



JULY 2020 MEETING SUMMARY

**Duwamish-Green (WRIA 9)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

July 28, 2020 | 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. | [Committee website](#)

Location

WebEx

Committee Chair

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

Next Meeting

August 25
12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
WebEx

Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates*

Lisa Tobin, *Auburn*
Trish Rolfe, *Center for Environmental Law and Policy*
Steve Lee, *Covington Water District*
Scott Woodbury, *Enumclaw*
Evan Swanson, *Kent*
Josh Kahan, *King County*
Rick Reinlasoder, *King County Agriculture Program*

Jennifer Anderson, *Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties*
Carla Carlson, *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe*
Kathy Minsch, *Seattle*
Stewart Reinbold, *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*
Stephanie Potts (chair), *Washington State Department of Ecology*

Cities caucus members: Black Diamond, Normandy Park, and Tukwila

Committee Members Not in Attendance*

WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum, ex officio and cities caucus representative
Tacoma Water, ex officio

Other Attendees

Ruth Bell (facilitator), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Caroline Burney (information manager), *Cascadia Consulting Group*
Bridget August (technical consultant), *GeoEngineers*

John Covert, *Washington Department of Ecology*
Joe Hovenkotter, *Washington 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 draft June meeting summary. The Committee voted to approve the June WRIA 9 WREC meeting summary, with the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe rep abstaining. The final version will be posted on the Committee website.

Updates and Announcements

Chair provided updates from Ecology.

- Ecology offices will be closed the following days due to furlough:
 - August 31
 - September 4
 - October 30
 - November 30
- WRE Plan Development timeline: Chair anticipates distributing the draft plan late, in early September. The delay will not reduce Committee members' time to review the draft plan. Chair has informed Ecology management that we may not submit an approved plan by the February 1, 2021 target date.
 - Chair plans to distribute draft chapter 4 in the next few weeks.

Updates from Committee members:

- Enumclaw: Last week the Enumclaw City Council was briefed on the status of the WREC planning process for WRIA 9 and 10, the inclusion of city water rights in the plans, and the draft policy recommendations. The direction they gave Scott was to communicate that the water rights that the City holds in trust in WRIA 9 not be included in the plans as potential offset projects. The City Council also said they would not grant approval to the plan if it includes policy recommendations, citing "additional bureaucracy" for their lack of support.
 - Several committee members shared that it is discouraging that the City of Enumclaw has taken this stance, especially since the policies are all voluntary.
 - Committee members discussed developing a letter to the City Council to explain why policies recommendations are important to include in the Plan.
 - Committee members discussed alternatives for showing support for policy recommendations, such as an addendum the plan.

Public Comment

No comments.

Projects

Objectives:

- Recap of July 7 Technical Workgroup meeting.
- Share workgroup recommendations for water rights acquisitions and water offset projects and ask for Committee support for including those projects in the plan.
- Status update on other water offset projects still in development.
- Update on tiering the project list.

Reference materials:

- [Project development tracking sheet](#)
- [Project tiering criteria descriptions](#)

Technical Workgroup Update

- The workgroup reviewed project profiles for water rights acquisitions in the Washington Water Trust (WWT) report and recommended including all of the water rights from the report in the plan, if they have support from King County Ag. Supported tiering the list of water rights to reflect feasibility and certainty.

- The workgroup reviewed the draft project description for two MAR projects and recommended including the two sites in the plan as one Green River MAR project, and counting the water offset based on assumption that one of the sites will be developed.
- Discussed a stormwater project on Mill Creek and the workgroup supported including it in the plan. The project has an offset potential of 10-100 acre-feet/year and the workgroup recommended using a conservative number for offset, such as 25 acre-feet/year.
- The workgroup discussed tiering criteria descriptions and recommended using those criteria to tier the project list.

