Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates*

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*
Michele Koehler, Seattle
Terri Strandberg, *Snohomish County*
Matt Baerwalde, *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*
Anne Savery, *Tulalip Tribes*
Stewart Reinbold, *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*
Stephanie Potts (chair), *Washington State Department of Ecology*
Ingria Jones (alternate), *Washington State Department of Ecology*
Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz (cities caucus rep), *WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council, ex officio*
Anne Harrie, *Snoqualmie Indian Tribe*
Beth Mountsier, *City of Bellevue*
Aaron Moldver, *City of Bothell*

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

Committee Members Not in Attendance*

Alderwood Water & Wastewater District

Other Attendees

Gretchen Muller (facilitator), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Caroline Burney (information manager), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Paulina Levy, *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 present voted to approve the September WRIA 8 WREC meeting summary, with the Ecology rep and cities caucus rep abstaining. The final version will be posted on the Committee website.
Updates and Announcements

Chair provided updates from Ecology.

- 2-year anniversary for Committee!
- Streamflow Restoration Program Grant update: Ecology awarded $22 million to 21 projects.
- **Plan review timeline:**
  - Today’s committee meeting will address comments received on the 9/14 Draft Plan.
  - Will ask for interim approval of the plan and discuss any remaining comments, if needed, at the November 18 meeting.
  - Meeting on February 25 to vote on plan approval.

Committee membership: Gretchen and Stephanie have been reaching out to all Committee members, including cities caucus members, to check in about their plan review and approval process.
  - City of Sammamish might withdraw from the Committee.

Public Comment

*No comments.*

Safety Factor/Offset Target

Objectives:

- Confirm Committee support for using 698 acre-feet/year as an offset target (consumptive use estimate of based on all homes using legal limit of 950 gpd).
- Review sections of draft plan related to offset target and discuss comments.

Discussion of safety factor:

- Committee members present expressed their support for the safety factor of 698 af via an interactive slide with responses ranging from “I can live with it” to “absolutely.”

Projects

Objectives:

- Review changes to project list since September WREC meeting.
- Discuss comments on the draft plan related to projects.

Technical workgroup update

- Workgroup reviewed recent changes to the project list.
  - Workgroup discussed the Willowmoor floodplain project, but Carla Carlson wasn’t able to attend the meeting and explain her recommendation to remove it from the plan.
- Discussed feedback on the first draft of the NEB chapter.

Project updates

- Added Sixty Acres Park water right acquisition.
- Cedar River Reservoir: Seattle reviewed the language and the project was added to future potential projects in the revised draft plan.
- Pre-identified #1 and #5 water rights: Workgroup discussed and recommended they be kept on the project list as tier 2.
• Washington Water Trust has offered to be the project sponsor for some of the water rights on the list.
• The Committee decided not to include longer project profiles for Tier 2 water right (Pre-ID #1 and #5) because there has not been a lot of outreach. Will remove the longer project profile from the appendix to be sensitive to potentially including private property information in the plan.

Discussion of Willowmoor Floodplain Restoration Project
• Project was recommended by Snoqualmie Indian Tribe and WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) and discussed over the summer.
• Stephanie reached out to King County Flood Control District (KC FCD) staff by email and phone to get confirmation that project sponsor supports including this project in the plan. Have not heard back.
• Carla shared several concerns MIT has with the project, including that the design might focus on flood control and not habitat improvements.
• The Committee discussed the project and decided to remove the Willowmoor project and instead include a more general Sammamish River floodplain restoration project without a project sponsor.
• **Action Item:** Jason, Matt and Carla will help draft a project description for a general Sammamish River floodplain restoration project.

WRE Plan
Objectives:
• Review and discuss comments from Committee members on the draft plan.
• Discuss adaptive management and policy recommendations.
• Discuss Net Ecological Benefit evaluation.

