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**WRIA 14 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

January 14th, 2020 | 9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. |[committee website](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37326/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_14.aspx)

## Location

WebEx**Committee Chair**

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

1. [Summary of December 2020 Meeting](https://app.box.com/s/yt98jg4522menl1zr0vuwe95zy0aonic)
2. [Final Project Descriptions](https://app.box.com/s/w9e7vk6wd383f55oq89nu88aqvymifis)
3. [Project Inventory](https://app.box.com/s/nni814m5xi5ptwbwyzehojzwl0ktatp8)
4. Red Flag Comment Tracker
5. Red Flag Review Plan – Embedded Comments
6. [Plan Review Timeline](https://app.box.com/s/gm7mnmktgpgeg1j9rwoxolgtn07ld4k9)

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates

Angela Johnson (*Ecology – Committee Chair)*

Seth Book (*Skokomish Tribe*)

Dana Sarff (*Skokomish Tribe*)

Ron Gold (*Mason PUD 1)*

James Reyes (*Mason PUD 1*)

Darrin Hall (*Mason PUD 1*)

Kevin Shutty (*Mason County*)

Dave Windom (*Mason County*)

Kaitlynn Nelson (*Thurston County)*

Ken Gill (*City of Shelton*)

Josie Cummings (*BIAW*)

Lois Ward (*Sierra Club*)

Larry Boltz (*Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau*)

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

Paul Pickett (*Squaxin Island Tribe*)

Patti Case (*Green Diamond Resource Company, ex-officio*)

Allison Cook (*WDFW*)

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

### Other Attendees\*

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions)*

Jimmy Kralj (*ESA*)

Deidre Peterson (City of Shelton Council)

Elena Hernandez (*Thurston County Public Works*)

## Welcome

Due to the spread of COVID-19 and the recommendations from Public Health Officials, the January 14, 2021 WRIA 14 meeting was held via WebEx conference. Angela and Susan kicked off the meeting and provided instructions for participants to participate remotely. Committee members introduced themselves. The group reviewed the meeting agenda.

## Approval of December 2020 Meeting Summary

Angela did not receive any additional comments beyond revisions from Paul Pickett to clarify Squaxin Island Tribe’s position on several items. The committee approved the December meeting summary.

## Updates and Announcements

* Photo Contest
	+ Angela will distribute a poll to committee members for them to vote on their favorite image to serve as the cover of the WRIA 14 plan.
* Ecology Report to Legislature
	+ Ecology has submitted their required report on RCW 90.94 to the state legislature. Angela will distribute this report to the committee.
* Ecology held a meeting with WDFW to coordinate on the WREC process across all committees.
* Paul Pickett informed the Committee that the Squaxin Island Tribe received a reply from Ecology in response to their recent letter sent to the Water Resources Manager regarding this planning process.

## Projects

* Angela provided a brief review of the updated project inventory for the plan appendix.
* Thurston County has revised the project descriptions for two projects: Schneider Creek Source Switch and Summit Lake and offered new descriptions for two additional projects.
	+ Schneider Creek Source Switch
		- Offsets are not being claimed for this project. Thurston County revised the offset potential that is used for the NEB calculation. This will be described in Chapter 5 of the plan.
	+ Summit Lake
		- Offset credits are not claimed in the plan for this project. Thurston County updated the project description for the committee with clarifying legal language. The description now mentions a potential alternative water supply for the site. This will be described in Chapter 5 of the plan.
	+ Steamboat Middle Storage Enhancement
		- This site was determined using aerial imagery to identify wetlands on private property. This would require landowner outreach and would be intended to expand water storage in a low-lying area.
		- Thurston County provided an overview of the project. The potential offset was calculated by Thurston County staff and reviewed by Tom Culhane of Ecology. While there is a range of potential benefit, the low end of the range provides 14 acre-feet per year (AFY) of offset.
		- Angela asked the Committee if they would like to include this project in the plan and claim the potential 14 AFY of offset – there were no objections.
		- Angela will add this project to the plan.
	+ Forestry and Flow Assessment
		- This proposal identifies potential feasibility sites for forestry efforts if funding becomes available in the future.
		- Patti Case noted that WA DNR has a trust benefit to harvest trees and noted that benefits described in this proposal should be clarified as “potential benefits” and that other benefits can arise from harvest and replanting actions.
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe noted that a feasibility study would help determine if this approach could improve base flows.
		- Patti Case noted a concern about including this project in the plan as it contains a lot of variability and that this kind of narrative is not helpful in maintaining forestry practices. However, Patti is willing to work with proposal sponsors and help refine language if the committee wants to include the project in the plan.
		- Mason PUD and Mason County noted the uncertainty associated with this project and forest hydrodynamics.
		- Angela noted that Thurston County would need to conduct more outreach efforts if this project is to be included in the plan.
		- Thurston County indicated they may work with Green Diamond, Mason PUD, Mason County, Squaxin Island Tribe, Sierra Club, and WDFW if they would like to further advance this proposal.
		- Angela noted that this project is currently in the longer project inventory, but it will not be included in the body of the plan unless there is agreement from the Committee.

