**Draft Template for Chapter Seven: Net Ecological Benefit Evaluation**

**7.1 Water Offsets**

* Compare the total WRIA offset to the total WRIA consumptive use estimate.
* Compare the total WRIA offset to the safety factor/offset target if applicable.
* Determine if the plan has succeeded in offsetting the impacts at the WRIA level.
* Compare the offset to the consumptive use estimate by subbasin.
* State how these projects provide additional benefits to instream resources beyond those necessary to offset the impacts from new consumptive water use within the WRIA.
* State how adaptive management provides additional certainty, if applicable.

Table 1. Summary of WRIA X Water Offset Projects.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Number** | **Project Name** | **Project Short Description**  (one sentence) | **Subbasin** | **Estimated Flow Benefits (AF/YR)** | **Project Included in NEB Analysis** |
| 1 | Project A |  | A | 50 | Yes |
| 2 | Project B |  | A | 160 | Yes |
| 3 | Project C |  | B | 150 | Yes |
| 4 | Project D |  | C | 45 | No |
| 5 | Project E |  | D | 165 | Yes |
| 6 | Project F |  | All | 140 | No |

[NOTE: Some projects that are in the plan may be very general and the Committee can decide not to count them toward net ecological benefit, e.g. a project to encourage PE well users to connect to water service]

Table 2. Subbasin Water Offset Totals Compared to Permit-Exempt Well Consumptive Use Impacts.\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subbasin** | **Offset Project Totals (AF/YR)** | **Permit-Exempt Well Consumptive Use (AF/YR)** | **Difference (AF/YR)** |
| A | 210 | 170 | **40** |
| B | 150 | 152 | **-2** |
| C | 0 | 50 | **-50** |
| D | 165 | 97 | **68** |
| All | 140 | 0 | **140** |
| **TOTAL** | **665** | **469** | **196** |

\*Numbers in table are examples and do not reflect WRIA 13 estimates

**7.2 Habitat Benefits**

* Summarize types of projects, anticipated benefits, and limiting factors addressed.
* Summarize the distribution of projects among the subbasins and the streams that will benefit.
* State how these projects provide additional benefits to instream resources beyond those necessary to offset the impacts from new consumptive water use within the WRIA.

Table 3. Summary of WRIA X Habitat Improvement Projects

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Number** | **Project Name** | **Project Short Description**  (one sentence) | **Subbasin** | **River Miles Benefitted** | **Benefits with Quantifiable Metric** (e.g. structures per mile) | **Limiting Factor(s) Addressed** | **Project Included in NEB Analysis** |
| 1 |  |  | A |  |  |  | Yes |
| 7 |  |  | B |  |  |  | yes |
| 8 |  |  | C |  |  |  | yes |
| 9 |  |  | C |  |  |  | yes |
| 10 |  |  | D |  |  |  | yes |

[NOTE: The technical consultant team will complete the Habitat projects table with information included in the project descriptions. The technical consultants will not collect additional information and some cells may be left blank]

**7.3 Adaptive Management**

* Reference Chapter 6 and how the adaptive management component of the plan increases certainty of achieving NEB.

**7.4 NEB Evaluation Findings**

* Include a clear statement of the Committee’s finding that the combined components of the plan do or do not achieve a NEB. For example: “The WRIA X Committee finds that this plan achieves a net ecological benefit, as required by RCW 90.94.030 and defined by the Final NEB Guidance (Ecology 2019).”