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**Meeting Summary**

Though a quorum was not present, the committee made an interim decision to approve the November, December and February meeting summaries. Rebecca reached out to other committee members to obtain approval. All meeting summaries have been approved.

## Updates and Announcements

* Rebecca posted a draft plan outline on box for the committee review. Feedback/comments were due on February 28. The only feedback received was from Pierce County, who said the outline looked good.
* Spencer developed a summary of lasts month’s adaptive management discussion. It is available on box and is included with this meeting summary.
* We included a committee brochure in the meeting packets. This is to help brief your supervisors/management/decision makers on the work the committee is doing in preparation for plan review.
  + [Committee Brochures](https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/2011070.pdf) are available on Ecology’s publication page. Brochure printing instructions are attached to the email and saved in the [March meeting materials folder](https://app.box.com/s/fbncf3qyr68m65vu2uvb28ufsggzgppm) on Box.

## Consumptive Use Recommendation

* Workgroup recommends consumptive use estimate of 277.4 acres per year and 0.38 cubic feet per second.
  + The reasons behind this recommendation are included in the [Consumptive Use Estimate recommendation document,](https://app.box.com/s/1znv1kdrxbknkvsk0fgjph1bwicn4tld) now available on Box.
* The committee discussed whether the legal limit of 950 gallons per home per day and analysis should be included in the plan.
  + Would be justification for adding a safety factor.
  + Provide context and show why the committee selected the target it did and not the legal limit.
* In addition to describing the consumptive use assumptions and calculations in the plan there will also be a tech memo that in an appendix that will explain everything deeper.
* **The WRIA 10 Committee will vote on consumptive use at the April 1 meeting.**
  + **The expectation is that committee members will brief and talk to decision makers before then.**
* The workgroup recommendation is not to set an offset target at this time and focus on projects, the committee may come back to it in the future.

## Projects and Actions

* Workgroup met to see what is on the project list and what’s in each subbasin, identifying next steps for WWT and HDR.
* The committee moved forward potential water rights project for WWT to review:
  + Fennel Creek Phase 3 in the Lower Puyallup.
  + Two projects in Prairie Creek: Stubbs Project and Old Inglin Dairy.
    - WWT can look into it, see if water right is viable and what the offset would be.
  + Three others but they are a little more sensitive due to landowners.
    - They are in Carbon River, Upper Puyallup River and South Prairie Creek.
  + In April we will have someone from WWT present findings.
  + Still confirming how much these water rights would offset.
* HDR will look into:
  + Alward Road Floodplain reconnection in Carbon subbasin
    - HDR would look into potential offset.
  + Boise Creek Augmentation.
    - Bob Montgomery discussed some work he did on this potential project. His [Scatter Creek write up](https://app.box.com/s/rqkddxga3qj63k3jrtu4lh5ekvlxf01f) is available on Box.
    - The committee did not recommend moving this project forward
  + Headwater restoration.
    - HDR to get in touch with Mount Rainer National Park to see if they have any plans for restoration and see if this would fit into those plans.
* The committee liked the idea of HDR looking into the Harmon Farm project.
  + Might have a direct offset, but could bring the agricultural community into the planning process, a lot of agricultural water users would like to switch to groundwater.
  + Projects like this could cause problems in the summer when stream temperatures are high because not as much cool groundwater would enter the rivers.
  + Use as a case study for design characteristics of this type of project.
* We currently have at least one habitat project per subbasin and that is something WDFW wanted to see.

## Policy and Regulatory Considerations

* The Streamflow Restoration law does not require any regulation changes, but does make some recommendations. Nothing in the plan can obligate Ecology or any authoritative bodies to make regulation changes.
* Multiple committees can put recommendations in their plans so they hold more weight.
* The plan can also be used by the county to propose legislation.
* Suggestions for regulatory recommendations from the committee included the following:
  + Recommend that the legislature fund Ecology to update the well database and develop a retrospective list with the location of each well as a lat/long coordinate or the parcel number.
    - This would also help landowners locate their wells.
    - This would be a good thing to have in multiple plans.
  + Metering permit exempt wells
    - Several committee members expressed concerns about metering wells because there is a lot of uncertainty about who and how it would be enforced.
    - Would have to be managed by regions or statewide because different jurisdictions could enforce it differently.
      * It could get complicated because jurisdiction will have different regulations and ways to collect/report data.
    - Could implement a pilot project and offer an incentive for people to participate.
    - Having this data would have been very useful in determining the consumptive use estimate.
* A committee member asked what the $500 permit exempt fee goes to. $150 go to the permitting agency and $350 goes to Ecology, who have funds for each of the watershed.
  + The $350 does not go to anything specifically in the watershed but the committee can make a recommendation for what it should be used for.
  + Would be less than $250K per year if all of the projected wells are installed, which is not a lot of money over 20 years. Committee suggestion to recommend letting the money accumulate for 10-20 years and the use it for adaptive management of an analysis of the plans success.

## Addressing Resiliency

* A lot of the projects already have climate change resilience built into them.
  + Habitat and Levee setback projects.
  + Talking to Mt. Rainer is a step towards developing projects that are resilient to climate change.
* King County white paper about climate change in WRIA 10 can provide some information for curious committee members.
* There is a lot of work that’s been done in the watershed that the committee can capitalize on.
* The committee discussed how to address resiliency in the plan ideas were:
  + Adding it to project narratives where relevant.
  + Adding a resiliency section to the plan.
  + Adding an appendix/ table for each project that would address various information about each including resiliency.

## Plan Review Process

Rebecca gave a presentation on plan development and review process. The presentation is available on Box, and the accompanying memo has been distributed to the committee members. The strategy is to begin releasing individual chapters in the spring and summer, then is early fall (October) a full draft plan will be released for committee review with a final approval goal of January 2021.

* Ecology is expecting plan approval at our January 2021 meeting, which is 1/6/2021.
  + The committee can change the date of this meeting to occur later in the month, extending the review process for agencies.
* Pierce County stated that if there are any regulation change recommendations that involve them they will have to get approval from the planning commission and may add an extra month to their review process.
* The City of Auburn stated that as long as the plan doesn’t commit them to anything, they will not be taking it to council or the planning commission for approval.
  + Pierce County is taking the plan to their council to ensure a consistent approval process for all WRIA’s within their County.
* Next month the committee will have a round table of each of their review processes.

## Next Steps

* The committee will be voting on the consumptive use estimate in April.
  + Please brief your decision makers before this meeting.
* WWT and HDR will be following up on the projects discussed today and will bring updates back to the group as they are available.
* Review and send you top 6 or up to 8 policy and regulatory considerations to Rebecca by 3/13/2020.
* The committee would like to include a resilience section in the report as well as bringing it up in the individual project discussion where applicable.
* [The King County white paper](https://app.box.com/s/pwx9pl8q0z2pwad2kqkusr7ybkmqmbvv) is available on Box and sent to the committee members.