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**WRIA 14 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

December 12, 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. Workgroup Meeting Summary
2. Safety Factor Discussion Guide

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Angela Johnson (*Ecology – Committee Chair)*

Larry Boltz (*agricultural interests, Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau)*

Erin Hall (*residential construction industry, Olympia Master Builders*)

Dana Sarff (*Skokomish Tribe)*

David Windom (*Mason County)*

Brent Armstrong (*City of Shelton)*

Barbara Adkins (*Mason CD, ex-officio)*

Kaitlynn Nelson (*Thurston County)*

Brad Murphy (*Thurston County*)

Darrin Masters (*WDFW*)

Paul Pickett (*Squaxin Island Tribe*)Fern Schultz *(DOH*)

Ron Gold (*Mason County PUD 1)*

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

Environmental Interests, WA Sierra Club

### Other Attendees\*

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions)*

Jimmy Krajl (*ESA*)

Mike Noone (*Ecology*)

Gino Lucchetti (*Squaxin Island Tribe*)

Erica Marbet (*Squaxin Island Tribe)*

Paula Holroyde (*League of Women Voters*)

Brandy Milroy (*Mason County PUD 1)*

\*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 November Meeting Summary

Angela received comments on the following sections of the November meeting summary:

* Updates and Announcements
* Workgroup Report – Growth Projection and Consumptive Use Update

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

## Updates and Announcements

Angela provided updates from Ecology:

* 2020 Meeting Schedule
  + Moving forward, Angela will aim to schedule workgroup meetings on the same day as Committee meetings. Some meetings may be consolidated to have a more technically focused Committee meeting, however in some cases the workgroup will meet in addition to a regular Committee meeting which would result in a longer meeting time and would be planned in advance. The group discussed that if decisions are planned to be made during the technical workgroup session following the full Committee meeting, Angela will notify Committee members in advance.
  + The project subgroup will continue to meet in addition to the full Committee meeting.
* Ecology meeting with Squaxin Island Tribe
  + Angela notified the Committee that Ecology Streamflow Restoration staff met with Squaxin Island Tribe staff, as part of a standing quarterly meeting to discuss ongoing process across multiple Committees where the Squaxin Island Tribe participates.
* Ecology meeting with Mason County
  + Angela notified the Committee that Ecology Streamflow Restoration staff met with Dave Windom and Commissioner Neatherlin from Mason County to continue a discussion on a proposed offset idea brought forward with the “Cumulative and Eventual Domestic Water use Model for Central Mason County” document. Ecology provided an additional technical review of the proposal, and the meeting resulted in a discussion on opportunities to move forward with further investigation of a detailed proposal.

Other Committee members provided the following updates:

* Hydrology and Hydrogeology Workshop in WRIA 15
  + Paul Pickett notified the Committee that the WRIA 15 Committee held a workshop on hydrology and hydrogeology, which included a discussion on flow and how a groundwater model could be used for project development. Paul encouraged the WRIA 14 Committee to consider holding a similar workshop.

# Workgroup Report

Angela and the workgroup members provided a summary of the previous workgroup meeting – see workgroup meeting summary from 12/9/19 for more details.

Reference Materials: 12/9/19 WRIA 14 Workgroup meeting summary

The workgroup summary was presented and included a discussion of the following items:

* Data needs
  + Hydrogeology/hydrology workshop will be arranged as the need arises for discussion on project development and evaluation. This will likely occur during a regular Committee meeting.
  + Angela is moving forward with a water right analysis for WRIA 14, and will likely be initiating a contract with Pacific Groundwater Group. Next step will be for contractor to attend Committee meeting.
* Growth Projection Update
  + Recommendation from the workgroup: move forward with “working numbers” from Mason and Thurston Counties that include projections for both the analyses that look at growth/no growth within water system service areas.
    - Some Committee members feel that the analysis which includes growth in the water system service areas is more accurate and noted that this is a preferred projection, however there was no objection to moving forward with both as a comparison.
* Consumptive Use
  + HDR and GeoEngineers completed a QA/QC exercise of the irrigated area analysis, and determined that while there is uncertainty inherent in the methodology, the HDR team feels confident with their approach and analysis. As a result, there are several options for interpreting the information from the original analysis.
    - HDR proposed using a “multiplier” correction factor with the original analysis to account for uncertainty.
    - The 0 values from the original analysis could be replaced with a minimum acreage size (i.e. 0.05).
    - The original analysis could be interpreted using the 95% upper confidence limit of the statistical analysis.
  + The workgroup did not propose a recommendation, however there was general agreement from the Committee on using the three options listed above as “working numbers” to continue the discussion. The consumptive use analysis will be discussed at the January meeting to further discuss all methods and reach agreement on the methods to move forward with.
* Project Subgroup
  + The project subgroup met on 12/10 to discuss the project evaluation criteria, and to refine some of the projects included in the project list on Box.
  + The subgroup recommended simplifying the project evaluation criteria for initial review of projects, and to use a more detailed criteria for a secondary review.
  + The subgroup reviewed the project list and created a pros/cons column to provide more detailed information on projects and the ideas discussed among subgroup members, in order to help Committee members review project ideas.
  + Committee members should take the time to review the project list on Box to add new projects, or to provide any additional information for projects on the list (including information in the pros/cons columns).
  + The subgroup recommended that HDR begin to provide additional analysis on some projects currently on the list. Angela will work with HDR on next steps for this proposal. The Committee agreed that HDR should further investigate four projects that the subgroup identified:
    - Skookum Valley, Squaxin Island Tribe (may be multiple projects)
    - City of Shelton Reclaimed Water Phase II
    - Mason County rooftop runoff infiltration
    - Evergreen mobile home park, Mason County
  + The Committee identified a need to further discuss projects with specific locations and landowners, compared to general projects like floodplain restoration, etc. that don’t have specific locations.
  + The Committee discussed programmed projects and elements, and the need to start developing a list of policy and regulatory actions – Angela will add a tab to the project inventory list to track policy and regulatory action ideas (list will be started based on Committee brainstorm).