## Plan Development

Angela reviewed the comments received by Committee Members during the red flag review that were prioritized for Committee discussion. Angela received over 150 comments in total.

Executive Summary

* Skokomish Tribe: Replace the terms “agreement” and “conclusion/believes” with the term “consensus” throughout the document.
	+ No concerns were expressed. Angela will make this change.
* Skokomish Tribe: The tribe does not agree with Ecology’s interpretation and request that all mentions of legal interpretation be referred to as Ecology’s interpretation, not that of the committee.
	+ Angela proposed language be added up front that states interpretations of the law reflect the opinions of Ecology and that all members do not share the same interpretation.
	+ Many similar revisions were made in the plan in response to this request from the Skokomish Tribe and the Squaxin Island Tribe.
	+ Mason County noted they agree with Ecology’s interpretation and that potential disagreements should be noted by members in their signing statement.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe said that the Plan could note where there is disagreement, and that a footnote should be included that references the compendium section.
	+ Mason PUD 1 agrees with Mason County’s stance and believes these statements should be made in the compendium section.
	+ The Committee agreed that language referencing different interpretations would be put in a footnote in the Executive Summary.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested clarification that the consumptive use estimate referenced is the “most likely estimate”.
	+ Angela made the proposed change.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe is not comfortable with the phrase “aspirational” goal proposed by Mason County, since it suggests that the Committee doesn’t really care. Both numbers are important, because of an unknown future. The estimates link back to adaptive management, and future information can inform which target is needed. Sufficient successful projects may exceed both targets and make the issue moot.
	+ The BIAW agreed with the language proposed by Mason County and disagreed with the concerns expressed by the Squaxin Island Tribe.
	+ Mason County clarified that their intent behind “aspirational” was to reflect proposed changes to the plan implementation process that arise through adaptive management.
	+ Susan noted that there is agreement around the most likely offset estimate and that a higher offset target would provide greater streamflow benefits. However, there is uncertainty (and varying opinions) whether future conditions will warrant the higher offset value being needed.
	+ WDFW noted that the word “aspirational” doesn’t fit the theme of the plan and seconded the proposal from the Skokomish Tribe to refer to the higher estimate as “adaptive management goal”.
	+ “Aspirational” was changed to “adaptive management goal”. Angela will make this change consistently throughout the plan.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested language be added to describe the surplus and deficit of offsets by subbasin in the executive summary.
	+ Angela will add this information to the executive summary.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Request to show most likely and adaptive management values on the map figure.
	+ Angela will work with HDR to update the figure.

Chapter 1

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Suggested a rewrite of the first sentence about the purpose of the plan.
	+ Angela will discuss this request further with Ecology management, but suggested that this may now be covered by the footnote in the chapter 1 regarding differing interpretations.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested additional language about the prior appropriation doctrine.
	+ The language was written and reviewed by Ecology. Angela added a footnote that addresses this request.
* Skokomish Tribe: Requested clarification about the terms “water availability” and “adequacy”.
	+ No changes will be made, but Angela will review the document for consistency with these terms.

Chapter 2

* WDFW: Salmon distribution information needs revisions
	+ Chinook salmon should be added.
		- WDFW stated the importance of making all tables and information regarding salmon species correct.
		- There is presence of Chinook due to hatchery strays from the Minter and Coulter stocks, but no natal stocks to any streams in WRIA 14.
		- Reference to Kitsap Basin should be removed.
	+ Angela will work with HDR to revise this information, and will distribute it to WDFW, Squaxin Island Tribe, and the Skokomish Tribe to review.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed expanded language regarding linkages between the plan and GMA.
	+ Language is being developed for WRIA 15 and will be incorporated.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested the addition of details regarding the MOU and commitments from Mason County.
	+ Mason County needs additional time to review the proposed language.

Chapter 3

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested clarification that subbasins are used to set priorities for offset project benefits.
	+ Angela updated this section.

