



SEPTEMBER 2020 MEETING SUMMARY

Cedar-Sammamish (WRIA 8)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee

September 24, 2020 | 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. | [Committee website](#)

Location

WebEx

Committee Chair

Stephanie Potts
Stephanie.Potts@ecy.wa.gov
425-649-7138

Next Meeting

October 29
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
WebEx

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates*

John McClellan, *Alderwood Water & Wastewater District*
Dan Von Seggern, *Center for Environmental Law and Policy*
Evan Swanson, *Kent*
Denise Di Santo, *King County*
Rick Reinlasoder, *King County Agriculture Program*
Gina Clark, *Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties*
Carla Carlson, *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe*

Terri Strandberg, *Snohomish County*
Matt Baerwalde, *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*
Ann Harrie (alternate), *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*
Kurt Nelson, *Tulalip Tribes*
Stewart Reinbold, *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*
Ingria Jones (alternate), *Washington State Department of Ecology*
Allen Quynn, *City of Issaquah*
Janet Geer, *City of Bothell*
Aaron Moldver, *City of Redmond*

Cities caucus members: Bellevue, Bothell, Issaquah, Kenmore, Redmond, and Sammamish

Committee Members Not in Attendance*

City of Seattle

WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council, ex officio

Other Attendees

Gretchen Muller (facilitator), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Caroline Burney (information manager), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Bridget August (technical consultant), *GeoEngineers*
Joe Hovenkotter, *King County*

Kelsey Taylor, *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*
John Covert, *Washington State Department of Ecology*
Stacy Vynne, *McKinstry, Washington State Department of Ecology*

* Attendees list is based on roll call and participants signed into WebEx.

Standing Business

Facilitator reviewed the agenda. *No revisions to the agenda.*

Chair did not receive comments on the meeting summary. The Committee voted to approve the August WRIA 8 WREC meeting summary, with the cities caucus rep abstaining. The final version will be posted on the Committee website.

Updates and Announcements

Updates from Ecology.

- Ecology furlough day on Friday, September 25.
- Ecology expects grant awards to be announced soon.
- WDFW resources: [Literature review](#) and [abstract bibliography](#) produced by Washington State University and contracted by WDFW. Documents provide additional context and information regarding the effectiveness of management strategies to restore streamflows.
- Distributed the [draft WRE plan](#) on 9/14. Comments due 5pm 10/19.
- Remaining WRIA 8 WREC meetings:
 - October 29
 - November 18
 - February 25

Public Comment

No comments.

Projects

Objectives:

- Recap of September 17 Technical Workgroup meeting.
- Comprehensive review of projects that are included in the plan.
- Discuss and decide on project tiering.

Reference materials:

- [Project devt. tracking sheet & maps](#)
- [Project tiering discussion guide](#)
- [Proposed tiering spreadsheet](#)
- [Revised section 5.2.3 Prospective Projects](#)

Technical workgroup update

- Workgroup discussed:
 - Whether to add Cedar River MAR or reservoir project to the list.
 - Tiering the project list.
 - Safety factor proposals.

Project list discussion

- Ecology worked with King County Ag on developing a project description for Sammamish River irrigation water rights.
 - Up to 400 af/year for water rights acquisitions within or upstream of the Sammamish agricultural production district (about half of the WWT estimated as consumptive use for 5 water rights).
- Workgroup recommendations:
 - Add Cedar reservoir release project to 5.2.3 Prospective Projects and Actions.
 - SPU needs to have internal conversations to confirm support for this approach.