Water Right Acquisition Opportunities

- Stephanie went over expectations for water rights acquisitions projects in the plan.
 - It is up to the Committee to decide what information is needed in order to count projects as a water offset.
 - Do not expect any water rights acquisitions to be completed before the plan is submitted. Negotiating water rights transactions can take months to years.
 - The project profiles in the Washington Water Trust report include a preliminary water offset quantity associated with the water rights acquisitions based on assumptions related to the current land use, or trust water amounts if the water right is in temporary trust. Do not have capacity to do a more thorough extent and validity analysis before submitting the plan.
 - The workgroup talked about including a generic water right acquisition opportunity in the plan in order to allow opportunistic acquisitions in future grant rounds.
- At the June WREC meeting, WWT shared the water right project profiles for WRIA 9. At July workgroup meeting, workgroup recommended keeping all of the water rights acquisition projects on the project list for inclusion in plan but would like to tier based on feasibility and certainty, etc. (see [tiering criteria descriptions](#)).
- Will remove Enumclaw WR acquisition from the list based on direction from Enumclaw City Council.
- Requested Ag representative (King County Ag) to provide feedback on water rights identified through the irrigation analysis.

Discussion:

- Question on the valuation of water rights. The main source of funding for water rights acquisitions is the streamflow restoration grant program. The guidance around water right acquisition projects states that there needs to be justification for costs associated. There isn't the same level of information available about water rights transactions as there is for land acquisitions, so the cost per acre-foot is often a negotiation between the seller and the buyer.
- Rick provided feedback on the water right acquisition opportunities from the agricultural perspective:
 - The following sites are in the farmland preservation program and are not feasible. These will be removed from the project list.
 - Lower Middle Green 13
 - Lower Middle Green 14
 - Newaukum 2
 - Rick will do further research to see if the following sites have a reliable, feasible, replacement for water:
 - Jenkins 1
 - Newaukum 5
- Carla Carlson suggested keeping the agricultural projects on the list as a lower priority in case other water sources become available.

- In past meetings, the workgroup and Committee supported including a generic water right acquisition description that would allow for opportunistic acquisitions in the future.
- Trish Rolfe shared that it is important to note which projects we have not initiated contact to yet.
 - We'll address this through tiering to identify which projects are more certain, are sited in priority subbasins, or have multi-benefits.
- The Committee supported including the non-farm water rights in the plan:
 - Soos Creek Park
 - Pre-identified 2 (Covington subbasin)
 - Pre-identified 6 (Jenkins subbasin)
 - Tukwila golf course (Duwamish subbasin)

Next Steps:

- Rick will provide feedback on whether to include Jenkins 1 and Newaukum 5 on the project list. Stephanie will share feedback with workgroup and Committee.

Water Offset Project Development

Stephanie Potts and Bridget August provided updates on several water offset projects:

Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR)

- Bridget provide an overview of the project descriptions for 2 Green River managed aquifer recharge project sites: [Tacoma Green River MAR](#) and [Kanaskat Palmer MAR](#).
 - Upper Middle Green subbasin
 - Water source: Green River
 - Estimated water offset: 327 af/year for each site (1 cfs from Dec 1-May 15)
 - GeoEngineers looked at the number of days the Green River is above the instream flow levels to determine the timing for diverting water from the river.
 - May include an above ground infiltration gallery or basin
 - Technical consultants looked at hydrogeology to understand infiltration capacity of soils.
 - Project details to be determined during feasibility study.
 - Ecology is talking with Washington Water Trust about being the project sponsor. Expect an update in mid-August.
 - Ecology and GeoEngineers are also reaching out to landowners.
 - Tacoma Water is supportive
 - In the process of reaching out to WA Parks to see if they have concerns.
- The workgroup discussed the 2 Green River managed aquifer recharge project sites at the July 7 meeting and supported including them in the plan as one combined Green River MAR project with an offset of 327 acre-feet/year.
 - The Green River MAR project would also include other sites on the Green River that could be identified in the future.
- Bridget provided an overview of the [Covington Water District MAR project](#):
 - Covington Water District property adjacent to Covington Creek
 - Water source: TPU water pipeline
 - Estimated water offset: 357 af/year (1 cfs from Nov 1 – April 30)
 - May include a buried infiltration gallery or basin
 - Project details to be determine during feasibility study.
 - Feasibility study will look at the water quality impact since the project would include infiltrating treated drinking water through the ground.

