# WRIA 10 Policy and Regulatory Ideas

**Background:** On April 22, the WRIA 10 workgroup reviewed the remaining policy and regulatory ideas and provided recommendations for next steps on the remaining ideas. They also reviewed ideas the committee flagged for workgroup review at the April 1 meeting. The document walks through the workgroup recommendations on the policy and regulatory ideas.

**Recommendation:** Do not include the following six ideas in the plan because of the lack of consensus and challenges for implementation.

| **Votes** | **Questions** | **Notes** | **Next Step** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Incentivize drilling of deeper wells to protect shallow aquifers** |
|  | What incentives?Does anyone have concerns with including this in the plan?Does this have a champion? | **May require TPCHD regulation change. May require hydrogeologist as part of implementation.****Could be extremely expensive (beyond feasible). (different construction technique, WQ and flow concerns in deeper aquifer)****Most wells are already drilled into confined aquifer.****$$$ (construction and pumping)****What is the benefit?****What are the impacts of pulling water from a deeper aquifer?** | **None. Do not pursue.** |
| **Restrict the number of watering days** |
|  | How would this be enforced?Needs more discussion before it can be included in the plan or dismissed.Who is the right group to discuss this further? |  | **Do not pursue.** |
| **Revise or modify the in-stream flow rules – ensure that instream flows are enforced, modify limits if needed for habitat and animal use.** |
|  | Is anyone interested in including this in the plan?If not, can we remove it from the list? |  | **Do not pursue.** |
| **Allow water suppliers to augment flows during critical conditions without the quantity counting against the supplier’s water rights** |
|  | Needs more discussion before it can be included in the plan or dismissed.Who is the right group to discuss this further? |  | Do not pursue |
| **Encourage smaller lot sizes (where appropriate in the UGA)** |
|  | How would smaller lot sizes be encouraged?Is anyone interested in including this in the plan?If not, can we remove it from the list? | **Questions on how it pertains to streamflow? Most UGA is within group A systems.****Pierce County looking at smaller lot sizes for other purposes.** | **Getting addressed through other processes.****Do not pursue.** |
| **Require well pumps that limit usage, need to ensure water for firefighting is available if needed** |
|  | How would this be enforced?How would people get the technology?Is anyone interested in including this in the plan?If not, can we remove it from the list? | **Not feasible on a well pump for firefighting. Not tied to well (life safety tanks).****Include fire marshal code.****Maintaining perimeter fire protection (landscaping).****Is that technology available? (flow restrictors, usually used for low wells. Easily removed).** | **Do not pursue (costs, monitoring, regulating).** |

**Recommendation:** Bring next step options to the full committee for discussion and input.

| **Votes** | **Questions** | **Notes** | **Next Step** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ease restoration regulations in the County/local jurisdictions or reduce policy barriers to restoration** |
|  | Determine what recommendations can be included in the plan within the mandated timeframe.Does this have a champion? | **Intent: increase the rate of restoration and reduce barriers to get mores restoration projects.****Permitting barriers (fed, state, local).****Needs to be fleshed out more. Need to know which specific barriers related to permitting, but willing to pursue.****Policy changes would happen in a different venue.****Streamlining water right acquisition?****Maybe better as adaptive management?** | **Do we want to move this forward?****Identify specific permitting barriers (do any of the projects have specific barriers to implementation)****Or****Do not pursue at this time.****Or****Include in Adaptive Management.** |

**Recommendation:** See what other committees are doing about withdrawal limits, including the Nooksack rule. Note that TPCHD approves subdivisions on wells and Group B systems based on lower per day withdrawal than the annual average of 950 gpd per connection(90.94.030 RCW limits) and the 5,000 gpd per well/project (RCW 90.44.050 limits). Continue the metering discussion before coming back to this question. Include TPCHD policies in the plan.

| **Votes** | **Questions** | **Notes** | **Next Step** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Change the gallon per day withdrawal limit (decrease both the streamflow restoration law limit of 950 gpd and the groundwater code limit of 5,000 gpd)**  |
|  | Does anyone have concerns with including this in the plan?Does this have a champion? | **Lower than 5,000 gpd limits subdivision potential. TPCHD would need to change regulations.****TPCHD: Average use is 400 gpd. Septic systems sized on bedrooms for indoor use.****How is it applied per subdivisions?** **Rule cannot change a law (90.94 gives authority to change 950 gpd)****TPCHD: 12 lots allowed if each lot is served by individual well(400 gallons per well).****-Group B designed at 750 gpd.****-Group B allowed only 6 connections.****-can’t talk about it unless we know what people are using (metering)** | **Include TPCHD policies in the plan.****Metering discussion first.****What are other WRIAs doing?****Share WRIA 1 Nooksack Rule.** |

**Recommendation:** Move to project list.

| **Votes** | **Questions** | **Notes** | **Next Step** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expand research on ways to make use of excess winter stream flows to increase aquifer recharge and groundwater storage** |
|  | Does anyone have concerns with including this in the plan?Should this be an action, rather than a policy recommendation?Does this have a champion? | Instead of researching ways of holding winter stream flows, we should instead think of ways to preserve aquifer recharge areas and wetlands. Focus on protecting what we do have before pursuing big MAR projects. Could be part of climate change/resilience component of the plan.Need to be more specific on what this looks like practically – expanded critical areas? Changes to aquifer protection regulations?Could potentially include land acquisition to protect existing resources | Put on the agenda for the technical workgroup to discussProject to identify and protect aquifer recharge areas and wetlands. Prioritize protection and enhancements of natural systems before relying on built systems. |