. Addendums may include the addition of new projects by subbasin, with justification and approval by the full committee as part of an adaptive management process.

4. Implement a Process and Program for Tracking PE Wells and Project Implementation

The WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee has identified the need to track streamflow restoration projects and new domestic permit-exempt wells to: 1.) improve the capacity to conduct implementation monitoring of streamflow restoration projects and actions, 2.) develop grant funding opportunities and track associated costs, and 3.) provide a template for adaptively managing emergent streamflow restoration needs. The Committee recommends piloting the Salmon Recovery Portal (<https://srp.rco.wa.gov/about>), managed by the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), for satisfying these needs. The implementation of project tracking through a pilot program using the Salmon Recovery Portal will be coordinated by the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife in collaboration with the Washington Department of Ecology, and RCO. To improve harmonization of streamflow restoration with ongoing salmon recovery efforts, local salmon recovery Lead Entity Coordinators shall be consulted prior to initial data uploads. University of Washington data stewards will be employed to conduct data entry, quality assurance, and quality control (see *Supplemental document: project tracking*).

Additional Information or Resources:

[WDFW proposed project tracking supplement](#)

Commented [J1(3): The Committee can include a link to information or we may be able to include in an appendix.

5. Continue monitoring of streamflow and groundwater levels

This Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan is one of many water resource management efforts underway in WRIA 7. Understanding the status and trends of streamflow in the basin will assist with adaptively managing this plan. The Committee understands that neither the impact of individual projects nor new permit exempt wells would be tracked through monitoring streamflow or groundwater levels, but the Committee believes that monitoring assists with an overall understanding for the hydrology in the basin.

The Committee recommends that agencies with current or planned gauging stations and groundwater monitoring programs continue funding and/or seek supplemental funding sources to ensure that monitoring continues and the data is publicly available. This includes counties, Department of Ecology, USGS, and other relevant entities.

Additional Information or Resources:

[Existing streamflow and groundwater monitoring](#)

6. Continue studies that improve understanding of WRIA 7 hydrology

The Committee supports the continuation or initiation of research, models, and additional datasets that provide regional, basin-wide and site-specific information to better understand the hydrology of WRIA 7 and inform the adaptive management of the plan (examples may include the recent Snoqualmie Indian Tribe's forest gap study, UW Climate Impacts Group Research, Velma modeling, and others).

7. Monitor projects for effectiveness

The Committee supports project sponsors incorporating project effectiveness monitoring into the cost and implementation of offset projects to ensure that projects continue to function as designed, and generate streamflow benefit to offset PE well consumptive use under a changing climate.

6.2.3 Adaptive Management Recommendations

1. Adaptive management process and roles

The Committee recommends meeting every other year to review and discuss updated information on plan implementation. The Committee anticipates reviewing information on the location and number of new PE wells and the status and outcomes of project implementation, as identified in the Plan. The Committee may meet more frequently if it determines that triggers/thresholds are being met.

[Requesting input from Committee members]

This watershed plan is narrow in scope and is not intended to address all water uses or related issues within the watershed. If a more comprehensive approach is developed to improve coordination of water resources for both instream and out of stream uses that result in improvements in WRIA 7 watershed health, the Committee will support development of a similarly collaborative and comprehensive planning process. It is expected that the planning process would need to expand to include representatives of all relevant entities in order to address all water resource needs, ensure sustained cooperation, and ultimately improved streamflow.

2. Triggers for Reconvening the Committee to Adaptively Manage the Plan

The Committee has identified the following information that ~~could~~ would facilitate adaptive management of the plan and identification of additional offset projects, if needed.

[Requesting input from Committee members]

3. Evaluate the Accuracy of PE well and Consumptive Use Projections at a Subbasin Scale

The Committee recommends evaluating the cumulative number of PE wells each calendar year tracked by both King and Snohomish County annually between January 2018 and December 2038 to identify how trends compare to projections. The Committee also recommends reviewing results of the voluntary metering pilot identified in Section 6.1 to identify whether assumptions in the consumptive use projection should be changed.

[Requesting input from Committee members]

Commented [J1(4): Committee input requested on frequency of meeting & convener.