- Add a Cedar MAR project to 5.2.3 Prospective Projects and Actions.
 - Remove North Creek Streamflow augmentation from project list.
 - Change offset estimate for pre-ID water right #4 (Darigold) to 286 af because that is the amount of water currently in trust as a temporary donation.
- Section 5.2.3 'Prospective Projects and Actions' lists the types of projects that the Committee supports if they are developed in the future:
 - Water rights acquisitions
 - Incentives for PE well users to connect to water systems
 - Water conservation education and outreach
 - Beneficial source switches: surface to groundwater, or surface/groundwater to recycled water
 - Levee setbacks, floodplain restoration
 - Offset projects in subbasins that have higher CU
- Workgroup discussed two projects last week: Cedar MAR and Cedar reservoir operations
 - Recommended including them in the plan by adding them to prospective projects in section 5.2.3.
 - Stephanie worked with Eric and Carla on draft language (see [revised section 5.2.3](#))

Discussion:

- The committee discussed adding language in italics to Section 5.2.3: "Projects or programs that support connections of existing homes on exempt wells to public water systems *without impacting critical areas or indirectly encouraging development outside of UGAs.*"
- Kurt said he would review section 5.2.3 and provide comments as part of the draft plan review.
- Matt shared that he thought section 5.2.3 looked good.
- Denise shared that the water right for 60 Acres Park is not on the project list but should be.
 - **Post meeting update:** *Stephanie had been discussing this project with King County and was waiting on confirmation that King County and King County Ag supported including it on the project list. Received that confirmation on 9/30.*
 - Committee members should review the [project profile](#) and let Stephanie know by 10/19 if you have concerns about adding that project to the list as a tier 1 project.

Next steps:

- Stephanie will update the language in Section 5.2.3 Prospective projects: "Projects or programs that support connections of existing homes on exempt wells to public water systems *without impacting critical areas or indirectly encouraging development outside of UGAs.*"
- Committee members should review the [60 Acres Park water right project profile](#) and let Stephanie know by 10/19 if you have concerns about including that project on the list.

Project tiering

- The technical workgroup discussed tiering, specifically (1) how project tiering relates to CU estimate and safety factor/offset target, (2) the key characteristics of Tier 1 projects, and (3) which tier to assign to water offset projects and habitat projects.
- Workgroup discussion:
 - Workgroup was not interested in using tiering to identify priorities for funding. The workgroup recommended adding language in Chapter 5 to clarify that water offset projects are tiered separately than habitat projects and Committee's priority is to fund water offset projects.

- Discussed adding language to Adaptive Management Chapter saying that the intent of tiering was to identify projects with more certainty and that will change over time.
- For water offset projects, recommend tiering based on project certainty related to implementation
- Recommendation from workgroup for water offset tiering:
 - Tier 1:
 - Overdale water right acquisition (pre-identified #2)
 - Wayne golf course water right acquisition (pre-identified #7)
 - Riverbend Mobile Home Park water right acquisition (pre-identified #9)
 - Pre-identified #4 (Darigold)
 - Pre-identified #8 (Chateau Saint Michelle)
 - Sammamish River Valley irrigation water rights acquisition (#1, 3, 4, 5, 7)
 - Recycled Water MAR - Sammamish River Valley
 - Recycled Water MAR - Snohomish County
 - Tier 2:
 - Pre-identified #1 (Sahalee Country Club)
 - Pre-identified #5 water right acquisition (Maplewood golf course)
 - The workgroup did not come up with a recommendation on habitat project tiering. Carla and Eric volunteered to work on that after the meeting and develop a habitat project tiering proposal that considers the location of the project and whether consumptive use is offset in that subbasin.
- Carla explained how they tiered the projects by looking at projects for each subbasin. They used the certainty of implementation and the priority subbasin category (which all of the projects were in) as the criteria.
 - Those with a high level of certainty are in Tier 1.
 - The two water offset projects in Tier 2 (pre-identified water right 1 and pre-identified water right 5) have less certainty due to the following concerns:
 - 1) Whether the projects have already been transferred to the local water district (pre-identified 1: Sahalee Country Club).
 - 2) Whether the water supply is already municipal.
 - 3) There have not been conversations with the city (pre-identified 5: Maplewood golf course).
 - Water offset deficits are in Bear Evans and Lower Cedar subbasins. Carla and Eric applied the habitat projects in those basins as going towards meeting the deficit for the subbasin water offset.
 - Tier 1 habitat projects are multibenefit (likely to provide streamflow benefit based on project type) and are located in subbasins that need additional offset. Tier 2 habitat projects are less certain about offset potential and/or are located in subbasins with greater water offset volumes.
 - Proposed tier 1 habitat projects:
 - Royal Arch Reach Acquisitions and Floodplain Reconnection
 - Elliot Bridge Acquisitions and Floodplain Restoration
 - WPA Levee Removal
 - Rutledge-Johnson Lower (a) and Rutledge-Johnson/Rhode (b)
 - Reconnection of Wetland 69
 - Seawest Granston/Middle Bear Creek Natural Area Restoration Project
 - Little Bit Restoration Project
 - Proposed tier 2 habitat projects
 - Carey/Holder/Issaquah Confluence Restoration
 - Issaquah Creek In-Stream & Riparian Restoration - Lake Sammamish State Park

