**Framework for Draft Adaptive Management Recommendations in the WRIA 14 Plan**

## Purpose

*This committee will fill out the details in this draft framework. These details will be incorporated into a draft plan section on Adaptive Management for further committee review and refinement.*

## Introduction

The framework includes the following components:

1. **Tracking/Monitoring**: What data should be gathered by what entities?
2. **Reporting**: How should that data be reported (i.e. who prepares the report, how often, what do reports include)
3. **Adaptations:** What actions are needed to respond to the reporting?
4. **Funding:** How can the adaptive management components be funded?

## Tracking and Monitoring

1. ***Existing Monitoring in the Watershed***

*(To be added: will need information from committee members)*

1. ***Recommended tracking and monitoring***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Data | Entity Responsible | Notes/Discussion Questions |
| Building permits issued with associated permit exempt wells. | Ecology (via reporting from counties and cities). | Number of building permits and associated fees are transmitted to Ecology annually. |
| Ongoing list and map of new PEWs within each sub-basin. | Counties and cities | This is targeting new PEWs since law was enacted. Is there a need/desire to include all PEWs? |
| Status of implementation for each project (e.g. not started, in progress, complete). | WDFW/Ecology? | Project implementors and/or funders can provide details. Salmon Recovery Portal project tracking tool will be used. |
| Status of each policy recommendation. | Varies | Will need to clarify responsibilities for reporting when policy recommendations are finalized.Should we identify a single agency that could report this? |
| Streamflow monitoring at the following locations: | (Note for each gauge) | This will provide information on status and trends in the basin but cannot be correlated to implementation (or lack of implementation) of the plan. |
| Seasonal Changes to Groundwater Elevation |  | Need better description |
| Precipitation and drought conditions. | USGS? Ecology? | Needs more detail |
| Land use changes | Counties (and city?) | Need more detail on how to describe this. |
| Water usage | Water purveyors, others? | Track water usage reported in Water Use Efficiency Reports and compare the number of connections in the systems. For example, Evergreen Estates uses 330% more than the average city user per single family residential user. |
| Other? |  | Ideas from previous discussion that are not included due to inadequate information include:* Climate variables
* Offset locations and amounts
 |

1. ***Aspirational monitoring (additional monitoring that is desired if funding becomes available)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Data | Entity Responsible | Notes/Discussion Questions |
| Streamflow monitoring at the following locations: | (Note for each gauge) | Do we want to link these to a data gap discussion in the plan? Does that belong in the Adaptive Management section or elsewhere? |
| Other? |  |  |

### Reporting

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Report Data/Frequency | Entity Responsible | Notes/Discussion Questions |
| **Annual Reports to Ecology** * Number of new building permits associate with new PE wells in the prior calendar year, including e-mail address of building permit recipients.
* A description of the status of each project
* Any other implementation actions to date
 | Counties | This is drawn from the WRIA 1 example. How would the committee like to tailor the reporting requirements (content or frequency)? |
| **Five-Year Self-Assessment:** Submitted to Ecology every 5 years through 2038:* Total number of new building permits (associated with permit exempt wells) since plan adoption.
* The status of all projects
* Estimate of water and instream flow benefits realized through project implementation or other streamflow restoration work associate with RCW 90.94.030.
* Recommended project substitutions or actions.
 | Counties and relevant cities (except for the project substitutions which would be recommended by a stakeholder group; see discussion on adaptation below) | This is drawn from the WRIA 1 example. How would the committee like to tailor the reporting requirements?2038 is drawn from the 20-year planning horizon, but does this committee believe the tracking and reporting should continue beyond?Should variation of the WREC or another entity be involved in the self-assessment? How?Flow benefits may be impossible to track for some projects as they are within the natural variation margin. |
| **Other?** |  |  |

### Adaptation

Adaptation strategies address what should occur if tracking indicates that plan expectations are not being met by significantly under-achieving or over-achieving offsets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Options for Consideration | Notes/Discussion Questions |
| A stakeholder group is involved in developing the 5-year assessment and recommending additional projects or other actions. The stakeholder group could consist of:* Reconvening the WREC
* A subset of the WREC who commits to participate
* Assigning responsibility to another existing group (LIO, Lead Entity, watershed council, county or other)
* Creating a new group
* Other ideas
 | Should the WREC meet annually (or more or less frequently) or only if specified targets are not met? Should the WREC disband following the planning process and rely on other groups for overseeing implementation?Are there other groups in WRIA 14 who are suited to this task?  |
| Certain results in the reports trigger specific actions*Triggers:**Actions required:* | If the committee would like to consider this, they will need to identify specific triggers and link them to specific requirements. However, the plan cannot obligate future actions, so this may be challenging.Suggestion from previous meeting: if projects are not being implemented or are not achieving anticipated results, building permits stop. |
| Other ideas |  |

### Funding Strategies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strategies | Notes/Discussion Questions |
| Support a request to the legislature to add additional funding after the current biennium to allow the watersheds planning under 90.94 have basic funding to oversee plan implementation | Current working language:*“The WRIA 14 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee recommends that the legislature provide funding and a structure to monitor plan implementation (including annual tracking of new permit-exempt wells and project implementation by subbasin) and develop a process to adaptively manage implementation if Net Ecological Benefit is not being met as envisioned by the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan”* |
| Other funding ideas for adaptive management | NOTE: funding for general plan implementation will be discussed in the policy recommendations; the funding strategies in this section are limited to funding to complete adaptive management.  |

**Appendix: Additional Information/Resources:**

* [WRIA 1 Adaptive Management Chapter](https://app.box.com/s/aif9cu7y65nggfz3yho06jtk9xumw00m)
* [Full WRIA 1 Rule](https://app.box.com/s/sb599kzmmrzjra2xvfn0pqh1qi3dm1h6)
* [Squaxin Island Tribe Adaptive Management Proposal](https://app.box.com/s/m9riyfgwl5oaso3z0b4ds658psijg1z1)
* [Adaptive Management Funding Recommendation to the Legislature](https://app.box.com/s/g0srt5d9taes68qfmyrho12b5awwkaph)
* [Nisqually Watershed Plan Addendum](https://app.box.com/s/1kqioz4cg8paaz8ljuzgptvfoipfpput)