Chapter 4

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested that the adaptive management goal be shown when the consumptive use estimates are discussed.
	+ Angela will make sure updated consistently throughout the plan.
* Mason PUD: Ron had supplied Group A meter data from rural systems that is measured at the source and connection. Throughout the process, consumptive use estimates have been used that are higher than observed values seen throughout the WRIA. Mason PUD believes these figures for consumptive use are inflated and do not reflect actual use in the WRIA. Mason PUD would like to include the data and information they provided in the plan appendix.
	+ Mason County stated that at several points in the plan development process there has been an inflated estimate of consumptive use for indoor and outdoor use. Mason County will note this in their notes for the plan compendium.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe noted that Group A metered data may be low because of price signals and conservation programs. Also systems vary and one systems data may not be representative. They disagree that the use estimates are inflated and cited the Skokomish analysis of outdoor water use.
	+ The Skokomish Tribe agreed with Squaxin Island’s comments on use estimates, and did not agree with the comments expressed by Mason PUD 1.
	+ The BIAW supports including this data as well.
	+ Angela indicated where this information could be referenced in the plan, and will include the data in an appendix. There were no objections to this inclusion.
* Mason County noted that livestock watering is a use covered under a separate well regulation.
* Mason County: Proposed adding the value difference between the turf grass and lawn watering amounts as determined by USDA.
	+ Angela will work with HDR to provide this information if possible.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed stating in the overview of the outdoor CU calculation description that 0.14 was used as the value for the higher estimate and to provide the results.
	+ Angela will make this change in the plan.
* Mason County: Proposed stating that water use over time is likely to become more efficient.
	+ This change was made during the meeting.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed changes regarding the methodology bias between the consultant teams regarding irrigated area size.
	+ Angela proposed language to address these concerns.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Requested that both the most likely and adaptive management goal be included in the figures in chapter 4.
	+ Angela will work with HDR to make this change.

Chapter 5

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed a revision to state that habitat projects were selected for their potential to improve streamflow.
	+ Angela made this change.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed a revision to include acquisition of all or part of water rights.
	+ Angela made this change.
* Mason County Rooftop Runoff
	+ Mason County is engaged in an ongoing discussion regarding the inclusion of the project in WRIA 15, where there is currently not agreement from the Committee to include the project.
	+ If this project is not approved in WRIA 15, Mason County will remove it from the WRIA 14 as well for management consistency.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe would like to see Mason County implement this project and hopes that issues in WRIA 15 can be resolved so that the project can be incorporated in the WRIA 14 plan.
	+ Susan noted that it may be challenging to have WRIA 15 reconsider this project for their plan. The Suquamish Tribe and WDFW are objecting to this project in WRIA 15. Susan and Stacy (WRIA 15 Committee chair) shared the concerns from the WRIA 14 committee with the WRIA 15 committee and urged them to reconsider.
	+ WDFW was asked if they have a suggested revision to this project to address their concerns regarding the project justification statement and they were unable to offer any proposed revisions.
* Managed Aquifer Recharge Projects
	+ WDFW is not confident in these projects and believes there is no commitment from relevant entities to moving them forward, specifically in the Mason County portion of WRIA 14. WDFW commented that this should not be a Category 1 project.
	+ Angela shared that Category 1 is an appropriate classification for this project package given the amount of local data and input that was provided to select potential project locations, and that there is a significant amount of support from the Committee to move projects like this forward. Mason County and Thurston County have indicated they would be likely project sponsors, and Angela noted that there is a strong interest from the group to develop an implementation group which could help further develop and support project these projects.
	+ WDFW shared that their concerns are primarily based on readiness to proceed.
	+ Ecology stated their opinion that there has been a very robust discussion of MAR projects with the committee. Ecology acknowledged that there is uncertainty, but that there is sufficient enthusiasm with the committee that some of these projects would be likely to occur.
	+ Angela raised two suggestions for this project package:
		- Change the readiness to proceed
		- Remove project categories from the chapter if they are restrictive
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe stated they disagreed with WDFW, but were concerned that WDFW’s position was being ignored.
	+ WDFW stated that the main issue is that Alison Cook’s name would be on the record as approving these types of projects through this plan and that would present conflicts in the permitting process for these types of projects in the future. Specifically, WDFW is concerned about in-stream structures.
	+ Ecology stated that it is appropriate to express concerns from WDFW about instream structures, and language was included in the project description in Appendix I that could be brought into Chapter 5.
		- Angela will provide these revisions and work with Allison to confirm language is satisfactory.
	+ Readiness to proceed will be changed to low, and WDFWs concerns about instream MAR projects will be included.
		- WDFW agreed with this approach.
* City of Shelton Reclaimed Water project
	+ WDFW: Requested information about the offset benefit and assumption related to the irrigation efficiency value of 80%.
		- Angela stated that she had shared additional information with WDFW but had not heard a response if that addressed their concerns.
	+ WDFW has ongoing concerns that cannot be addressed today.
	+ Angela suggested no changes be made until there are additional discussions and WDFW provides additional feedback regarding this project.
	+ City of Shelton shared that they anticipate far less well water usage due to efforts by the Corrections Center to run reclaimed water through their facility. City of Shelton is increasingly supportive of this project and its projected offset.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed language related to projects in the Certainty of Implementation section.
	+ Angela will add a reference to the assurance of implementation language, and Angela will review language from Pierce County in WRIA 15 and share that with Mason and Thurston Counties if appropriate.