- The first phase of any MAR project funded by a streamflow restoration grant is a feasibility study. The [2020 Streamflow Restoration Grant Guidance](#) describes the components of a feasibility study in Appendix D.

Discussion:

- Carla Carlson noted that the project proposals do not say how the benefit to streams will be determined and that she has concerns about timing of benefits. She added that she would like to see criteria for how streamflow benefit will be determined.
- Stewart said that WDFW agrees with Carla. WDFW wants “water for water” and considers the Eagle Lake siphon project “water for water” and water rights acquisitions “water for water.”
- GeoEngineers is using the [USGS STRMDEPL08](#) model to estimate timing of benefits.
 - Results are posted in the [streamflow augmentation 30-year analysis folder](#) on box.
- Trish Rolfe suggested that we be conservative about the offset amount for the CWD MAR project since there are differences in infiltration potential depending on the soils.

Next steps:

- Stephanie will set up a time for GeoEngineers to discuss the MAR project model results with MIT and WDFW.

Stormwater projects

- The workgroup discussed the [Mill Creek Tributary 51 stormwater project](#), which has an offset estimate of 10-100 acre-feet per year. The workgroup recommended being conservative and quantifying the offset at ~ 25 af.
- Stephanie provided an update on a meeting about stormwater projects with King County and Ecology staff working with the [Our Green/Duwamish stakeholder group](#). Our Green/Duwamish staff will contact the cities they work with in WRIA 9 to ask about planned stormwater projects that have streamflow restoration or habitat benefits. Stephanie will share any specific project ideas that come from that with the workgroup and Committee.
- The Committee can also include a general project description that would cover future stormwater projects that have streamflow benefits,

Next steps:

- Stephanie will share stormwater project ideas that come from the Our Green/Duwamish group with the workgroup and Committee.

Other water offset projects

- Eagle Lake siphon project: Tacoma water proposed an updated Eagle Lake siphon and Howard Hanson Dam release project concept. Greg Volkhardt will join the August 11 technical workgroup meeting to talk through the project concept.
- Increase connections of PE wells to water service: Additional conversations needed with Carla, Steve and others before developing a project proposal to share with the Committee. Previously talked about how it would be difficult to quantify the water offset benefit because of the uncertainty related to the number of homes that would switch their water source.
- Surface to groundwater source switches on King County farms: previously discussed including these in case the permitting issues get resolved in the future. Will not count toward water offset or NEB.

Next steps:

- Join the August 11 workgroup meeting to discuss details of updated Eagle Lake siphon project.

- Stephanie will follow up with Carla, Steve, and Trish on the PE well to water service project description.

Habitat projects

- At June WREC meeting, Committee discussed a list of habitat projects recommended by the workgroup and supported including them in the plan.
- GeoEngineers drafted project descriptions and sent the project descriptions to project sponsors to review ([draft habitat project descriptions](#) are on box).
- King County recommended removing a couple projects from the list. Josh Kahan added additional details below:
 - Ray Creek in Lower Mid Green – lack of implementation potential.
 - Myer Imhof in Mid Middle Green– lack of implementation potential.
 - Change scope of Flaming Geyser from levee setback to revegetation.
 - Most of river is non-vegetated. Looking at revegetation and wood placement projects.
 - Levee setback not feasible because don't know where the levee is.

Next steps:

- Committee can review the [draft habitat project descriptions](#) and let Stephanie know if you have questions or comments before the August 25 meeting.
- Carla will review the habitat project list and let the Committee know if she has any concerns.

Project Tiering

- The workgroup discussed [project tiering criteria descriptions](#) at the July 7 meeting and recommended using these criteria to tier the project list.

Next Steps:

- Ecology staff will add readily available tiering criteria information to project inventory.
- The workgroup will fill in gaps in information and develop recommended project tiering to bring to the Committee.

