MEETING SUMMARY

**WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement**

**Committee Meeting**

August 1, 2019 | 9:30 a.m.-12:00p.m.|[WRIA 15 Committee Webpage](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37327/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_15.aspx)

## **Location**

Kitsap Conservation District

10332 Central Valley Rd

Poulsbo**Committee Chair**

Stacy Vynne McKinstry

Svyn461@ecy.wa.gov

(425) 649-7114

**Handouts**

Agenda

June Meeting Summary

Committee Calendar

Stormwater/LID documents

Growth Projection documents

Final NEB Guidance

Policy Interpretations

# Attendance

Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

David Winfrey (*Puyallup Tribe)*

Nathan Daniel *(Great Peninsula Conservancy)*

StacyVynneMcKinstry *(WA Dept of Ecology)*

GregRabourn *(King County)*

DaveNash (*alternate) (Kitsap County)*

SamPhillips *(Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe)*

TeresaSmith *(City of Bremerton)*

Mike Michael *(City of Bainbridge Island)*

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

Dave Ward (*Kitsap County)*

Jacki Brown (City of *Port Orchard)*

Allison Satter (*City of* *Bremerton)*

Larry Boltz *(ex offio)(Mason-Kitsap Farm Bureau)*

Josie Cummings (*Building Industry Association of Washington)*

Alison O’Sullivan (*alternate) (Suquamish Tribe)*

Leonard Forsman (*Suquamish Tribe)*

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 Gig Harbor

City of Poulsbo

Other Attendees

Susan Gulick *(Sound Resolutions, Facilitator)*

Bob Montgomery *(Anchor QEA)*

Stephanie Potts *(WA Dept of Ecology)*

John Covert (*WA Dept of Ecology)*

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

Zach Holt (*Port Orchard)*

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

# Meeting Agenda and Meeting Summary

Stacy introduced Jacki Brown, Utilities Manager for the City of Port Orchard, who replaces Thomas Hunter as the city’s representative.

Stacy introduced Josie Cummings, Regulatory and Government Affairs Manager at Building Industry Association of Washington, who will fill the building industry representative seat through the end of 2019. Russ Shiplet from Kitsap Building Association will return in 2020.

Susan reviewed the agenda.

*No revisions to the agenda.*

Susan acknowledged minor revisions to the June meeting summary – editorial and clarifying language around Kelsey’s presentation. Stacy distributed a track changes version with meeting agenda. Ecology will post the final meeting summary on the committee webpage.

*No further refinements to the meeting summary provided.*

# Updates and Announcements

Stacy provided updates from Ecology.

* Ecology published the Final Net Ecological Benefit Guidance and Policy Interpretations on July 31. Documents are available on the [Streamflow Restoration webpage](https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shorelines/Water-supply/Streamflow-restoration/Streamflow-restoration-planning). Committee members should review the documents ahead of the September 5 meeting.
* Ecology will release draft [Streamflow Restoration Grants Guidance](https://ecology.wa.gov/About-us/How-we-operate/Grants-loans/Find-a-grant-or-loan/Streamflow-restoration-implementation-grants) on August 7 for public comment. The grant application period is expected to open in early 2020.
* Stacy provided an updated committee calendar. The calendar highlights when we anticipate needing to reach agreement on critical components of the plan. Committee members should consider which components need vetting within their entities prior to committee approval.
* The Skokomish Tribe proposed slight revisions to the region delineation – dividing the western portion of the Kitsap Peninsula to better align with the rainfall patterns and county jurisdictions. Further discussion on the revisions will occur with the workgroup as there are implications for how we present growth projections and consumptive use estimates.

# Stormwater Management and Low Impact Development (LID)

Per the request of committee members, this initial discussion was intended to highlight the stormwater and LID requirements within jurisdictions as well as identify opportunities for enhancements. The committee held an open conversation around the current stormwater and LID requirements within the jurisdictions.

Reference Material

* Some jurisdictions provided hard copies of materials. Stormwater info linked below.
* [Kitsap](https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Documents/2016%20Kitsap%20Stormwater%20Design%20Manual%20Final.pdf)
* [Pierce](https://www.co.pierce.wa.us/2969/Stormwater-Site-Development-Manual)
* [Mason](http://www.co.mason.wa.us/stormwater/)
* [King](https://www.kingcounty.gov/services/environment/water-and-land/stormwater/documents/surface-water-design-manual.aspx)
* [Bainbridge](http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/176/Stormwater-Management-Program)
* [Poulsbo](https://cityofpoulsbo.com/public-works-stormwater/)
* [Bremerton](http://www.bremertonwa.gov/489/Stormwater-Management-NPDES-Phase-II)
* [Port Orchard](https://www.cityofportorchard.us/documents/2019-stormwater-management-program-plan-pdf/)
* [Gig Harbor](https://www.cityofgigharbor.net/241/Stormwater-Information)