- Little Bear instream projects
- Cutthroat Creek Restoration at Carousel Ranch and Little Bear instream projects
- Wayne Sammamish Restoration
- Reconnect Wetland 38
- Lake Sammamish Creeks habitat restoration projects
- North Creek Beaver Dam Analog/Log Jam Installation
- They categorized stormwater projects as a separate tier (Tier 3) – they don't count as offsets and don't count as habitat.

Discussion:

- Dan expressed concerns about the projects in Lower Cedar, since there is projected to be a significant number of PE wells and there are no offset projects.
 - Matt echoed Dan's concerns.
 - Carla agrees with Dan's concerns and assigned the Maplewood golf course to Tier 2 because it has lower feasibility. She shared it may be worthwhile to have a conversation with Maplewood Gold Course about switching their source for irrigation.
- Matt asked if there is information on whether the habitat projects in the Lower Cedar have the potential to help meet NEB.
 - There are many habitat projects under consideration in the Lower Cedar that are of ecological importance but have been hard to complete because of the high cost of real estate in the basin.
 - Matt shared that the habitat projects may be the biggest bang for our buck in this location.
 - Muckleshoot Indian Tribe does not agree with other entities' opinion that habitat projects will provide offsets but Carla will check with the MIT biologists to see if these projects can move forward to meet NEB.
- Dan asked what barriers exist for fish migration regardless of whether we improve habitat.
 - Carla said that Muckleshoot Indian Tribe has done spawning surveys in the Lower Cedar. Renton also dredges there. There are problems with predation for juveniles for Chinook, Sockeye, and Coho.
- Dan asked whether to include Tier 2 projects, such as Maplewood Golf Course, in the plan.
- Carla shared that it would be good if we could find other projects in the Lower Cedar. She disapproved of Ecology's directions for the water rights analysis because it was a narrow approach to look at irrigation rights only, had to be more than 5 acres, and had to be water rights that had priority dates.
 - Gretchen clarified that the WWT contract ended and there is not capacity for WWT to look for additional water rights. It is up to Committee members to bring forward new project ideas at this point.
 - **Post meeting update:** *As part of the water rights assessment work, WWT developed proposed selection criteria to use to focus the water rights assessment, given the large number of water right claims in WRIA 8 and limited time and capacity available to do the work. WWT shared the proposed water rights assessment selection criteria with the Committee at the March 2020 meeting ([see WWT memo dated 3/24/20](#), which is also embedded in the [final WWT report](#)) and Stephanie asked for comments on the approach. The Committee supported WWT's approach. [See March 2020 meeting summary](#).*
 - See the water rights acquisitions research folder on box for [Washington Water Trust documents](#).
- Dan asked about the status of discussions with the City of Seattle regarding releasing more flow down the Cedar.

- **Post meeting update:** Seattle proposed a project to commit to releasing more than their instream flow requirements, which they currently do as an operational buffer. The workgroup discussed this at the September 17 meeting and did not want to include that project in the list as water offset. The workgroup recommended including a future Cedar reservoir project in the plan as a prospective project in section 5.2.3.
- Committee members discussed how tiering should relate to the consumptive use estimate and offset target.
 - Workgroup discussed looking at tier 1 water offset projects to offset consumptive use. All projects, including tier 2 and habitat projects contribute to meeting a higher offset target.
 - Committee did not express concerns with the that approach.
- Committee members agreed to focus on implementation certainty when deciding which projects to include in Tier 1.
- Gretchen encouraged committee members to review Section 6.1: Adaptive Management to see how it incorporates flexibility to find additional projects as they become available and provide comments/edits on that section as part of the draft plan review (comments due 10/19).
- Committee members expressed support for the placeholder language included in the draft plan to describe the purpose of tiering and characteristics of tier 1 and tier 2 projects.
- The facilitator asked whether the Committee wants to indicate preference for funding for Tier 1 projects or another subset of projects?
 - The technical workgroup was not interested in using tiering to identify priorities for funding. They recommended adding language in Chapter 5 to clarify that water offset projects are tiered separately than habitat projects and Committee's priority is to fund water offset projects. This recommendation was supported by the Committee.

