Meeting Summary

**WRIA 10 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement**

**Committee Meeting**

December 4, 2019 | 9:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.| [Committee Webpage](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37323/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_10.aspx) | [Webmap](https://hdr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=80d55f4e263d4a27a7f987f62f7846b7)

## **Location**

Puyallup Public Library

324 S. Meridian, Puyallup**Committee Chair**

Rebecca Brown

Rebecca.brown@ecy.wa.gov**Handouts**

Agenda

Project Inventory

Map

# Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Paul Marrinan (City of Puyallup)

Lisa Tobin (City of Auburn)

Austin Jennings, alternate (Pierce County)

Carla Carlson (Muckleshoot Indian Tribe)

Robert Wright, alternate (City of Sumner)

Char Naylor (Puyallup Tribe)

Greg Reed (City of Orting)

Jessie Gamble (MBA Pierce)

Rebecca Brown, Chair (Ecology)

Scott Woodbury (City of Enumclaw)

Allan Warren (Pierce Conservation District)

Jeremy Metzler (City of Edgewood)

Liz Bockstiegel (WDFW)

Merita Trohimovich (City of Tacoma)

Lisa Spurrier, ex officio (Salmon Recovery Lead Entity)

Other Attendees\*

Spencer Easton (ESA, Facilitator)

Mike Noone (WA Dept. of Ecology)

Madeline Remmen (ESA, Information Manager)

Jacob Heckert (South Sound Beaver Recovery)

Mark Heckert (South Sound Beaver Recovery)

Rusty Mulholland (PCC Farmland Trust)

Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA)

Jim Pacheco (WA Dept. of Ecology)

Tom Culhane (WA Dept. of Ecology)

\*Attendees list is based on sign-in sheet.

# Welcome and Introduction

Goal of the project workshop is to get a sense of what projects are out there and where we need more research and priority projects.

# Project Workshop Overview

Spencer went over NEB definitions of projects and actions, and emphasized that NEB needs to be achieved within the whole watershed, not required by subbasin.

* The working CU estimate is 0.38 cfs or 277.4 acre-ft.
* Update on acquisition assessment: Ecology is having a meeting with WA water trust to talk about capacity to do the watershed acquisition in this watershed and cost.

# Project Ideas and List Review

Brief presentations on potential projects:

City of Enumclaw projects: ([Photos of projects](https://app.box.com/s/elkxz9olkanslqxagoxwgypb7q6wrcoq) are available on Box for committee members).

* Relocation of Boise Creek at the Enumclaw Golf Course. This project was initially considered back in 2009. Project would provide better spawning habitat, and a restoration/habitat project candidate. Project has a 30% design. Multi-benefit (flooding and habitat).
* Enumclaw Golf Course Water Right Change. Golf course would stop surface withdrawals for irrigation and connect to municipal water. The water right is 0.2 cfs, and is used during critical low flow times. The surface water right would be relinquished.
* Boise Creek Augmentation: There is existing infrastructure that moves water from Scatter Creek to Boise Creek. Could be used to augment flows in Boise Creek (important salmon stream). Infrastructure related to 5 cfs Weyerhaeuser water right.
  + Look into the Weyerhaeuser water right.

City of Puyallup Projects:

* Deer Creek. Stream is very channelized and has no channel in some places. Project is move and naturalize the channel, creating flood storage, moving and updating culverts. 30% design this year.
* Main street culvert replacement to enhance fish passage.
* Silver Creek Channel Stabilization. Project is similar to the Clark’s Creek project during August 7 site visits. Mainly to address sediment loading downstream, but would have a small offset benefit from log jams, large woody debris, slowing flows and raising the water table.

PCC Farmland Trust:

* Harman Farm. Property owned by the Trust, with intent to continue agriculture on the property. Interest in changing irrigation right from surface water (small, unnamed creek) to groundwater right. Water right is for 80 acre-ft, 180 gallons per minute, from a small system, historically irrigated 30 acres.
  + Changes from surface to groundwater rights is challenging, costly, and time-intensive.
  + Could only be counted as an offset if part of the water right is conveyed permanently to trust.
  + Other agricultural producers are interested in similar projects if the Harman Farm project is successful.
  + Potential to put this project type in the plan without specific farms/landowners.

Pierce Conservation District:

* Farmers interested in using cisterns or other off-channel storage to store winter rainwater for the summer.
  + To count as an offset, we would need to quantify the offset amount the cistern water provides.
* Green storm water infrastructure, providing cost share or increasing incentives to implement projects. Stormwater is difficult to estimate offset, but could help contribute to NEB.
* Purchase water rights from willing landowners and permanently convey them to Ecology’s Trust Water Right Program.

South Sound Beaver Recovery:

* Not a specific project, but a suggestion to consider beaver projects in general. Studies have shown that beaver dams can increase groundwater infusion by 10-30%. Work with landowners and farmers to address specific beaver problems. Work with farmers in lower watershed. Relocating animals to areas of less conflict, where they could beneficial impacts to the watershed.
  + Beaver projects as part of restoration are listed as a “near term action”.