Next Steps for Project List Development

- The technical workgroup will discuss the following at the August 11 meeting:
 - Eagle Lake siphon project
 - Tiering the project list using the tiering criteria
- GeoEngineers will start working on drafting Chapter 5: Projects & Actions.
- Committee members should review the projects on the “short list” tab and “conceptual ideas” tab on the [project inventory](#) and consider whether this set of projects meet your expectations for the plan. If Committee members think there are critical gaps in the project list, up to Committee members to voice those concerns during meetings, or to the facilitator or chair during check-in calls, and bring new project ideas forward to fill in those gaps.

Adaptive Management & Policy Recommendations

Objectives:

- Update on policy recommendations.
- Recap of July 8 policy and adaptive management subgroup meeting.
- Gather input on key components for adaptive management.

Policy Recommendations

- On July 8 representatives from WRIAs 7, 8, 9 met to discuss policy recommendations and coordinate language to include in the plan. A meeting summary is available [here](#).

Discussion:

- Several committee members expressed support for continuing to develop the policy proposals.
- Lisa Tobin noted that Enumclaw cited concerns around providing additional funding to Ecology as a rationale for not supporting policy recommendations. Lisa asked whether the adaptive management proposal will be supported given that the proposal intends to give Ecology the authority and funding to monitor the plan.
 - Scott Woodbury will check in with the City Council regarding adaptive management once the chapter is ready.
 - The Committee will discuss preparing a letter to transmit with the draft AM chapter to express the importance of including policy recommendations and adaptive management components in the plan.
- Trish Rolfe added that CELP will veto the plan if there is no adaptive management component. Carla also said she would recommend that MIT not approve the plan if there is no adaptive management.

Adaptive Management

- The Committee did not have time to discuss the adaptive management discussion questions during the meeting, so Ruth sent an email on 7/30 requesting feedback by 8/6.
 - Discussion questions:
 - What information should be tracked?
 - What should happen if tracking shows significant diversion from planned outcomes?
 - Does the Committee support a standard request to the legislature for funding for adaptive management?

Next Steps:

- Ruth to send out discussion question and ask for feedback over email (see email from 7/30).
- Facilitation team to coordinate with AM sub-group (Dan/Stewart) to use the input received from the Committee and draft AM chapter.
- Plan to distribute draft adaptive management chapter to Committee for review and discussion at August 25 meeting.
- The Committee will continue discussing outreach to Enumclaw city council on policy recommendations and adaptive management.

Consumptive Use and Offset Target

Objectives:

- Committee decision on consumptive use estimate to include in the plan.
- Discuss adding a safety factor or offset target to the consumptive use estimate.

Reference materials:

- [Consumptive use decision memo](#)

Discussion

- Stephanie provided a recap of methods used to develop the consumptive use (CU) estimate.

- The consumptive use estimate based on average lawn size is: 247.7 acre-feet/year
- Trish Rolfe and Carla Carlson voted to approve the CU estimate but noted that they want to a safety factor.
- The workgroup will discuss a safety factor at the August 11 meeting.

Decision: Approved. All Committee members present voted to approve the consumptive use estimate of 247.7 acre-feet per year for WRIA 9 and subbasin-level consumptive use estimates (see table below). The cities caucus representative was not present and sent approval for the cities caucus by email. Kent left the meeting early and sent approval by email. Enumclaw left the meeting early and provided vote to approve at the start of the meeting.

WRIA 9 Subbasin	20-year PE well projection	CU estimate (acre-feet/year)
Duwamish	0	0
Central Puget Sound	0	0
Lower Green	4	2.1
Soos Creek	83	41.4
Jenkins Creek	45	21.2
Covington Creek	41	21.5
Lower Middle Green River	84	51
Mid Middle Green River	100	31.9
Upper Middle Green River	110	26.9
Newaukum Creek	103	39
Coal/Deep Creek	62	12.6
Upper Green	0	0
WRIA 9 total	632	247.7

Next Steps:

- Stephanie will draft Chapter 4 with CU estimate of 247.7 af/year and a placeholder for the safety factor.
- The workgroup will discuss ideas for a safety factor/offset target at the August 11 meeting. Committee members should provide feedback on ideas for safety factor before the workgroup meeting.