Next steps:

- Stephanie will add the project tiers to chapter 5.
- Stephanie will revise the language explaining how habitat projects are tiered: Tier 1 habitat projects are multibenefit (likely to provide streamflow benefit based on project type) and are located in subbasins that need additional offset. Tier 2 habitat projects are less certain about offset potential and/or are located in subbasins with greater water offset volumes.
- Stephanie will look at how tiering is described in chapter 5 and make sure it is clear that water offset project tiers are separate from habitat project tiers and that the Committee did not use tiers to indicate priorities for grant funding. Clarify that Committee's priority is to fund water offset projects.
- Committee members should review Chapter 5 of the draft plan and provide feedback on language on project tiering by October 19.
- Committee members should review Section 6.2: Adaptive Management to see how it incorporates flexibility to find additional projects as they become available and provide comments/edits on that section as part of the draft plan review (comments due 10/19).

Overall of Chapter 5: Projects and Actions

- Ingria provided an overview of chapter 5: Projects and Actions, which includes:
 - Approach to develop projects.
 - Table of water offset projects.
 - Short summaries of water offset projects.
 - Table with all habitat projects.
 - Longer project descriptions for water offset and habitat projects are in the appendix.
 - Prospective projects (section 5.2.3): describes future project types that the Committee supports. Added that Committee is looking for more water offset projects in certain subbasins.

Discussion:

- Committee members provided input on what to include in 5.3.1 Summary of Projects and Benefits via an [interactive slide](#). Some Committee members noted that they have not reviewed the plan yet.
- Committee members provided input on what to include in 5.3.3 Certainty of Implementation via an [interactive slide](#). Responses include:
 - Whether there is a project sponsor.
 - Project feasibility.
 - Explanation of how projects were vetted.
 - Funding.
- Committee members should provide feedback on this section as part of the draft plan review. Comments due 10/19.

Next steps:

- Stephanie will revise sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3 to incorporate Committee feedback provided on the interactive slide and as part of the draft plan review.

Safety Factor

Objectives:

- Share consumptive use safety factor proposal recommended by workgroup.
- Discuss whether to add a safety factor to the consumptive use estimate to address uncertainty.

Background and Technical Workgroup Recommendation

- The terms offset target and safety factor have been used interchangeably. The result is the same, it's a higher number to try to offset.
- There is placeholder language in the draft plan that references a safety factor/offset target (in Chapters 4, Chapter 5, and Chapter 6.)
- The NEB Guidance says: "Watershed plans must, at a minimum, identify projects and actions intended to offset impacts associated with new consumptive water use. Planning groups may, at their discretion, decide to address new water use beyond these minimum requirements. Such an optional approach may include, but is not limited to, new water use beyond the 20-year planning horizon, or beyond new consumptive water use, or other goals of the planning group. However, watershed plans are not required to include such projects and actions. Any work undertaken beyond the specific planning minimum requirements increases the likelihood that time and funds are spent on matters that will not necessarily yield a locally approvable or adoptable plan within the very tight timeframes of the law."
 - Note that Targets and Safety Factors are not addressed in the law, NEB Guidance or Policy Interpretative Statement. If a committee wishes to include these, they must define on their own. Ecology will not issue additional guidance outside of the NEB Guidance and Policy Interpretative Statement.
- Technical workgroup discussed a safety factor at the August meeting and the Committee also briefly discussed safety factor proposals in August. Technical workgroup revisited this discussion at the September meeting and discussed 2 proposals:
 - Matt proposed an offset target based on the 950 gpd scenario: 698 af.
 - This is based on the statutory legal limit and the predicted number of PE wells that we've calculated for the planning period.
 - Matt added that King and Snohomish Counties used different methodologies to calculate the projected number of PE wells. Additionally, through COVID-19, there

are indications that people are migrating away from urban areas. In order to address these uncertainties, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe would like to see an offset target.