# General Comments:

* If we have quantified offsets, then we do not need to quantify all of the restoration projects.
* Question to add to the [Project Inventory](https://app.box.com/s/0pfgkd52oaktueqwjzw73yw5suayc15v) so there can more clarity on projects:
  + Has the offset been quantified?
  + Is there a water right associated with properties?
  + Determining this and what level effort will be associated with it
  + Is there a storage/infiltration benefit?
* How do we categorize projects in the plan?
  + NEB has project categories.
* What are the priority sub basins?
* Mitigation/restoration/ mixed funding sources: some projects from the Salmon Recovery Plan are restoration, but other projects may benefit from leveraging multiple funding sources.
* What are the tiers?
  + Projects that offset consumption in space and time?
  + Projects that contribute to NEB
* Clarity on HDRs scope and process. HDR has capacity to evaluate and develop some projects (up to 10 with a deeper evaluation), but more information on HDR’s work is needed. Need to have project list prioritized by Q1 2020.
* Where do we want projects?
  + Number we want in each subbasin
* How will we incorporate projects that come up in the future?
  + Option to include more vague project types.

# What makes a good project?

Committee had a wide ranging discussion, including the process for developing the project list, categorizing projects, identifying projects with offsets, the water right assessment, implications for project funding, priority areas, locations of projects, technical contract scope, NEB, the WRIA 11 plan,. A number of questions and points came out of the discussion.

* There is a need to review and clean up the project list, and add projects to a map (see Next Steps).
* Some habitat/restoration projects have streamflow benefits even if the offsets are difficult to measure.
* Projects can occur anywhere in the watershed to offset water and contribute to NEB.
* WRIA 11 plan may provide some guidance, but word of caution: it was a quick timeline and a different process. Ecology developed the tiers in the WRIA 11 plan based on certainty of projects listed on the plan. Ecology only counted Tier 1 projects toward the offset, and it was difficult to evaluate.
* Option for project tiers includes 1st tier would be a project that offsets water in space and time. Projects that contribute to NEB are still good, just go in a lower tier because they are not quantifiable. 0.4 cfs is not a lot of offset so a lot of projects could contribute to NEB
  + Interest in still looking at other projects.
* Ecology is working on water rights assessment using stream prioritization. Will be would be very helpful for the group because that would start a lot of the conversation about areas that we have not thought about
* If we have quantified offsets, then we do not need to quantify all of the restoration projects.
* Question to add to the [Project Inventory](https://app.box.com/s/0pfgkd52oaktueqwjzw73yw5suayc15v) so there can more clarity on projects:
  + Has the offset been quantified?
  + Is there a water right associated with properties?
  + Determining this and what level effort will be associated with it
  + Is there a storage/infiltration benefit?
* How do we categorize projects in the plan?
  + NEB has project categories.
* What are the priority sub basins?
* Mitigation/restoration/ mixed funding sources: some projects from the Salmon Recovery Plan are restoration, but other projects may benefit from leveraging multiple funding sources.
* What are the tiers?
  + Projects that offset consumption in space and time?
  + Projects that contribute to NEB
* Clarity on HDRs scope and process. HDR has capacity to evaluate and develop some projects (up to 10 with a deeper evaluation), but more information on HDR’s work is needed. Need to have project list prioritized by Q1 2020.
* Where do we want projects?
  + Number we want in each subbasin
* How will we incorporate projects that come up in the future?
  + Option to include more vague project types.

# Priority Subbasins and Streams

* Interest in South Prairie Creek and Boise Creek.
  + South Prairie Creek has a lot of activity and restoration focused on it. There will be an action plan soon. Potential to develop a strategy with the restoration community.
* Upper Puyallup really needs some attention.
  + Salmon enhancement group is conducting studies in the upper White and Puyallup; the hope for that is that they will identify projects. Their restoration plan timeline does not line up with the committee’s.
  + Option to add the restoration plan projects to the WRE plan.
* Interest in compiling a list of jurisdictions, impacts, and projects in each subbasin
* Start by focusing on streams in impact areas (spencer wrote a list on flow chart)
  + Kapowsin, Voight, Wilkeson, South Prairie, Boise.

# Action Items and Next Steps

Project list maintenance:

1. Pair down the list before we start going through it:
   * Take a look at the list and let us know if some of the projects are funded or constructed.
   * Put projects in buckets.
2. Map projects and see where there are in relation to streams in high impact areas.

Rebecca to check with Ecology:Can this funding source be mixed with salmon funding?

**Workgroup Meeting: January 13, 2019, I pm – 3 pm, Puyallup Public Library.**

**Next full committee meeting: February 8, 2020, 9:30 am - 12:30 pm.**