# WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Workgroup Meeting

May 2, 2019

Participants: Stacy Vynne, Susan Gulick, Bob Montgomery, John Covert, David Nash, Alison O’Sullivan, John O’Leary, Nam Siu, Sam Phillips, Joel Purdy, Dan Cardwell, Austin Jennings, Erica Marbet

## Subbasin Discussion

The workgroup reviewed the southern WRIA 15 subbasin proposals developed by Squaxin Island Tribe and Pierce County (available on committee webpage). The Pierce County proposals builds on the Squaxin Island Tribe’s proposal but merges some subbasins. The group discussed using the Pierce Co proposal but splitting a few of the watersheds further.

Concern was raised that if we apply the same logic as used for the southern part of the watershed for the northern subbasins, we will end up with an unmanageable number of subbasins. There is concern about time and cost lost on consultants working with small subbasins, which they could instead spend working on project development. The counties are also concerned about a higher margin of error for growth projections the smaller the subbasins.

The group agreed that we want to offset close to the impacts and that we need to balance offset impacts on small streams with project ideas (ie. We want good projects, not just projects for the sake of projects).

The group began digging into the southern WRIA 15 proposal and proposed some lumping and splitting (Key Peninsula, Gig Harbor, McNeil/Anderson).

The group then reviewed the proposal from Kitsap County (combined HUC 12s) along with the potential wells map. The group discussed and recognized that if the map shows an area is covered by a water purveyor, it may still have wells. There is the possibility to further refine the data to those homes that are more than ¼ mile from the water main (and therefore, it is not cost efficient to connect).

The group discussed the combined HUC 12 map from Kitsap County.

The group then revisited the idea of starting with 3-4 larger drainage basins (or “regions”). These regions include 1-2 in northern Kitsap, a split down the middle for Hood Canal and West Sound, and a southern Puget Sound region. Using regions as a starting point, the group discussed then digging down deeper to look at the HUC 12s, streams, and political boundaries.

The counties shared that they can project growth at any level, but recognize that the data is less reliable the smaller we go. It’s helpful for the counties to have the subbasins for providing their growth projections.

Considerations for subbasins include starting large, using a nesting approach, and ensuring there is justification for offset projects outside of a subbasins.

Some workgroup members are interested in applying the smaller Assessment Units as well, which look at particular stream impacts.

Pierce County put forward a proposal to move forward with the 3 to 4 “regions” plus the islands. KPUD supported the proposal. Ecology also supported the proposal with inclusion of caveats: 1) we commit to offset projects that are near the impact; 2) we commit to revisit the subbasins throughout the process.

The workgroup agreed to bring forward the regions as an approach for moving forward (not a specific subbasin proposal). The workgroup will frame it as an initial informational gathering approach and bring forward to the committee for discussion.

Sam, Alison and Nam will talk about how to approach the northern part of the WRIA and whether to have as one or two regions. The workgroup will refer to the regions as Hood Canal, West Sound, South Puget Sound, and North Kitsap (A and B?). This is in addition to the islands.

The consultant will work on developing a map of the regions and ensure alignment with the salmon recovery lead entity boundaries.

Stacy will send out the list of project site visits that have come in so far.

The committee will work on identifying projects that are best for fixing the watershed.

Consultants will work on a map of the regions and language with the caveats for this proposed approach.

## Growth Projections

The workgroup had a short conversation on the direction to the consultant. In some counties, the consultants may do some independent analysis; in other counties, the staff will hand over information.

The consultant will schedule meetings with the counties to identify the best way to pull and analyze data.

## Next Steps

* The workgroup will meet on 5.9 via webex to review a draft map of the regions from the consultant and to hear a proposal on addressing the North Kitsap region.
* The workgroup will meet on 5.15 via webex to review draft data on growth projections.
* It is likely the workgroup will cancel the 6.4 meeting unless final preparations are needed ahead of the 6.6 committee meeting.
* It is likely the workgroup will meet in person in July to: a) finalize growth projection recommendations if not completed by June; b) discuss consumptive use estimate approaches.