- Dan proposed an offset target that is 2 times the CU estimate: 850 af.
 - Dan added that CELP has concerns that some of the offset projects may not happen. CELP would like to see an oversupply of offset projects in the plan, so Ecology is encouraged to fund the projects.

Discussion:

- Committee members provided comments on the safety factor proposals through an [interactive slide \(slide 8\)](#).
- Gina asked for clarity around when the offset target kicks in.
 - If the Committee decides to include a safety factor/offset, assume Committee members would evaluate whether we achieve the offset target when deciding whether to approve the plan.
- Gina asked for additional clarity around the built-in buffer included in the consumptive use estimate of 425.4 af.
 - The consumptive use estimate was calculated using the Washington Irrigation Guide estimates of water needed for turf grass, which is likely more than what people actually use, based on the aerial photo analysis.
 - **Post meeting update:** *There are also other reasons the consumptive use number is likely an overestimate, from Ecology's perspective (see [January 2020 meeting summary](#)).*
- John McClellan asked whether the offset target is the best way to account for projects that may not happen.
 - John Covert clarified that if robust adaptive management was part of the law, we would have more certainty around project implementation after the plan is adopted. Given that the law is not prescription about plan implementation, the safety factor can help account for the uncertainties.
 - Dan added that if we put in exactly the number of projects that we think we need to offset consumptive use and then some don't happen, we do not have another opportunity to add more projects to the plan.
- Gina expressed concerns about assumptions around migration away from urban areas. She added that King County builders will be discussing this issue in more depth in October and November.
- Gina asked the group to consider whether the safety factor undermines credibility in the project list.
 - Matt clarified that he thinks the main benefit of having a safety factor is to account for the uncertainties around the growth rate.
 - Gina added that we need to consider densifying urban areas to avoid building in rural areas.
 - Denise added that uncertainties around societal and climate shifts are likely to continue. She agreed that the region needs to densify but added that we also should incorporate a safety factor to account for all the uncertainties. Denise affirmed Matt's proposal.

Next Steps:

- Stephanie to discuss safety factor proposals with Committee members to try to reach consensus on a proposal before the October meeting.

NEB Evaluation

Objectives:

- Discuss purpose of including NEB evaluation.

- Confirm Committee interest for a statement that says plan meets NEB and explanation why.

Reference materials:

- [NEB evaluation discussion guide](#)

Purpose of including NEB evaluation

- Committees have the option of including an NEB evaluation within the plan. If they choose to include it Ecology will give considerable deference to the planning groups to decide what NEB means for their watershed.
- At the August meeting, shared an outline of what that chapter could include:
 - Compare water offset to consumptive use at WRIA level.
 - Compare water offset to consumptive use at subbasin level.
 - Explain how plan achieves NEB by providing additional benefits to instream resources, beyond those needed to offset consumptive use.
 - Explain how adaptive management helps with plan implementation.
 - Statement that the Committee believes we achieved NEB.
- If this isn't included in the plan, Ecology will do the evaluation based on information included in the other chapters in the plan.

Discussion:

- Committee members expressed their support for including NEB via an [interactive slide](#).
 - Dan added that if there is not an offset target included, CELP cannot agree that NEB is met.

Next steps:

- GeoEngineers will start drafting the NEB chapter based on the outline included in the draft plan.
- Stephanie will share draft chapter for review, separate from review of draft plan, before the October Committee meeting.
- Matt and Carla volunteered to help with review of the chapter and the workgroup will provide initial feedback at the October meeting.

WRE Plan

Objectives:

- Provide an overview of the draft plan and plan review resources
- Provide an overview of the plan review timeline
- Discuss comments on chapter 6: Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management

Reference materials:

- [Draft WRE Plan](#)
- [Revised plan approval timeline](#)
- [Comments](#) and [revised](#) Ch. 6: Adaptive Mgmt.

