**Meeting Summary**

**Chambers-Clover Watershed (WRIA 12)**

**Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

**Meeting Information:**

Wednesday, April 10, 2019

12:30 pm – 4:00 pm

Environmental Services Building

[9850 64th St W](https://www.bing.com/local?lid=YN873x132342623&id=YN873x132342623&q=Environmental+Services+Building&name=Environmental+Services+Building&cp=47.198768615722656%7e-122.56482696533203&ppois=47.198768615722656_-122.56482696533203_Environmental+Services+Building&FORM=SNAPST)

[University Place, WA](https://www.bing.com/local?lid=YN873x132342623&id=YN873x132342623&q=Environmental+Services+Building&name=Environmental+Services+Building&cp=47.198768615722656%7e-122.56482696533203&ppois=47.198768615722656_-122.56482696533203_Environmental+Services+Building&FORM=SNAPST)

**Committee Chair:**

Rebecca Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology

360-407-6666, Rebecca.Brown@ecy.wa.gov

| **Topic** | **Time** | **Action** | **Handouts** | **Lead** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Welcome and Introduction** | 12:30 pm  | None |  | Facilitator |
| **Approval of March Summary** | 12:40 | **Vote** | Agenda | Facilitator |
| **Announcements** | 12:45 |  |  | Chair and Committee |
| **Public Comment** | 12:50 |  |  | Facilitator |
| **Committee Goals for Plan** | 1:00 |  |  | Facilitator  |
| **Operating Principles** | 2:10 |  | Operating Principles | Facilitator |
| **Instream Flow Presentation** | 2:50 |  |  | Jim Pacheco |
| **Next Steps and Adjournment** | 3:50 | None |  | Chair |

**Next Meeting: May 8, 2019, 12:30 pm – 4:00 pm**

**Environmental Services Building**

**Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance**

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cal Taylor | Tacoma | Kris Kauffman | Chambers Clover Watershed Council |
| Dan Cardwell | Pierce County | Paul Picket | Squaxin Island Tribe |
| Kelly Still | WA Department of Fish and Wildlife | Paul Loveless | Steilacoom |
| Austin Jennings (alternate) | Pierce County | Ryan Mello | Pierce Conservation District |
| Rebecca Brown | WA Department of Ecology |  |  |

Committee members not in attendance: Puyallup Tribe, City of Lakewood, MBA Pierce, Lakewood Water District.

**Other Attendees**

| **Name** | **Representing** | **Name** | **Representing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rebecca Kowalksi | JBLM | Lisa Spurrier | WRIA 10/12 Salmon Recovery |
| Jeff Johnson | Spanaway Water | Tom Kantz | Pierce County |
| Jim Pacheco (presenter) | Ecology | Burt Clothier | Pacific Groundwater Group |
| Spencer Easton (facilitator) | ESA | Madeline Remmen (facilitation support) | ESA |

## **Approval of March Summary and review of agenda:** Approved with amendments.

* The summary be amended to include comments at the March meeting that the model is very complex and it would require expertise to run it, and that the uncertainty in the model is important to understand.
* The USGS slides will not be posted online as per USGS’s request

## **Announcements:**

* The ESA facilitation team is now onboard and will be present at all meetings
* Binders for each entity will be provided and all meeting handouts will be three hole punched to be added
* The scope of work for the technical consultants will be available April 15th
	+ Technical Consultants: HDR, Anchor QEA, and Pacific Ground Water
* Kris Kauffman will be representing the Chambers-Clover Watershed Council
* The Tacoma Pierce County Health department does not have the capacity to be an Ex-Officio member, but they are willing to contribute data
* WRIA 11 lessons learned link is available on Ecologies website
	+ The link will be redistributed
* The Squaxin Tribe has submitted a letter to Ecology expressing a concern about the technical contract being too narrow in scope and about how the law should be interpreted

**Committee Goals for the Plan:**

Committee members wrote their goals and desired outcomes for the process on sticky notes – a full list of the statements on notes is attached as Appendix A. Common goals include: enhance habitat for fish and wildlife, offset future consumptive use, meet the letter of the law and fulfill requirements, and include implementable projects.

