AGENDA

**WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement**

**Committee Meeting**

June 6, 2019 | 9:30 a.m.-12:45p.m.|[WRIA 15 Committee Webpage](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37327/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_15.aspx)

## **Location**

Eagles Nest Community Center

1195 NW Fairground Road,

Bremerton

**Committee Chair**

Stacy Vynne McKinstry

Svyn461@ecy.wa.gov

(425) 649-7114

**Handouts**

Agenda

May Meeting Summary

Data Acquisition Sheet

Region Proposal

# Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Nathan Daniel *(Great Peninsula Conservancy)*

TrentWard *(City of Gig Harbor)*

StacyVynneMcKinstry *(WA Dept of Ecology)*

GregRabourn *(King County)*

DaveNash (*alternate) (Kitsap County)*

SamPhillips *(Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe)*

TeresaSmith *(City of Bremerton)*

BeckyErickson *(Poulsbo)*

Christian Berg *(Bainbridge Island)*

Paul McCollum *(alternate) (Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe)*

Shawn O’Dell (*ex officio) (Washington Water Service)*

Brittany Gordon (*Dept of Fish and Wildlife)*

JoelPurdy *(Kitsap Public Utility District)*

DanaSarff *(alternate) (Skokomish Tribe)*

JoyGaritone *(Kitsap Conservation District)*

NamSiu *(alternate) (Dept of Fish and Wildlife)*

RandyNeatherlin *(Mason County)*

Paul Pickett *(alternate) (Squaxin Island Tribe)*

AustinJennings *(alternate) (Pierce County)*

JohnO’Leary *(alternate) (Suquamish Tribe)*

Committee Representatives Not In Attendance\*

City of Port Orchard

Puyallup Tribe

Kitsap Building Association

Mason-Kitsap Farm Bureau (*ex officio*)

Other Attendees

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions, Facilitator)*

Bob Montgomery *(Anchor QEA)*

Stephanie Potts *(WA Dept of Ecology)*

Lisa Dally Wilson (*Dally Environmental)*

Chris Pitre (*Coho Consulting*)

Kelsey Collins (*WA Dept of Ecology)*

Angela Pietschmann (*Cascadia Consulting Group, Information Manager*)

\*Attendees list is based on sign-in sheet.

# Meeting Agenda and Meeting Summary

Susan reviewed the agenda.

*No revisions to the agenda.*

Susan acknowledged no revisions submitted on the May meeting summary.

*No refinements to the meeting summary provided.*

# Updates and Announcements

Stacy provided updates from Ecology.

* Waiting to receive confirmation of Mason-Kitsap Farm Bureau as ex officio member from Port Orchard.
* Stacy has talked with the three salmon recovery lead entities (Hood Canal Coordinating Council, West Sound Watersheds and Nisqually). They are determining level of engagement on the project workgroup.
* Documents out for comment:
	+ Draft final NEB guidance (public comment closes June 7)
	+ Policy interpretations (public comment closes June 7)
	+ Initial inquiry on data sources and needs for completing watershed restoration and enhancement plan (initial input sought by June 12)
* Ecology recently met with: Squaxin Island Tribe, Great Peninsula Conservancy, Kitsap Conservation District and the UW’s Climate Impacts Group. Stacy is happy to meet with anyone regarding their needs, interests or concerns regarding the planning process.
* Squaxin Island Tribe is still determining whether they will sign on to the Operating Principles

# Acquisition Opportunities

Kelsey Collins (Ecology) provided an overview of water rights acquisitions in Washington as well as considerations for WRIA 15. Kelsey discussed the different types of water right acquisitions open to consideration for the planning process.

Reference Material

* Her overview presentation on water rights acquisitions from the May 30 webinar is available here ([Play the recording.](https://watech.webex.com/recordingservice/sites/watech/recording/playback/8820055c6c084fd685783d9d1ad04176)). Kelsey’s presentation is the first ~30 minutes of the webinar.

Discussion

* Committee members asked whether reclaimed water receives a 1:1 mitigation credit. It is likely that if a wastewater treatment plan is discharing to marine waters and switches to upstream groundwater recharge, there is the potential for an offset. Ecology will work internally with the Water Quality program on any site specific proposals to assess the contribution to offset and net ecological benefit.
* Ecology does not have good data on price range for purchasing water rights on the west side of the state. Ecology will check with Washington Water Trust and other entities to get estimates. We also have to be careful about publicizing numbers as that can drive up the market value.
* Project certainty and feasibility for water right acquisitions varies, as there is no guarantee that someone will sell their water right. A lot of research and negotiation is required to identify willingness.
* There is the possibility to swap senior water rights with junior water right holders (interruptible water right holders), but this will likely not count as a consumptive offset. However, it would support net ecological benefit.
* Source switches (e.g. replacing the upstream diversion with downstream; switch from surface to groundwater) are allowed, but the details of the source switch will determine if counts towards an offset or net ecological benefit. Ecology and contractors will estimate the amount of offset likely from a source switch.
* Ecology will look into the offset or NEB “credit” provided for taking existing permit exempt wells offline or legal or illegal “straws” out of the system. This could occur through decommissioning/ retiring wells or hooking them up to a municipal system. The issue is on how to quantify and what amount of credit is received (e.g. just the consumptive use).
* Kelsey will attend a future WRIA 15 meeting to discuss what a water acquisition assessment would look like for the watershed.