Commented [J1(5): This language was developed in response to comments on Chapter 1. As worded, it is not an active recommendation directed to any entity. Does the Committee want to make this a recommendation? e.g. to the legislature?

Commented [J1(6): Committee input requested on thresholds: level of specificity; include in plan now or develop as part of adaptive management process?

Examples provided by the small group include:
XX Percentage above predicted number of new PE wells
XX percentage above expected PE well water consumption rates
XX no of projects for water offset and NEB goals not being implemented in subbasins as identified

Commented [J1(7): Committee clarification requested: Is the Committee the implementer of this recommendation?

1268

Chapter Seven: Net Ecological Benefit

1269 *[Comment 17: Chapter Seven (Net Ecological Benefit) is optional but recommended by Ecology’s*
 1270 *Final NEB Guidance. The WRIA 7 Committee has not yet agreed on whether to include Chapter*
 1271 *Seven. Below is a template for the chapter, for the Committee’s consideration.]*

1272 7.1 Water Offsets

- 1273 • Compare the total WRIA offset to the total WRIA consumptive use estimate
- 1274 • Compare the total WRIA offset to the safety factor/offset target if applicable.
- 1275 • Determine if the watershed plan has succeeded in offsetting the impacts at the WRIA
- 1276 level.
- 1277 • State how these projects provide additional benefits to instream resources beyond those
- 1278 necessary to offset the impacts from new consumptive water use within the WRIA
- 1279 boundary.
- 1280 • State how adaptive management provides additional certainty, if applicable.
- 1281 • Include a clear statement of the planning group’s finding that the combined components
- 1282 of the watershed plan do or do not achieve a NEB.

1283 Table 9: Summary of WRIA 7 Water Offset Projects

Project Number	Project Name	Project Short Description (one sentence)	Subbasin	Estimated Water Offset Benefits (AF/YR)	Project Included in Offset Calculations/NEB Analysis
1	Project A		A	50	No
2	Project B		A	160	Yes
3	Project C		B	150	Yes

1284 [NOTE: Some projects that are in the plan may be very general and the Committee can decide
 1285 not to count them toward net ecological benefit, e.g. a project to encourage PE well users to
 1286 connect to water service]

1287 Table 10: Subbasin Water Offset Totals Compared to Permit-Exempt Well Consumptive Use
 1288 Impacts

Subbasin	Offset Project Totals (AF/YR)	Permit-Exempt Well Consumptive Use (AF/YR)	Difference (AF/YR)
A	210	170	40
B	150	152	-2
C	0	50	-50

Subbasin	Offset Project Totals (AF/YR)	Permit-Exempt Well Consumptive Use (AF/YR)	Difference (AF/YR)
D	165	97	68
All	140		140
TOTAL	665	469	196

1289

1290

7.2 Habitat Benefits

1291

- Summarize types of projects and anticipated benefits and limiting factors addressed.

1292

- Summarize the distribution of projects among the subbasins and the streams that will benefit.

1293

1294

- State how these projects provide additional benefits to instream resources beyond those necessary to offset the impacts from new consumptive water use within the WRIA boundary.

1295

1296

1297

Table 11. Summary of WRIA 7 Habitat Improvement Projects

Project Number	Project Name	Project Short Description (one sentence)	Subbasin	River Miles Benefitted	Other Benefits with Quantifiable Metric (e.g. structures per mile)	Limiting Factor(s) Addressed	Project Included in NEB Analysis
1			A				
7			B				
8			C				
9			C				
10			D				

1298

1299

7.3 Adaptive Management and Policy Recommendations

1300

1301

- If applicable, reference Chapter 6 and how that increases certainty of achieving NEB.

1302 **7.4 NEB Evaluation Findings**

- 1303
- 1304
- 1305
- 1306
- Include a clear statement of the Committee’s finding that the combined components of the watershed plan do or do not achieve a NEB. For example: “The WRIA X Committee finds that this watershed plan achieves a net ecological benefit, as required by RCW 90.94.030 and defined by the Final NEB Guidance (Ecology 2019).”

1307

DRAFT