# Ecology logo. A state of Washington shape separated into three bands of color; light blue, green, and dark blue. a sun sits in the middle of the light blue band.MEETING SUMMARY

**WRIA 14 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

May 9, 2019 | 9:00 a.m.- 12:30 p.m. |[committee website](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37326/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_14.aspx)

## Location

Mason County Public Works
100 Public Works Dr.
Shelton, WA 98584**Committee Chair**

Angela Johnson
angela.johnson@ecy.wa.gov**Handouts**

1. Growth Projections Discussion Guide
2. Subbasin Discussion Guide
3. Workgroup Summary/Maps

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Angela Johnson (*Ecology – Committee Chair)*

Ron Gold *(Mason PUD 1)*

Darin Hall *(Mason PUD 1)*

Larry Boltz (*Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau)*

Shelley Spalding *(WA Sierra Club)*

Seth Book *(Skokomish Tribe – phone)*

Dana Sarff (*Skokomish Tribe)*

Kevin Shutty (*Mason County)*

Dave Windom (*Mason County)*

Craig Gregory (*City of Shelton)*

Barbara Adkins (*Mason Conservation District – ex-officio)*

Fern Schultz (*DOH – ex-officio)*

Kaitlynn Nelson (*Thurston County)*

Allison Cook (*WDFW)*

Paul Pickett (*Squaxin Island Tribe*)

Erin Hall (*Olympia Master Builders*)

Marilyn Vogler (*WA Sierra Club*)

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

None

### Other Attendees\*

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions)*

Jimmy Kralj *(ESA)*

Chad Wiseman (*HDR)*

Alex Paysse (*Mason County*)

Kell Rowan (*Mason County)*

Gino Lucchetti (*Squaxin Island Tribe)*

Amy Correa (*Thurston County*)

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

## Welcome

Angela and Susan kicked off the meeting with meeting location logistics. Committee members and other meeting attendees introduced themselves around the room. The group reviewed the meeting agenda.

## Approval of April Meeting Summary

Angela received the following comments about the April meeting summary:

* Paul Pickett provided clarifications on the following meeting summary sections:
	+ Updates and Announcements
	+ Local planning presentations
	+ Technical workgroup report
	+ Action items

*All of the proposed changes were made. The Committee approved the April meeting summary.*

## Updates and Announcements

Angela provided updates from Ecology.

* Operating Principles signature pages – Committee Chair will continue to receive those.
* HDR has been selected as the technical consultant – Chad Wiseman will be the WRIA 14 liaison
* Committee Chair will share the final scope of work for the technical consultant with the Committee. The consultant is beginning work on growth projection analysis and subbasin delineation, in alignment with the information provided by the Committee.
* May 30th webinar on Streamflow Restoration project types.
* WRIA 1 rule amendment preliminary draft language, and preliminary draft rule supporting document are available for public comment through May 10, 2019.
* Please send field trip ideas to Angela, we will try to pick a location at the June meeting.
* Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) final draft guidance is available for public comment through June 7, 2019.
	+ Angela gave a brief overview of NEB final draft guidance

## Debrief from County/City Presentations

Angela asked Committee members if there were any lingering questions from the County and City presentations from the previous meeting.

Discussion:

* If the group would like an additional presentation from Mason County in the future, the Committee Chair can set that up.
* Consider providing a comparison of the roles and resources of Thurston County and Mason County, and any available GIS information from presentations. This may help identify data gaps resulting from Mason County’s lower level of resources and information.
	+ Note that HDR is meeting with the Counties at a group meeting to get a sense of their available data. Committee Chair will distribute this information, which will be included in a matrix of available data.
* There is still a need for a thorough data inventory and a repository for data-sharing.
	+ HDR will be providing an inventory in a few weeks.
* Angela will post presentations on the WRIA 14 website.

## Mason County – Domestic Use Water Model

Dave Windom (Mason County, Director of Community Development) discussed the “Eventual and Cumulative Domestic Use Water Model for Central Mason County”. The presentation will be posted on the Committee website.

