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**WRIA 10 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

**Committee meeting**

February 5, 2020 | 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. |[WRIA 10 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

Administrative Center and Library

3005 112 St. E. Tacoma

Committee Chair

Rebecca Brown

Rebecca.brown@ecy.wa.gov

Handouts

Agenda

Discussion Guide

Project Summary

2020 Work Plan

**Attendance**

Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Tim Osborne (Lake Haven Sewer and Water District)

Lisa Tobin (City of Auburn)

Austin Jennings, alternate (Pierce County)

Carla Carlson (Muckleshoot Indian Tribe)

Michael Kosa (City of Sumner)

Paul Marrinan (City of Puyallup)

Rebecca Brown, Chair (Ecology)

Allan Warren (Pierce Conservation District)

Liz Bockstiegel (WDFW)

Merita Trohimovich (City of Tacoma)

Lisa Spurrier, ex officio (Salmon Recovery Lead Entity)

Carrie Hernadez (Puyallup River Watershed Council)

Ryan Johnstone (City of Bonney Lake)

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Not Attendance\*

Puyallup Tribe

City of Edgewood

City of Pacific

City of Orting

City of Fife

City of Enumclaw

Pierce MBA

Other Attendees\*

Spencer Easton (ESA, Facilitator)

Madeline Remmen (ESA, Information Manager)

Brandon Parsons (American Rivers)

Angela Johnson (WA Dept. of Ecology)

Tom Culhane (WA Dept. of Ecology)

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

**Meeting Summary**

A quorum was not present; therefore, the November and December meeting summaries could not be approved. The committee will review the meeting summaries and vote on their approval at the next meeting.

**Updates and Announcements**

* The 2020 [Streamflow restoration grant](https://ecology.wa.gov/About-us/How-we-operate/Grants-loans/Find-a-grant-or-loan/Streamflow-restoration-implementation-grants) round is open on EAGL and will close March 31st.
* The water rights assessment is underway.
* The Ecology Planners met with WDFW habitat biologists and streamflow restoration team to increase communication.
* Rebecca sent out [draft plan outline](https://app.box.com/s/4tsvkj888jtwv9t9xk6g5l1pqj0kodh4) through Box, it is a standard outline for all the watershed groups and feedback is due by Feb 28.
* Rebecca is working on a [draft work plan](https://app.box.com/s/k2t0qaeig4g7khj5gu6dd4y7hq14bc09). As of right now the committee will continue to meet monthly. Hopefully the committee will be able to have fewer meetings in the second half of the year depending on if we get to agreements and/or conclusions sooner.
* Ecology staff and the technical consultant team have started drafting introductory parts of the plan. HDR is working on drafting the historic conditions sections.

**Public Comment**

* *No comments.*

**Consumptive Use Update**

* The committee decided on a working CU estimate at the November meeting
* GeoEngineers and HDR stand by their work and the other consultant groups
  + People are not watering their lawns as much as turf is watered, so it is very hard to tell exactly how much of the area was irrigated and a lot was up to the interpretation of the individual analyst leading some differences
* The workgroup will review the CU estimate and provide a recommendation in March. The full committee will vote on it in April

**Projects and Actions**

Brandon Parsons from American Rivers discussed the potential for restoration projects at the headwaters of rivers and streams. These projects have been implemented in high elevation areas of California, allowing for more water to be held in the runoff period and then released during dry periods. Projects have resulted in a 5-time increase in the base flow as well as increases in groundwater and habitat benefits.

* These projects involve raising streambeds and increasing storage, potentially using a pond and plug method, beaver analogs, or other natural structures to restore existing meadow to natural streamflow.
* Project like this could be good at Mt. Rainer.
* The ability of floodplains and wetlands to hold water and release it at a different time indicate that this may work in Western Washington. More research on specific locations would be needed.
* Storage capacity of the channel will be factor. A wider alluvial channel will provide more benefit.
  + Too high in the watershed, you tend to have narrower valleys
  + It would be great to develop a mapping system of where the best opportunities for this are
* A feasibility study is needed, but there is some legwork that has been done in California.

The committee had a discussion following up on the projects workshop in December.

* Our working CU estimate is .38 cfs and 277.4 acre feet per year, but it may change
  + Our project list currently has more offset then our CU estimate, so we can set our offset target higher than the CU estimate.
  + The workgroup will identify which factors in the CU estimate are the most sensitive to change and work on coming up with potential safety factors.
* The contract with WWT for the water rights assessment is moving through Ecology. WWT will review any temporary donations, opportunities for reclaimed water use in Tehaleh wastewater system, rapid assessment of priority stream and review up to 10 water rights selected by committee members, and provide a presentation at the April meeting.
* Ecology does not have an issue including projects that are partially or all the way funded by restoration funding.
* The committee began narrowing down and taking a deeper look at projects and categorizing them into the following categories: estimated, could be estimated, difficult to estimate, no offset, types, and programmatic.
* The workgroup will continue to refine the project list at the February 19 meeting.
* It would be beneficial to have a summary of the all projects to get an idea of what is in each sub basin. Then we can identify areas that are lacking projects and make the determination if more projects are needed.
* Have WWT work on Stubbs projects and look at water right for Boise creek augmentation.
* Have HDR work on GIS and quantifiable data we can use for selection criteria/sites for Headwater Restoration Projects. The workgroup will define what this scope should include.

**Implementation and Adaptive Management**

* The chances of getting this group of people back in the room are very small. This means that reconvening in a few years would require time to bring new people up to speed.
* Committee members thought that adaptive management is something Ecology should lead.
* The plan should not put responsibility for adaptive management on this group or the local jurisdictions.
  + Hard for jurisdictions to get resources for adaptive management if Ecology is not going to provide any resources.
* This is an opportunity to work across the watershed to implement adaptive management.
  + For example, by implementing a statewide monitoring website for projects.
* Could make a recommendation for the legislation to fund Ecology for adaptive management.
* Important for us to have some sort of framework to track the outcome of this plan.
  + Maybe having 5 year check-ins and status update meetings to talk about what we’ve done.

**Timelines/Work Plan**

* For the time being we will continue to meet monthly. We are planning to vote on a final approval on the plan in Jan 2021.
  + Local agencies will likely need at least 2 months to approve plans and that is why we need to continue to meet monthly.
  + Meetings will become sparser in the second half of the year due to holidays and the plan approval process.
* Make sure that if any committee member has additional projects to get them to the technical workgroup ASAP, so they can wrap up the projects.
* Questions: If one of us can’t approve the plan (abstaining from the vote), does that automatically make it go into rule making?
  + All members of the committee must approve the plan (I believe this is covered in all of the Operating Principles as well). There is no abstaining on the final plan approval. An abstention for final plan approval is considered a ‘no’ vote. Committee members also must approve the full plan.

**Action Items and Next Steps**

* Update on CU in March and then vote in April.
* Workgroup will keep working on project list and develop a plan for HDR to start looking at Headwater Restoration feasibility.
* Next meetings:
  + Workgroup Feb 19, 2020 1 pm- 3:30 pm, Puyallup Public Library
* Full Committee Meeting: March 4, 2020 9:30am - 12:30pm, Puyallup Fairfield Inn & Suites (Marriott) Pioneer Rooms 1 & 2.