The committee discussed the goal of implementable projects, which means projects that can receive funding, are acceptable to the jurisdiction that would be implementing them, and that are supported by sufficient information to show the need and value.

The committee discussed keeping the scope of the plan narrow enough to be achievable. There are still questions about interpretations of the legislation that need to be resolved. The committee felt it would be helpful to understand the plan structure and the funding process better. The committee discussed the value of a planning process when there are few potential permit-exempt wells in the watershed. Committee members want to have a voice in the process. The plan provides an opportunity to fund projects that produce a net ecological benefit and potentially to address the impacts of past development.

**Operating Principles:**

Below is a summary of the discussion of the operating principles.

* No decision was made as the Puyallup Tribe was not present
* The group discussed whether to make interim decisions with a super majority vote or by consensus
* A concern was expressed that super majority votes will undermine the eventual consensus that is required for the plan to be implemented
* The process can proceed without operating principles or a formal decision-making process for interim decisions. In this case, we would advance multiple scenarios where necessary
* A committee member recommended looking into the Sussman model of consensus
* A smaller group of committee member will meet to discuss a solution

**Instream Flow Presentation:** Jim Pacheco (Department of Ecology) presented an introduction to instream flow science, policy and impacts to availability. The full presentation can be found on the [WRIA 12](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37324/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_12.aspx) webpage. Below is a summary of the questions and discussion following the presentation:

* Q: Why can’t you add more water to the stream?
	+ A: The instream flow rule itself cannot add water to the stream flow, but projects can increase the amount of water in the stream.
* If there is more water going into the stream does that not allow ecology to give more water rights?
	+ Improper way of looking at it
	+ Projects would meet instream flows to be met more, you can still apply for a permit
	+ Huge amount of effort to increase instream flow
	+ Set targets instead
* How often are instream flows looked at and reconsidered?
	+ Instream flow updates do not occur often. The last update was in the Wenatchee watershed (WRIA 45) in 2007

## **Action items:**

* A small group will be convened to discuss operating principles
* Operating principles will be on next month’s agenda
* Ecology will look into whether there are examples of a plan structure, as well as more information project funding, that can be shared at the next meeting

# *Appendix A:*

* Enhancement of water supply without fish impacts
* Projects that enhance fish
* A plan that identifies additional habitat and water quality projects that help to achieve Ecologies definition of NEB
* Think long-term: when the CCC system may support more salmon species once the dam is removed
* Ensure projects will address needs in viable fishery areas
* Identify strategies that meaningfully enhance/support in-stream flows and salmon habitat
* Invest in efforts that are the most “cost” effective
* Focus on actions that will improve fish production
* Where possible coordinate project with permitted water rights
* Identify specific projects/initiatives that meaningfully enhance instream flows and salmon habitat
* Develop WREC plan in accordance with ESSB6091- Stream Restoration
* More water and more fish
* Collaborative problem solving
* Basin delineations that follow in national standardized datasets (HUC 12)
* Enhance, restore and conserve habitat for fish and wildlife
* WDFW would like to maintain cool (temp) instream flows
* That the plan will inform and guide in accomplishing these goals for the WRIA 12’s future population and water use
* Project to benefit fish and wildlife habitat
* Fulfill “letter of the law” clearly and have a complimentary list of strategies that get at the “spirit of the law”
* To have mitigation as a priority/ error on the side of over mitigation
* Mitigation on priority 2- good projects, well developed, address needs for fish
* The plan will be implemented
* A plan document that identifies projects to offset water use from future domestic permit exempt wells
* Meet legislative requirements
* Identify realistic fundable projects that will achieve results
* Come up with a list of implementable projects
* Find projects to offset our future consumptive use estimates
* Mitigation on Priority 2 – good projects well developed, address critical needs for fish
* Recognize seasonal Q delta at USGS gage is 0-700+ cfs
* Projects: appropriate to urban environment, restore ecological functions
* Non-degradation of levels (lakes) and flows. Recognizing the history, i.e. 1986 server diversion, great impacts in the watershed.