Reference materials:

* Dave Windom’s presentation (will be made available on Committee website)

Discussion following the presentation included:

* Using rainwater from rooftops for irrigation:
	+ It will offset water normally drawn from a well for the same purpose; however, it cannot be used for drinking water in Mason County.
* Using rainwater for mitigation:
	+ For rainwater from roof runoff – there was a discussion on how much would be available for mitigation, it was suggested that Ecology review the document and provide feedback.
	+ How to differentiate between rainwater that is running off houses into the ground, vs. direct infiltration to the ground. 9% is the normal recharge rate from rainfall.
* A similar proposal was made by Skagit County, and Joel Massman did a technical review. A copy of that review will be provided if it can be released.

# Mason Public Utility District 1 and WA Dept. of Health

Ron Gold (Mason PUD 1 Commissioner) and Fern Schultz (DOH, Office of Drinking Water Regional Planner) discussed information on their relevant WRIA 14 data to the Committee.

DOH:

* Criteria and conditions for an exempt well to be constructed in a service area
	+ No regulations regarding well installation in a service area, it depends on each individual water system. Need to look at each Group A water system plan to determine.
		- Reasons someone wouldn’t be connected: capacity, consistency with regulations, water rights, timely and reasonable connection to services.
		- Since 2008, there have been more than 100 wells per year. Prior to that, there were around 200 wells per year. Most developments are hooking up to existing water systems so the number of wells installed has dropped dramatically. Looking to place 3,000 homes (connections) over 20 years.
		- Note that the County, through its ordinances, and the purveyor, through its policies and feasibility determination, each have a say on whether a new home gets connected.
	+ Coordinated Water System Planning (CWSP). Those plans are useful in densely populated areas that do not have competing service providers. Mason County is not part of this system.
* Data is available for Average Day Demand information for all of the WRIA 14 Group A systems.

Mason PUD:

* Buildout for new development depends on:
	+ The water system plan’s identified limiting factor
	+ The available water right: how many acre feet are needed for supply versus what the water right allows
	+ ADD (Average Day Demand)
	+ Max (Max Demand)
	+ Infrastructure
* It’s possible to get this information from all the water systems,
* How to address fire flow – large impact for many Group A systems
* 72 separate water systems in Mason County - trying to consolidate under one water system, with different locations
	+ A key issue is the cost of upgrading out-of-compliance systems

Discussion:

* Metering:
	+ All Class A systems are metered, and most of the Class B systems are. There are tiered rates for A systems.
	+ A Committee member suggested to look into analyzing metering data for seasonal differences, and changes in use after metering is first installed.
* Consideration for technical consultant – get information on the number of deep and shallow wells in WRIA 14.
	+ Useful for identifying project opportunities
	+ DOH may have information on locations of shallow wells.
* Seasonal/vacation homes – how to consider these for consumptive use?
	+ Roughly 38%
	+ Is that figured into water rates?
	+ No, there is a basic water charge.
	+ Does this change consumption?
		- No. The average consumptive use value does not include data from part time houses.
		- When they designate connections that a water system is allowed to have, they don’t include that data.
* What is the difference when we’re talking about “new domestic permit-exempt wells” and “connections”?
	+ We are looking at new connections to existing domestic permit-exempt wells and new domestic permit-exempt wells.
	+ Ecology considers new water uses, and new connections to existing domestic permit-exempt wells falls into that – NEB guidance mentions this as well.

Technical Consultant Introduction

Chad Wiseman (HDR) provided an introduction to the technical scope of work, including a discussion on data needs and Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) determination.

* Scope of work includes:
	+ Subbasin delineation
	+ Growth Projections
	+ Consumptive Use Estimate
	+ Offset Projects
	+ NEB Evaluation
	+ Inventory and Acquire data necessary for these tasks
* HDR can be the driver or be in more of a supportive role, depending on who wants to be doing the work. Technical memos will be provided by HDR along the way for each task.
* HDR has significant background working on projects like the type this group will evaluate, including habitat restoration, floodplain reconnection, aquifer storage, reservoirs, reclaimed water, etc.
* HDR will assist the Committee in evaluating its plan for meeting Net Ecological Benefit.