Reference materials:
• Revised draft plan ([version dated 10/22](#))
• Compiled comments

Stephanie provided an overview of the comment process:
• Received comments from most Committee members. Several members responded saying they did not have any comments. The entities that submitted comments are tracked in [this spreadsheet](#) on box. All comment trackers are in the Comments from WRIA 8 Committee members folder on box.
• The compiled comment tracker includes all comments submitted by Committee members and describes how they were addressed.
• Some of the comments were corrections or text edits and were incorporated into the revised draft, dated 10/22.
• Some comments require Committee discussion. Those comments are grouped by the following buckets:
  o Safety factor
  o Projects
  o Project tiering
  o Adaptive management and policies
  o NEB
• Committee members were asked to review the revised draft plan (10/22 version) and flag any additional comments to discuss.
Comments on draft plan related to safety factor

- The Committee reviewed several comments related to safety factor that required committee discussion or clarification.
- Section 4.3 Impacts of New Consumptive Water Use
  - Dan expressed his concern that there are two potential sources of error: 1) how much water people are going to use; 2) whether the projects are going to work. He shared he is fine with the 698 af safety factor but added project certainty should be discussed in NEB.
  - No additional changes were suggested for this section.
- Section 4.5 Summary of Uncertainties and Scenarios
  - Dan reiterated his concerns as stated above regarding two potential sources of error.
  - He supports the way offset target is discussed in the plan.
  - No additional changes were suggested for this section.
- Section 5.3.1 Summary of Projects and Benefits
  - Same comment as above.
  - Committee members support the two reasons Dan stated to include a safety factor.
  - No additional changes were suggested for this section.
- Section 6.1 Plan Implementation and Adaptive Management Recommendations
  - The Committee discussed the comments on this section and suggested changes to the last few bullets under “existing challenges” that talk about the “margin of safety.”
  - **Action item:** Stephanie will make revisions and flag the new language in the next version of the plan. Committee members should review the revisions.
- 7.2 Water offsets in NEB chapter
  - No additional changes were suggested for this section.

Comments on draft plan related to projects

- **Section 5.2.1 Water offset projects**
  - Dan shared concerns about the distribution of projects in certain subbasins. For example, Bear-Evans is an important subbasin in terms of offsetting water and there is just one project here. There is not a high level of certainty that the project will be implemented. He suggested that the plan should acknowledge that this is an important subbasin in the NEB section.
    - **Action item:** added some text in 7.2 Water offsets in NEB chapter to address Dan’s comment. (page 94, lines 607 in 11/4 draft)
  - Discussed Kurt’s comment on water rights acquisitions in Issaquah subbasin. Anne Savery clarified that Kurt does not want to remove the project. Rather, he wants to point out that the project is low down in the creek and is therefore not as beneficial to flows as other projects. He wanted to point out that it’s a lower priority than projects that provide offsets higher up in the system.
  - Carla added that even if it’s lower in the system, anything that will provide offsets is beneficial, especially since projects lower in the system benefit Chinook habitat.
    - **Action item:** added a sentence to the short descriptions in Chapter 5 for Pre-Identified Water Right No. 2 water right acquisition (8-I-W8) and Pre-Identified Water Right No. 4 (8-I-W9).
- **Section 5.2.3 Prospective Projects and Actions**
  - The Committee discussed WDFWs comments about the bullet on ag water rights acquisitions.
  - No additional changes were suggested for this section.
• WDFW submitted a comment suggesting that instream and floodplain management projects be required to provide a beaver management plan. Stewart added that WDFW requires a beaver management plan which identifies flood elevations, key elevations for protective infrastructure (roads, housing), and standards for beaver deterrents.
  o Stewart sent Stephanie suggested language by email. The Committee supported the revision.
  o **Action item**: Stephanie will add the language Stewart suggested to 5.2.2 Habitat projects.
• WDFW submitted a comment suggesting that all infiltration projects be required to provide baseline infiltration amounts and O&M costs. Stewart added that it’s important that baseline infiltration amounts and O&M costs are included to ensure that projects are durable over the 20 year planning horizon.
  o The Committee talked about whether this applies to stormwater projects, since we are not counting offset from those types of projects. Carla added that these details are determined during the feasibility stage. She added that she does not want to put a number to the infiltration amount because it could be viewed as an offset when it’s not.
  o **Action item**: Stephanie will work with Stewart and Carla on language to add to Section 5.3.3 to address WDFW’s comment.
• WDFW recommended water offset projects that have existing river, lake, or creek intakes or diversions that will no longer be used, include removal of the intake infrastructure as part of the plan. Stewart clarified that a lot of these intakes are old and do not meet current criteria for screening.
  o The Committee supported this change.
  o **Action item**: Stephanie will add text to 5.2.1 Water offset projects about removing intake infrastructure.
• **Section 5.3.3 Certainty of Implementation**
  o The Committee discussed this section and recommended some revisions.
  o **Action item**: made revisions to section (page 78, lines 1-3 in 11/4 version)

**Comments on project tiering**
• The Committee reviewed the language in the draft plan describing project tiering and discussed revisions.
  o The Committee supported changes to how the tiering for habitat projects was described.
  o **Action item**: made revisions to project tiering in section 5.2.2 Habitat Projects (page 64 in 11/4 version) and 7.3 Habitat projects in NEB (page 96 in 11/4 version).