WRE Plan Chapter 1-3

Objective: Share comments received and get Committee guidance on how to address comments.

Reference materials:

- [Revised Chapters 1-3](#)

Discussion

- The [WRE Plan folder on box](#) includes a list of entities that provided comments, the compiled comments from Committee members, and a revised chapter 1-3 that incorporates comments.
- Ecology Streamflow Restoration Management staff will review comments on Chapter 1 because changes might apply to other WRIA plans and aim to keep language consistent.
- Corrections were incorporated into revised draft that Stephanie sent out to the Committee for review. Stephanie did not receive any feedback on the revised chapters 1-3.
- Comments on sections related to Tribal reservations and treaty rights are being reviewed by all Tribes on the Committee before incorporating.
- Note that there will be additional salmon habitat information included in Chapter 2.

Next Steps:

- Stephanie to share draft plan in early September, after the August 25 Committee meeting.
 - Will ask for feedback on AM chapters at the August meeting
 - Will include revisions to chapters 1-3 as well as remaining chapters.
 - Will still have work to do on some of those chapters.
- Chapter 4 (PE well growth and consumptive use): Stephanie will send out a draft in next few weeks. Plan to discuss comments at August 25 Committee meeting.
- Chapter 5 (projects): GeoEngineers is working on the draft of the chapter but likely will not have all project descriptions ready to include in the draft plan (included in appendix).
- Chapter 6 (AM/Policy recommendations) will be compiled for August but may need work after that depending on proposal status.
- Chapter 7 (NEB) will need more discussion.

Action Items for Chair/Technical Consultants/Facilitator

- Facilitation team to coordinate letter to City of Enumclaw regarding policy and adaptive management proposals.
- Stephanie will set up a time for GeoEngineers to discuss the MAR project model results with MIT and WDFW.
- Stephanie will share stormwater project ideas that come from the Our Green/Duwamish group with the workgroup and Committee.
- Stephanie will follow up with Carla, Steve, and Trish on the PE well to water service project description.
- Ecology staff will add readily available tiering criteria information to project inventory.
- Stephanie will share draft Chapter 4: PE well projects and consumptive use.
- GeoEngineers will start working on drafting Chapter 5: Projects & Actions.
- Facilitation team to send out AM discussion questions by email and coordinate with AM sub-group (Dan/Stewart) to use the input received from the Committee and draft AM chapter. Plan to distribute draft adaptive management chapter to Committee for review and discussion at August 25 meeting.

Action Items for Committee Members

- Rick will provide feedback on whether to include Jenkins 1 and Newaukum 5 on the project list. Stephanie will share feedback with workgroup and Committee.

- Committee members should plan to join the August 11 workgroup meeting if they want to discuss details of updated Eagle Lake siphon project.
- Carla will review the habitat project list and let the Committee know if she has any concerns.
- Committee members should review the projects on the “short list” tab and “conceptual ideas” tab on the [project inventory](#) and consider whether this set of projects meet your expectations for the plan. If Committee members think there are critical gaps in the project list, up to Committee members to voice those concerns during meetings, or to the facilitator or chair during check-in calls, and bring new project ideas forward to fill in those gaps.
- Committee can review the [draft habitat project descriptions](#) and let Stephanie know if you have questions or comments before the August 25 meeting.
- Committee should provide feedback on adaptive management discussion questions to Ruth by email.
- The workgroup will discuss ideas for a safety factor/offset target at the August 11 meeting. Committee members should provide feedback on ideas for safety factor by August 10.
- Review meeting summary and provide comments by August 18.

Next Meeting: August 25, 12:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

- Next WREC meeting: Tuesday, August 25, 12:30 – 3:30 pm
- Next Technical Workgroup meeting: Tuesday, August 11, 10 am – 12 pm
 - The technical workgroup will discuss the following at the August 11 meeting:
 - Discuss Eagle Lake Siphon project
 - Updates from conversation with King County Ag about water right acquisitions and conversations with WDFW and Muckleshoot Indian Tribe regarding MAR projects
 - Start tiering the project list
 - Discuss offset target/safety factor proposal