# Workgroup Report and Subbasin Recommendations

Stacy summarized the last three workgroup meetings. The workgroup met once in person, following the May 2nd committee meeting, and twice via phone. The workgroup conversations focused on: 1) reviewing criteria and ideas for delineating subbasins; and 2) growth projection approaches. The workgroup took the input from the committee on subbasin delineation and continued discussions on lumping vs splitting as well as criteria for consideration. The workgroup ultimately landed on a “region” proposal. The workgroup also discussed and heard updates on the growth projections. Each county is working with the consultant to develop their methodology for growth projections. Raw notes from workgroup meetings are posted on the committee webpage.

Nam presented the proposal from the workgroup on the “region” approach to watershed delineation. He reminded folks of the requirements under the legislation and some of the criteria or considerations discussed for delineation. The workgroup did not reach consensus on lumping or splitting, but did agree on 1) a nested approach that is essentially a “do not cross” line for finding projects to offset impacts ; 2) finding projects that are closest to the impact but that are also beneficial projects; and 3) continuing to revisit delineation of subbasins once growth projections and projects are developed.

The proposal includes three main regions (with a dotted line in North Kitsap to allow flexibility), plus the islands.

Reference Materials

* The proposal map is on the committee webpage.

Discussion

* Joy requested the map layers to support an agricultural inventory.
* Committee members requested that the growth projection analysis be at a finer scale than the regions and that the information be visually presented. The consultants are planning to develop visuals to show growth projections.
* John presented an example of why it may be important to have more refined subbasins (e.g. AU scale) to ensure projects are closest to the impact. John’s maps will be posted on Box once the site is established.
* Some members of the committee like the larger “region” approach with the commitment to find the best projects closest to the impact
* The Skokomish Tribe is reviewing the proposal and may have some additional consideration or an alternative proposal.
* Stacy and Susan will develop language regarding the commitment to find the best projects closest to the area of impact as well as the commitment to revisit the proposal in the future as we have a better understanding of growth and project opportunities. The committee will review the language and revisit the delineation proposal in the fall.

# Technical Needs and Updates

Lisa Dally Wilson, a member of the technical consultant team, provided an overview of the Nisqually planning process and lessons learned on the technical components. Bob Montgomery provided an update on the growth projections work underway with the counties.

Reference Materials

* Lisa’s presentation is posted on the committee webpage.
* Data acquisition sheet distributed to committee.

Discussion

* For consumptive use estimates, Ecology has recommended methods but committees can use other methods with justification or numbers using local data.
* WRIA 11 used local data from the Thurston PUD to calculate consumptive water use and, per the request of Ecology, also used Ecology’s guidance to calculate a second set of consumptive use forecasts. Because Ecology’s guidance relies on calculations rather than observed use, the Ecology method assumed an average irrigable acreage of .2-.25 acres per connection. The acreage was based on results from WRIA 1 They also forecasted consumptive use on an average annual basis.
* WRIA 11 used local data for calculating average lawn size that resulted in .2-.25 acres. They also used the average annual basis.
* Coordination with salmon recovery entities and planning is critical.
* Based on the WRIA 11 experience, Lisa recommended that committees make conservative estimates with growth and consumptive use and focus their efforts on project development.
* It is important that we look at opportunities for using common languages across water resources, salmon recovery and planners. At a minimum, we need to ensure there is translation across the disciplines.
* The technical consultants are supporting the counties in growth projections. Some counties are working on developing their methodologies and forecasts; others will allow HDR to support their work. The role of the consultants is to support, assist, and gather the data as appropriate. They will summarize the methods, assumptions and approaches along with the results.
* Some committee members expressed interest in focusing on the specific task and not blurring the lines with other planning processes.
* Committee should review the data acquisition table and provide feedback to Stacy.

# Committee Check In

Susan asked for input on the process and resources to date and whether any additional presentations or information is needed to support the committee as we move forward with technical discussions and decisions.

Resources

* Presentations and resources on committee webpage.

Discussion

* Committee members requested increased transparency and accountability associtated with the growth projections, e.g. having the technical consultant develop the growth projection ranges and documenting the methods step by step, including the assumptions made.
* Committee members requested showing the data in a webmap and access to GIS layers.
* Some committee members requested seeing real numbers to track what is going on on the ground, but that we use projections when numbers aren’t available.
* We will want to be conservative in our offsets for consumptive use recognizing that projections may not reflect reality; however, some committee members requested using caution in applying a conservative buffer to every step in the process.
* We need clear documentation of assumptions.

# Public Comment

*No comments.*

# Action Items for Committee Members

* Next meeting: August 1, Kitsap Conservation District. Shorter meeting followed by site visits.
* Committee members should send additional needs or resources to Stacy.
* Committee members should review and comment via eComments (as appropriate) on draft NEB guidance and policy interpretations by June 7.
* Committee members should review data acquisition spreadsheet and send comments to Stacy by June 12.

# Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

* Ecology will work with the consultant to develop a webmap and provide access to GIS layers.
* The consultant will work with the counties to document methods and assumptions for growth projections for each county.
* Ecology will respond to questions regarding offset “credits” for different projects.
* Ecology will distribute documents shared by committee members via Box once available.