Draft plan update

- Distributed the [Draft WRE Plan](#) on 9/14.
 - Comment period until 10/19.
 - Note that each WRIA has its own plan review process. Some WRIAs distributed a draft plan that didn't include a projects chapter and therefore are doing two draft plan comment periods. Not planning to do that for WRIA 8, because this plan is a complete draft.

- Please submit comments using the [comment tracker](#).
 - Comment instructions are available [here](#).
- [Plan review and approval timeline](#) includes key deadlines and meeting dates.
 - Will discuss all comments on the draft plan at the 10/29 meeting.
 - Goal to circulate final plan in late November.
 - Vote on final plan at February 25 meeting.
- Chapters 1-4: Incorporated Committee members' comments into revised versions.
 - Tracked changes version of these chapters is available on Box so you can see how the edits were incorporated.
- Please thoroughly review Chapter 5: Projects and Actions and provide feedback.
- Materials to help with internal review
 - [Cover memo](#) that provides some context and background, explains the content and status of each chapter (included at the beginning of the draft plan).
 - [PowerPoint slides](#) you can use to brief your internal decision makers.
 - [WRIA 8 Committee handout](#), background of streamflow restoration law, says who is on Committee and scope and timeline of the planning process.
 - [Streamflow restoration policy and interpretive statement](#) which includes Ecology's interpretation of the law.
- Plan review timeline
 - 5 weeks for draft plan review: due October 19.
 - Discuss comments at October 29 meeting.
 - Short meeting November 18 to address any remaining items and confirm that plan is ready to distribute for local review.
 - Distribute final plan week of November 23.
 - 12 weeks for final plan review: ~Nov 23 – Feb 16.
 - Did not build in any time for another review period. If we get comments back on the final plan, will need to adjust the timeline. Please thoroughly review the draft so that we can address your concerns before distributing the final plan.
 - Meeting Feb 25 to vote on plan. Every entity on the Committee must approve the plan before it is submitted to Ecology.
- When submitting comments on the draft plan, please provide proposed solutions (revised text to include, sources for additional info, etc.) to address concerns and color code comments based on whether it's a strong, moderate, or mild concern.
- Carla asked whether Committee members can get Word versions of the draft plan to provide track changes edits.
 - The facilitation team is using the [Comment Tracker](#) to streamline edits to the plan.

Chapter 6 Comments on Adaptive Management and Policies

- Received comments from these entities, several other members responded saying they did not have any comments.
 - CELP
 - WDFW
 - Tulalip Tribes
 - City of Seattle
 - MBAKS
- Some of the comments were corrections or text edits and were incorporated into the revised draft.
- Some comments required discussion by the Committee.
- Comments discussed:

- Line 111: comment from Tulalip Tribes – “This needs to include the ability to add new projects and fund them.”
 - There is currently not a process for the Committee to add new projects.
 - Allen asked whether there is a statutory requirement to update the plan.
 - No requirement currently. The only process Ecology has authority for is NEB determination and adoption by June 30, 2021.
 - Ingria added that WRIA 7 is adding language to their Adaptive Management plan that recommends that Ecology has authority to recommend projects to the plan. Ingria will share the language with WRIA 8. ([posted on box](#) in the September meeting folder)
 - **Post meeting update:** *The adaptive management section includes a recommendation for Ecology to revise the plan if, after the 5 year report, Ecology finds that not on track to offset consumptive use.*
- The draft adaptive management chapter states: “members of the WRIA 8 Committee are not expected to reconvene after approving the plan. Final adjustments and amendments shall be at the sole determination of Ecology after public input.”
 - Tulalip asked if this was what the Committee agreed to.
 - The adaptive management subgroup (Dan, Gina, Elisa, Stewart) recommended the language around Ecology making amendments to the plan.
 - Kurt added how can anyone know when the committee should meet again if the plan is not being implemented if there are no triggers?
- Table 2: comment from WDFW: “with respect to the second action, to improve clarity, please consider changing the language of this action item to ‘Revise Streamflow Restoration Grant Guidance’ to prioritize projects in sub-basins that have not offset permit-exempt water use.”
 - Tristan added that if there are subbasins projected to have an offset deficit, would be useful to revise restoration grant guidance to prioritize funding towards subbasins with deficits.
 - Dan, Denise, Kurt, and Matt agreed with this proposed change.
- Tristan Weiss, WDFW, provided an update on the Salmon Recovery Portal.
 - Tristan added that the data we get out of the Salmon Recovery Portal is as good as the data we put into it. It is a tool to collate data.
 - WDFW is implementing a pilot project in the Nisqually and Chehalis Basins. The pilot should be complete in January. Will then have a better understanding of costs.

