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**WRIA 14 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee**

January 26th, 2020 | 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 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. Revised clean plan with changes highlighted
2. Revised plan full track changes

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates

Angela Johnson (*Ecology – Committee Chair)*

Seth Book (*Skokomish Tribe*)

Ron Gold (*Mason PUD 1)*

Darrin Hall (*Mason PUD 1*)

James Reyes (*Mason PUD 1*)

Kevin Shutty (*Mason County*)

Dave Windom (*Mason County*)

Kaitlynn Nelson (*Thurston County)*

Ken Gill (*City of Shelton*)

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*)

Josie Cummings (*BIAW*)

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

Lois Ward (*Sierra Club*)

### Other Attendees\*

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions)*

Jimmy Kralj (*ESA*)

Chad Wiseman (*HDR*)

Tom Culhane (*Ecology*)

Mike Noone (*Ecology*)

Elena Hernandez (*Thurston County Public Works*)

Leland Fuhrig (*USGS*)

Jason Gano (Olympia Master Builders)

## Welcome

Due to the spread of COVID-19 and the recommendations from Public Health Officials, the 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.

This meeting was a supplemental meeting after the regularly scheduled January committee meeting to review final comments and concerns in the draft plan prior to distribution for local review.

## Outstanding Comments from Plan Review

The purpose of this meeting was to review and resolve items brought forward by committee members prior to the local review period of the plan development process.

Angela walked committee members through a revised version of the plan that was sent out based on the comments at the January 14 Committee meeting, any additional comments that were submitted to those revisions.

* Mason County Rooftop Runoff update:
	+ Mason County has decided to remove the Mason County Rooftop Runoff project from the WRIA 14 plan because of objections to the project in WRIA 15. Mason County stated that they need consistent requirements across the watersheds covered by Mason County and the County Commission was hesitant to include the project in one watershed and not the other.
		- Without this project, the Committee will still be able to meet it’s the “most likely” consumptive use estimate target, but does not meet the higher adaptive management consumptive use estimate.
		- Mason County expressed their thanks to Ecology, HDR, and other committee members for their work in developing this project.
		- The Skokomish Tribe expressed their hope that the work put into this project can be maintained for potential consideration in the future.
		- The Skokomish Tribe and City of Shelton expressed frustration about the removal of the project and asked why it couldn’t be in one plan and not the other. It was also noted that is project is not included in the WRIA 22/23 plan, which Mason County approved, so even if WRIA 15 included it, it would not be in all of the County’s watersheds.
			* Mason reiterated the Council’s opinion that a disparity between two portions of the county would not be amenable for long term planning and management.
			* Additionally, this would mean higher building costs in one portion of the county as compared to another.
			* Mason County also noted that their projected growth in WRIA 22/23 is very small and was a main reason why this project was not proposed there.
		- WDFW inquired about the differences between watershed and county regulations.
			* Mason County reiterated the importance of consistency in the county regarding building and development regulations.
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe expressed that a lot of effort was put into this project and the removal of this project feels like a breach of trust. The planning process built relationships, and Plan hangs on implementation, which relies on relationships. It will be difficult to agree to a Plan without that trust.
		- Mason County responded that they also felt a breach of trust when the Squaxin Island Tribe sued them in the midst of this planning process.
		- Thurston County expressed that they consider proposals in one WRIA to be applied county-wide
	+ Angela reviewed the updated consumptive use offset estimates:
		- The removal of the Rooftop Runoff project would result in a decrease of 249 afy, bring the total offset from projects to 891 afy. This value falls between the most likely and higher adaptive management consumptive use estimates.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe asked if this project could be left in the plan as a non-offset project, like other projects in the plan in the prospective project section (section 5.4).
		- Mason County asked if this would give Ecology a chance to implement this project through rule making.
			* Angela noted that ultimately, if this plan is approved by the committee and adopted by Ecology, there is not a system to revise the plan. An implementation group could discuss the project in the future.
			* Tom Culhane stated that this project could be included in the plan with an explanation that at this point in time, the county doesn’t want to implement it. If WRIA 15 does not approve their plan and Ecology finishes it and goes into rule making, there is potential that this project may be included and it would make it easier for Mason County to implement it in WRIA 14.
		- For other projects in this position (Schneider Creek), the potential offset benefit is identified but not claimed toward the official offset estimate.
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe supported this approach and thinks there is value to honor the time and effort put into developing this project.
		- Ecology stated it would be better to include this as an optional project in the plan with the caveat that the County is unable to implement it at this time.
		- The City of Shelton stated that this project was particularly beneficial given its county-wide benefits.
	+ Removal of the project does effect the NEB chapter, which will need to be significantly rewritten.
	+ Mason County agreed that this project can remain in the WRIA 14 plan as a “prospective” project, but no offset benefit will be claimed. Angela will develop language with Mason County to caveat that this project cannot move forward at this time, although it has support from the Committee to be implemented in the future.
* Executive Summary
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe objected to the statements in the executive summary and in Chapter 7 that state that the Committee had determined that the plan meets NEB. Ecology guidance says the Committee can include an evaluation, but doesn’t have to determine that the plan meets NEB. The Tribe is ok with including the evaluation, but does not agree with the determination. Instead, that decision will be left up to Ecology. Alternative language for Chapter 7 was worked out for WRIA 15, which might also be included in this plan.
		- Ecology will remove the statement from the Executive Summary and the NEB chapter.
* Chapter 2
	+ HDR, WDFW and Squaxin Island Tribe provided some updated information regarding salmon presence in WRIA 14.
	+ Coordination with Existing Plans
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe proposed a new paragraph to better describe the relationship between the Growth Management Act and water planning. The language was developed for WRIA 15 by a discussion with Kitsap and Pierce counties, and the Suquamish and Squaxin Island Tribes. It doesn’t go as far as the Tribe would like, but they agreed to this language. The group agreed on “facts” and avoided “interpretations” where we disagreed.
		- The new language has been added to the plan.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe would like to add a statement that Instream flows set by rule are considered during a water right application.
		- Angela will discuss this request with agency staff.
* Chapter 4
	+ Angela updated the map with consumptive use estimates.
* Chapter 5
	+ Rooftop Runoff:
		- Mason County stated they would be OK with the rooftop runoff project being included as a prospective project in the plan instead of fully removing it.
		- Mason County agreed to list the potential offset value similar to other prospective projects.
	+ Angela reviewed several revisions to project descriptions.
	+ Language was added to state the surplus or deficit for subbasins. This will be revised to reflect the changes from the Rooftop Runoff project being moved to a perspective list.
* Chapter 6
	+ Revisions were made to the Waterwise Landscaping proposal regarding “total outdoor water use” as requested by the Mason Kitsap Farm Bureau.
		- Language was revised to clarify water uses by saying “changes in landscaping water use per household”.
	+ Angela made revisions to the plan implementation language.
* Chapter 7
	+ Overall there were suggestions to emphasize habitat benefits, and Angela worked with HDR to strengthen language related to those points.
	+ Since the higher consumptive use estimate will no longer be met with the list of offset projects, Angela proposed language to state that the portfolio of projects does not achieve the higher consumptive use estimate WRIA wide. Additionally, this language explains how adaptive management and implementation will work towards offsetting necessary water.
		- The Squaxin Island Tribe proposed a revision to state that this plan “will rely on successful adaptive management if it is to meet the goals of the committee”.
			* Ecology proposed using “would” instead of “will”.
			* The Squaxin Island Tribe agreed.
	+ The Squaxin Island Tribe repeated their objection to the statement that the plan meets NEB, and instead leave it to Ecology to determine whether or not NEB is met.
		- Angela shared proposed language in Chapter 7 regarding this issue, and the Committee expressed no disagreement to the revised language.
* Green Diamond Resource Company proposed removing the Forest Stand Proposal from the plan. Green Diamond feels that the proposal does not demonstrate positive habitat benefits and that it misunderstands the benefits of forestry for streamflow. Green Diamond is not concerned with the general idea on page 62 of the plan (Section 5.4.2), rather their concerns are with the specific project from Thurston County.
	+ There was not consensus to make changes to the plan.

