

WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Workgroup March 4th Agenda

Participants: Austin, Stacy, John O, David N, Bob, Joel, Thomas, Allison, Becky

1. Reminder on the role of the workgroup and identify a representative to report back to the committee on March 7th! (Note that Stacy will provide meeting summary) (5 mins)
 - a. *Joel volunteered to provide the report*
2. Review scope of work for technical consultant (25 mins)
 - a. Refresher on committee products and decisions as relates to scope of work
 - i. Review slides from Jan meeting
 - ii. Review work order
 - b. Are there any WRIA 15 specific needs for the scope of work?
 - c. What data is available to support delivery of the products and inform committee decisions?
 - i. *Considerations for Gig Harbor/Key Peninsula. Health Department not allowing wells because of concerns for salt water intrusion. We may need to review the Health data but there could be some data gaps.*
 - ii. *Recognize uniqueness of the Kitsap peninsula. There are many small basins and drainage basins. The peninsula is very different from other watersheds and therefore it is important for the consultant to have local knowledge.*
 - iii. *The Peninsula has pretty good coverage of streamflow, aquifer levels and precipitation.*
 - iv. *The USGS Kitsap model does not cover key islands (Fox, McNeil, Anderson, Vashon) and groundwater data may be limited.*
 - v. *KPUD has access to quite a bit of data that could be helpful.*
 - vi. *There is interest in knowing what water has been appropriated in the WRIA, what is the overall water budget for the watershed. While we are focused on offsetting new impacts, it is hard to understand the future scale without understanding the impacts that have already occurred and what the current landscape is.*
 - vii. *There is a database of all wells that have been submitted to health district in Kitsap Co and Ecology. Database that is searchable that could be used to how many wells drilled each year for past ~15 years.*
 - viii. *Committee may be able to pick subbasins without help from consultant*
 - d. Are there any critical data gaps/needs that will impact our ability to make decisions and/or develop the plan?
 - e. Discussion on firms that bid on WRIA 15 – concerns, preferences?
 - i. *Aspect, HDR/PGG, RN all have experience in 15*
3. Discussion on subbasin delineation and recommendations (25 mins)
 - a. Refresher on why need subbasins
 - b. Review slides that John Covert presented at February meeting as starting point for discussion
 - c. Identify consideration for subbasin delineation

- d. What additional information / maps are needed to inform subbasin delineation
 - i. *Impacts on islands will be isolated and may need to keep as individual subbasins for project identification. E.g. Anderson island anticipated to have a lot of growth and needs its own projects; if lump with other islands, Anderson may not get offsets they need.*
 - ii. *Will need to justify if we decide to expand subbasins beyond a watershed; subbasin more as a container, but keep as close as possible to hydraulic units*
 - iii. *Consider lumping subbasins to start as opposed to breaking up into smaller subbasins. Might reconsider in the future, but will help with finding offset projects. Initially try to get offsets with where growth is anticipated on watershed by watershed basis, but may be too limiting. Start on watershed basin and then expand out to subbasin. Joel has a preliminary approach that includes 7 subbasins. (lumped islands) - Joel will share his initial approach to subbasins.*
 - iv. *John wants to ensure we address difference in rainfall precipitation, recharge $N \rightarrow S$, $W \rightarrow E$. $N \rightarrow$ recharge is less than a foot; SW is about 3'. Impacts will vary quite a bit for individual wells. Closed and partially closed basins may need to be considered as we look at subbasins. John did an analysis with the Kitsap model for averages over the subbasins.*
 - v. *Political realities should also be considered such as where are the jurisdictional boundaries and land use boundaries.*
 - vi. *Geology also needs to be a consideration such as aquifers and recharge areas and how they impact the subbasin. Consider where there are gaps between. Where is this process going to end politically and the ability to influence politically?*
- 4. Action items and next steps (5mins)
 - a. Gaps in expertise and recommendations for other entities to join workgroup

Next meeting:

1. In person on April 4th 1:30pm-3:30pm (Kitsap Conference Center, Bremerton)
2. Develop subbasin recommendation(s) for committee
3. Continue data availability discussion
4. Work with consultant on growth projection scenarios and develop recommendation(s) for committee