## Safety Factor Discussion

The Committee participated in a discussion to review options for including a safety factor in the plan, and developed a list of ideas to consider while moving forward. No decisions were made, and the Committee will continue this discussion at further workgroup and Committee meetings.

Reference Materials: Safety Factor Discussion Guide

Committee discussion:

* Some Committee members expressed that they would feel more comfortable using analyses that do not include safety factors, and instead to focus on adaptive management options in the plan to account for uncertainty.
  + There was general agreement from Committee members that adaptive management will be an important component in the plan to help meet the required offsets.
* Some Committee members expressed that they believe it is important to include a safety factor to account for uncertainty, and that it is important to make sure the plan is robust due to the legal requirement that the plan will meet the required offsets.
* It was suggested that an analysis with a safety factor could be viewed as a “high estimate”, and that it will be useful to include this as an upper offset limit in the plan.
* A question was raised regarding what justification is needed by Ecology to support a safety factor. It was discussed that information that is vetted by the Committee representatives as well as the technical consultants will likely provide assurance to Ecology that the analysis is justifiable.
* A concern was raised that adding a safety factor increases the amount of projects that will need to be implemented, and that the group may already face some difficulties in finding projects that can meet an offset target or funding difficulties.
* A Committee member raised an issue that adaptive management may be difficult to ensure if there is not clarity on the thresholds and triggers, and there will need to be a monitoring system in place. While it is important to include an adaptive management plan, adding a safety factor is still critical to creating a robust plan.
* Angela raised the view from Ecology that a safety factor may be most helpful when added to the offset target, and not individual analyses throughout the plan (i.e. PE well growth and consumptive use). It is most important to show that the projects put in the plan will reasonable meet the offset target in the plan.
* A Committee member mentioned that replace the 0 values in the outdoor irrigation analysis may be a possible place to consider a safety factor.
* A Committee member raised the concern that if implementation is not an assurance, then the group should include a larger safety factor, however if implementation is stronger there could be a smaller range in the safety factor.
* The group discussed that it is important to document uncertainty as it arises throughout the planning process. This will help the Committee understand where adaptive management or a safety factor may be more applicable.
  + Committee member raised two areas of uncertainty to keep in mind may be growth projections, and effects of climate change.
  + A suggestion was raised to keep a tracking sheet moving forward to document areas of uncertainty and how to address them. Angela will work with HDR on this.
* The group discussed that if they were to include a safety factor in the plan, that in general they felt comfortable agreed that it would be added to a final estimate and not to individual analyses.
* The group will continue to discuss this topic moving forward throughout the planning process.

## Streamflow Restoration Grants Guidance

The Committee received a presentation from Mike Noone (Ecology) on the Streamflow Restoration Competitive Grants Guidance. The presentation will be made available on Box.

Committee discussion included:

* A question was raised on how feasibility studies may be scored within the grant program.
  + Ecology requires feasibility studies for Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) projects. For other projects, feasibility studies may score well if they are a phase of a larger project that is expected to have provable streamflow benefits. Feasibility studies alone may not be as competitive.
* A question was raised regarding funding for a decision support tool to help groups develop projects over time.
  + Ecology provided feedback that funding for a program like this on its own may not score highly in the grant program, however if it is included as a part of a larger application to determine the best of several specific projects to pursue, it may be more competitive.
* A Committee member raised the concern that there is a need to assess resources in WRIA 14, and to do so more monitoring data is needed such as streamflow gauges.
  + Ecology mentioned that this could also be a recommended policy or regulatory action to include in the plan.
* The issue of letters of support from Committees was brought up, in that they can show local support of grant applications. However, a joint letter from the planning Committee does not necessarily provide more points in the grant review.
  + The Committee discussed that they would consider letters of support as a group on a case-by-case basis. If an entity would like to request a letter of support from the Committee for a grant application, the project will be presented to the full Committee and interested representatives may choose to sign a letter of support.

## Public Comment

No public comment was made.

## Action Items for Committee Members

* Next meeting is January 9, 2020 (9 am) at Mason County Public Works – 100 Public Works Dr., Shelton, WA 98584.
  + This will be a technically-focused meeting instead of scheduling a separate workgroup meeting.
* Committee members should review the project list on Box – Angela will send out information and a reminder.

## Action Items for Ecology:

* Angela to work with HDR on documenting and tracking uncertainty
* Future meetings
  + Continue assessment of consumptive use
  + Continue discussion of adaptive management and implementation
  + Update on water right analysis