Next steps:

- Stephanie will revise the language in Table 2 of the Adaptive Management chapter: “Revise Streamflow Restoration Grant Guidance’ to prioritize projects in *sub-basins* that have not offset permit-exempt water use.”
- Committee members should consider whether they want to reconvene regularly after plan approval to implement adaptive management and plan to discuss at the October meeting.
- Committee members should thoroughly review the Adaptive Management and policy chapter and provide comments via the comment tracker by 10/19.

Action Items for Chair/Facilitator/Technical Consultants

- Stephanie will revise Chapter 5: projects and actions
 - Add 60 Acres Park water right acquisition project
 - add the project tiers to the project tables

- explain how habitat projects are tiered: Tier 1 habitat projects are multibenefit (likely to provide streamflow benefit based on project type) and are located in subbasins that need additional offset. Tier 2 habitat projects are less certain about offset potential and/or are located in subbasins with greater water offset volumes. Stormwater projects are tier 3.
- make sure it is clear that water offset project tiers are separate from habitat project tiers and that the Committee did not use tiers to indicate priorities for grant funding. Clarify that Committee's priority is to fund water offset projects.
- update the language in [Section 5.2.3 Prospective projects](#): "Projects or programs that support connections of existing homes on exempt wells to public water systems *without impacting critical areas or indirectly encouraging development outside of UGAs.*"
- revise sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3 to incorporate Committee feedback provided on the interactive slide and as part of the draft plan review.
- Stephanie to discuss safety factor proposals with Committee members to try to reach consensus on a proposal before the October meeting.
- GeoEngineers will start drafting the NEB chapter based on the outline included in the draft plan. Stephanie will share draft NEB chapter for review, separate from review of draft plan, before the October Committee meeting.
- Stephanie will revise the language in Table 2 of the Adaptive Management chapter: "Revise Streamflow Restoration Grant Guidance' to prioritize projects in *sub-basins* that have not offset permit-exempt water use."
- Ingria to share language on adding projects from WRIA 7's adaptive management chapter. ([posted on box](#) in the September meeting folder)

Action Items for Committee Members

- Committee members should review the [60 Acres Park water right project profile](#) and let Stephanie know by 10/19 if you have concerns about including that project on the list and whether you have concerns including it as Tier 1.
- Submit all comments on the [draft WRE plan](#) by October 19.
 - Review Chapter 5: Projects and Actions and provide feedback, including on language on project tiering and what to include in 5.3.1 and 5.3.3.
 - Review Chapter 6: Adaptive Management and Policy Recommendations and provide any additional comments using the comment tracker.
 - Review Section 6.1.2: Adaptive Management to see how it incorporates flexibility to find additional projects as they become available and provide comments/edits on that section as part of the draft plan review.
- Consider whether the Committee should reconvene regularly after plan approval to implement Adaptive Management and plan to discuss at the October meeting.
- MBAKS to have internal conversations to discuss safety factor.
- Carla and Matt will help with review of the NEB chapter and the workgroup will provide initial feedback at the October meeting.
- Reach out to Tristan Weiss with any questions regarding using the Salmon Recovery Portal to track streamflow restoration projects.
- Review the draft September meeting summary and provide comments by 10/21.

Next Meeting: Thursday, October 29: 9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

- Next technical workgroup meeting: October 15.

- The agenda for the October Committee meeting is review of comments submitted on the draft plan. Entities that submit comments should come to the meeting prepared to explain your comments and proposed solutions.