Chapter 6

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed including the full proposal in a plan appendix for enhanced well tracking as this proposal reached full consensus with the committee.
	+ This will be included and the reasoning will be stated in the plan.
* Water Supply Data for Comprehensive Water Planning
	+ Mason County: Expressed that this goes well beyond what is legally required.
		- This is the County’s opinion for the record; they have no proposed revisions.
* Permit Exempt Well Tracking
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe: Proposed that the information tracked should include the total number of building permits issued in addition to the numbers of permit exempt well permits to compare the proportions.
	+ Mason County noted that not all building permits require water, but is ok with this if the language is clarified.
	+ Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau: Asked how wells not listed on well logs will be tracked and monitored.
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe stated that some of these details are in the memo produced by Erica.
* Waterwise Landscaping
	+ Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau: Stated that “total” is too broad and covers water uses beyond just landscaping.
	+ Angela will work with Erica to clarify this language.
* Reporting and Adaptation
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe: The policy chapter should have a section on funding.
		- Angela added proposed language, but Susan reminded the Committee that there is a section already in the plan regarding funding for plan implementation which can be referenced.
* Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau: Tribal partners are included as stakeholders and don’t need to be called out separately.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe expressed concerns with this (Tribes are sovereign nations and not stakeholders) and proposed language be changed to “allow collaboration on plan implementation” and remove references to stakeholders.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Questioned differences between adopting the plans by resolution or ordinance.
	+ Thurston County: Clarified that there are different processes between adopting by resolution or ordinance. Thurston County will need to speak with the Squaxin Island tribe to clarify their concerns. If there are changes they will be sent to Susan.
	+ Mason County: Normally adopts things by resolution.

Chapter 7

* Squaxin Island Tribe: Section needs a discussion of ecological benefits and potential negative impacts.
	+ Angela will work with HDR to address this.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: The breakdown of potential offsets should be displayed by subbasin.
	+ Angela will provide a reference to chapter 5 table 8 in the plan text to reference this.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Add a column to Table 13 that shows the surplus/deficit for the higher value as well.
	+ This will be added.
* Squaxin Island Tribe: Revise reasonable assurances and include the goals of providing reasonable water to improve and enhance streamflow.
	+ Angela will make these revisions.
* Language was clarified to state to replace “assumption” with “intention; and that the plan “can” meet NEB, not that it “will” given uncertainty and long-term planning horizons.

Appendices and Compendium

* The Squaxin Island Tribe requested that Ecology take their comments on the glossary back to the Ecology communications committee to see if they can improve the definitions.
* Angela provided compendium information. Committee members can provide compendium documents after the vote is taken.

Plan Review Next Steps

* January 26th: Potential meeting to finalize the plan for distribution for local review.
* January – April: Local review.
* February 11: Committee meeting TBD depending on local review process
* March 11: Committee meeting TBD depending on local review process
* April 8: Potential date to meet and vote on final plan.
	+ Angela may schedule this for later in April to extend local review as long as possible
* June 30: Ecology to make decision on plan adoption.
* Steps to Approval
	+ Once the plan is sent for local review, members are responsible for ensuring they work through the review process with their entity.
	+ Committee members should ensure that the appropriate representative with authority to vote on the plan is present during the scheduled meeting for plan approval.
	+ The schedule does not allow for substantive changes to be made during or after review.
* The Squaxin Island Proposed that after the plan revisions are complete, Angela distribute them to the Committee for a quick review to see if the January 26th meeting is needed. If the meeting is being held, committee members submit items they would still like to discuss to keep the meeting as short and streamlined as possible.
	+ Angela and Susan agreed that this is an appropriate approach.

## Public Comments

* No public comments were made during the meeting.

## Next Steps and Adjourn

* Angela will work with HDR to revise the draft plan in accordance with the discussion at today’s meeting, and distribute to Committee members as soon as possible.
	+ Committee members will be asked to do a quick review to identify any red flags on the revisions
	+ Angela and Susan will review the comments received and determine whether an additional meeting in January is needed
* Next Committee meeting is tentatively January 26th, 2021 from 1 – 4pm
	+ Angela will notify Committee members if this meeting will be necessary to go over any remaining comments.
* April 8, 2021
	+ This is the scheduled date for the vote on plan approval.
	+ This might be rescheduled to the following week.
* Committee members should continue internal discussions within their entity regarding plan review and voting authority.