## Public Comment

* No public comments were made during the meeting.

## Next Steps and Adjourn

* Some changes still need to be made in the plan after today’s discussion before the plan can be sent out for local review, namely revisions to chapters 5 and 7 based on the removal of the Rooftop Runoff project. Susan proposed that either the revised plan can be sent to the committee for a final quick review to determine if another meeting is needed, or another meeting be scheduled today.
	+ Members are comfortable without another meeting after the final revisions are made.
* The committee agreed that Angela should make the changes and send a revised draft to the committee for a quick 3 day review. Committee members will send Angela any red flag comments, and Angela and Susan will determine if another meeting is needed. At the very latest, a new version of the plan will be distributed by Monday 2/1.
	+ Angela will send a follow-up email to the Committee with a timeline for the immediate next steps.
* Plan Review
	+ April 8th is the date of the regularly scheduled Committee meeting in April, but Angela is working to reschedule this meeting for the final plan vote. A Doodle poll will be distributed.
		- Local review should be completed 5-10 days in advance of this meeting.
		- Committee members must ensure that the representative designated to have authority for plan approval is present during the meeting scheduled for the final vote.
* Next Steps
	+ Angela will send a poll to vote on the cover photo.
	+ Angela will send a poll to select a date in mid-April for the final plan vote.
	+ Materials for local review will be compiled and provided to the committee.
		- Draft plan
		- Presentation for draft plan
		- Committee brochure
		- Other relevant materials
	+ If committee members need support or additional resources during the local review period, they should reach out to Angela or Susan
	+ Regularly scheduled Committee meetings will be held as-needed.
	+ Committee members will be contacted periodically for check-ins by Angela and Susan through the local review process.
	+ January meeting summaries will be sent out as soon as possible. Angela will ask for revisions and agreement over email.