**Comments on policies recommendations**
• The Committee reviewed and discussed each policy recommendation in chapter 6 to confirm support.
  • 6.2.3 Development and use of reclaimed water
    o **Action item**: Added “Department of Health” to the implementing entities
  • 6.2.6 Statewide mandatory water conservation measures in unincorporated areas of the state during drought
    o Discussed comments from Snohomish County related to role of counties and capacity to enforce that policy.
    o **Action item**: remove reference to counties.

**Comments on adaptive management recommendations**
The Committee discussed Section 6.1.2: Oversight and Adaptation and how it incorporates flexibility to find additional projects as they become available.
  o No comments.

The Committee discussed the language in 6.1.2 stating that “members of the WRIA 8 Committee are not expected to reconvene after approving the plan.”
  o Stephanie added that this section was drafted by a subgroup including Dan, Gina, Elisa, and Stewart. The subgroup drafted the adaptive management chapter based on the input from the Committee. At the time, the Committee did not express interest in continuing to meet after plan approval.
  o Matt added that there should be a feedback mechanism for committee members to provide comments to Ecology. Matt also suggested that based on the outcome of the report, he would like to have the opportunity to reconvene to have a mechanism for committee members to give input.
  o Dan added that it is not clear whether anyone but Ecology has the authority to reconvene the group.
  o The Committee discussed revisions to this section related to Ecology getting feedback on the report and the Committee reconvening.
  o **Action item**: made revisions 6.1.2 Oversight and Adaptation (page 82-83 in 11/4 version).

Comments on NEB evaluation

- Stephanie provided an update on the feedback provided by the technical workgroup:
  o Add an introduction section.
  o Revise language throughout chapter to clearly indicate the benefits are only achieved if projects are implemented, including in the last sentence.
  o Add explanation of why didn’t count offset from habitat projects.
  o Add explanation of habitat project tiering.
  o Add subtotal of water offsets from only tier 1 projects.
- The Committee discussed comments and additional changes to make to the NEB chapter.
- WDFW submitted a comment regarding identifying the timing for offset benefits.
  o Stephanie clarified that the Committee would need to decide a specific critical flow period and have not done that.
  o **Action item**: Stephanie will work with Carla to add a “timing of benefits” column to the water offset projects table in Chapter 7.
- The Committee reviewed the NEB statement in the last paragraph and discussed edits.
  o The Committee discussed Tulalip Tribes’ comment about NEB at the subbasin and WRIA levels.
    ▪ **Action item**: Stephanie will add a sentence to 7.5 NEB evaluation to note that did not find offsets in each subbasin. (page 110 in 11/4 version)
  o Dan suggested being more explicit about how the plan is meeting NEB by clarifying that NEB is dependent on the habitat projects.
    ▪ **Action item**: Stephanie will work with Dan on additional edits to make to section 7.5.

WRE Plan: Next Steps

- Stephanie will make the revisions discussed during the meeting and add the executive summary and circulate a new draft before the meeting on November 18.
- At the November 18 meeting, Committee will vote on interim approval of the plan before distributing for local review. Want to make sure all Committee members support the plan before initiating the local review process.
After the November 18 meeting, Stephanie will share the Final Draft plan, along with a cover memo and supporting materials.

Stephanie shared that some Committee members have mentioned they plan to send a letter to go along with plan approval. This is optional for Committee members. However, chair wants to make sure that letters don’t undermine vote on final plan.
  - Let Stephanie know if you are planning to send a letter.

**Action Items for Chair:**

- Stephanie will make the revisions discussed during the meeting and circulate a new draft before the meeting on November 18.
- Stephanie will add the executive summary to the next draft.

**Action Items for Committee Members**

- Thoroughly review the plan revisions and flag any remaining concerns to Stephanie by 11/10.
- Prepare to give interim approval of the plan at the November 18 meeting.
- Upload submissions for cover photos by 11/12.
- Let Stephanie know if you are planning to send a letter to go along with final plan approval.

**Next Meeting: November 18 from 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.**