Reference materials:

* Angela will distribute the technical consultant Scope of Work following the meeting

Discussion:

* Recognize differences in local resources and provide help where fewer resources are available.
* Some committee members feel it’s important to not decide too quickly on subbasins – it needs to be an iterative process with PE well projections and projects. Chad: good to look at spatial distribution of growth, but too much iteration can be bad.
* Information will be needed about the certainty of project benefits.
* Aquatic fish use, limiting factors, and biological implications will be important.
* While the group is analyzing water quantity offsets, they should consider water quality issues – including temperature and dissolved oxygen.
* Consider connections between consumptive use and growth data points.
* Projects that are funded from other sources should be avoided. But leveraging or complimenting other projects, and coordination between projects, can be good overall.

Growth Projections/Consumptive Use

Overview presentation of growth projections and consumptive use estimates. Angela discussed the different methods and assumptions for completing this task.

Reference Materials:

* Growth Projections presentation (will be made available on Committee website)
* Growth Projections discussion guide.

Discussion:

* Important to look at ranges (medium and “worst case”), evaluate assumptions, keep it simple, and defer to the Counties.
* Suggest using allocations. Building in Shelton zeroed out during the recessions, so permits might not be helpful.
* Clarifying the difference between terms such as forecast, scenario, and projections.

# Workgroup Report/Subbasin Delineations

Angela and the workgroup members provided a summary of the previous workgroup meeting – see workgroup meeting summary from 5/1/19 for more details.

Reference Materials: 5/1/19 WRIA 14 Workgroup meeting summary

Discussion:

* Workgroup discussed:
	+ Data Available
	+ Growth Projection methods
	+ Considerations for data and project types
	+ Subbasin delineations
* Workgroup feedback on subbasin delineations:
	+ WRIA 14 (from previous RCW 90.82 planning effort) draft subbasins were too coarse
	+ Skokomish tribe had concerns about subbasins that drain to Hood Canal, and creating a larger Hood Canal subbasin.
	+ Discussed looking at streams listed in the in-stream flow rule
	+ Acknowledgement that subbasins are not based on ground water divide.
* Committee comments:
	+ Interested in hearing more about the “South Shore” delineation and how to mitigate projects from Alderbrook Use
	+ Consider collaboration between WRIA 14 and WRIA 15 WRECs, or other WRIAs to address the Hood Canal
	+ Subbasins are a priority for Skokomish tribe. Concern is that the NE Section of Goldsborough Creek has recessional outwash gravel and the slope of the ground is to the south. However, hydrogeology studies (done by Pacific Groundwater Group) has shown that the water flow is to the north, into the Skokomish River. Needs more discussion – important area for hatcheries and ESA listed fish.
	+ Fish needs should be compared to likely permit-exempt well growth areas.
	+ A presentation on ground water modeling would be helpful.
* Next steps:
	+ Work group will continue to look at lumping/splitting subbasins, with special consideration based on committee feedback.
	+ We may consider a delineation that considers the projected growth
	+ Consider how level of delineation affects ability to determine offset projections/actions at that level.

## Public Comment

*No comments.*

## Action Items for Committee Members

* Next meeting is June 13, 2019 at the Mason County Public Works – 100 Public Works Dr., Shelton, WA 98584.
* Next WRIA 14 technical workgroup meeting will be June 7, 2019.

## Action Items for Ecology:

* Consider scheduling detailed Mason County presentation if Committee finds it beneficial.
* Consider providing information on how to compare and contrast information brought forward by Mason County and Thurston County given the different methods and assumptions they are making.
* Data sharing
* Ecology technical staff review of Mason County water use model.
* Clarification on connections vs. new wells
* Angela will send out SOW for technical consultant contract
* Angela will ask for ideas for field trip visits for August meeting
* Angela will ask for project ideas to create a running list
* Future meetings
	+ Presentation for water rights, water law
	+ Talk on water rights acquisition opportunities
	+ Tribal treaty rights presentation
	+ Decision on initial subbasin delineation
	+ Discuss products from consultant and work group
	+ Presentation on groundwater models
	+ Field visit site discussion