Discussion

* Many of the jurisdictions adopted Ecology’s stormwater manual; some jurisdictions have revised the manual and tailored to their jurisdiction.
* Some jurisdictions are working towards 100% onsite stormwater treatments/zero runoff goals.
* Some of the jurisdictions have heard concerns from builders about the ability to navigate and pay for the requirements. King County is working on additional voluntary actions.
* Kitsap County has a new requirement requiring treatment for pollution-generating surfaces (e.g. driveways, patios).
* There is a concern for long-term maintenance of the some of the stormwater treatment and LID components (e.g. rain gardens).
* Jurisdictions are also working on enforcement – often with Ecology – such as a recent development in Port Orchard.
* We need to ensure that the requirements aren’t cost prohibitive and that they benefit streamflow.
* The committee could consider projects in our plan that enhance the minimum requirements for LID/stormwater, provided that the project provides a defined offset.
* The committee may want to consider projects that: 1) support maintenance over time; and 2) address legacy development (i.e. retrofits). Both of these approaches will take time and resources.
* Green roofs present a challenge because current code still considers them as a hard surface that needs to be mitigated, and they often don’t pencil out for builders and homeowners. And for the WRE planning process, it doesn’t provide infiltration.
* Committee should continue to consider and explore ideas for enhancements to LID/Stormwater, including projects addressing legacy stormwater issues, and whether there are opportunities to consider as part of our planning process.

# Project and Technical Workgroup Reports

Stacy shared the report from the project workgroup. The workgroup met in person on July 9 and 22. The workgroup completed the following during the two meetings:

1. The workgroup met with Kelsey Collins to develop a draft scope of work for looking at acquisition opportunities, focused on select streams in each of the regions. The project workgroup will provide input on which streams to focus on for the assessment. Committee members should share additional acquisition opportunities with Stacy.
2. The workgroup decided to break into subgroups, focused around the regions, in order to take advantage of geographic expertise. Each subgroup has a lead, who will help to organize meetings and lead the subgroup towards identification of projects or project ideas. The subgroup delineations, initial assignments and leads are included in the Project Workgroup Overview document and below. The Committee was supportive of this approach. Committee members that are interested in joining a subgroup should contact the lead.
	1. The workgroup discussed considerations for project types to avoid as well as priorities or areas to focus on when exploring project ideas. The list is summarized in the Project Workgroup Overview document.

North: Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe, Suquamish Tribe, GPC, Poulsbo, **DFW**\*

South: **Squaxin Island Tribe**\*, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, GPC, Mason Co, Gig Harbor, Puyallup, Nisqually Salmon Recovery lead entity

West/Hood Canal: Suquamish Tribe, HCCC, Skokomish Tribe, Mason Co, **DFW**\*, Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group, GPC

East: **Suquamish**\*, GPC, West Sound salmon recovery lead entity, Bainbridge Island Land Trust, Bainbridge Island, Port Orchard, Bremerton

V/M: Puyallup Tribe, **King Co**\*, WRIA 9 Lead Entity, Vashon Land Trust

WRIA wide: **ECY**\*, DFW, Kitsap Co, WWS, KPUD, HDR, GPC, Long Live the Kings, Wild Fish Conservancy [some of these folks may participate in other subgroups, but this subgroup provides an opportunity to look across the watershed for projects without participating in multiple subgroups]

\***Leads** for subgroups

* Paul provided a summary of the technical workgroup meeting, which met in person on July 22. The technical workgroup reviewed initial growth projection data from the counties and an initial consumptive use calculation. The workgroup will need to look further into the KPUD metering data and different considerations for the consumptive use estimates.

Reference Materials

* Project Workgroup Overview document

Discussion

* All project ideas coming out of the subgroups and project workgroup will come before the committee for discussion. Susan and Stacy will present to the workgroup and committee a draft process for how projects will be brought forward.
* The exercises about project considerations provide good information to help consultants develop screening criteria
* The committee raised the following additional project considerations: project size (avoid a small number of large projects); redundancy (good to have); climate change considerations; prioritizing areas that don’t typically receiving funding (e.g. not priorities for salmon recovery funding).
* There is no dedicated funding allocation for funding projects in our plan. There is a new streamflow restoration grant program, which will be one source of funding, but we will need to identify how each of the projects will be funded.
* Regulatory actions or policies put in place prior to Jan 2018 cannot be included in our plan as counting towards NEB. If there are other actions or policies put in place after January 2018, with streamflow benefit in mind, those may count and we will need to quantify benefit to the extent possible.
* The committee discussed examples of projects already required for mitigation – such as some culvert replacements or development permit requirements –that cannot be included as part of our plan. But we could include an upstream habitat improvement project connected to a culvert replacement or other required project (will want to quantify streamflow benefit to the extent possible).
* Project workgroup discussed consideration of priority watersheds and priority stocks – in some cases, these are the areas that attract funding sources. We may want to consider projects in places where it is harder to get funding.
* The committee discussed whether there was value in considering the legal withdrawal limit for the consumptive use estimates – there was not agreement on this approach. There was agreement that it is not a huge effort to adjust the numbers and run the various scenarios, but there is concern by some members on what we do with the analysis as it has implications on our offset need and the number of of projects we need to find.
* Some members of the committee believe that it’s important to consider drought and climate change impacts in consumptive use estimates. Some members of the committee believe the Plan should address hot, dry years when both permit exempt well use and streamflow impacts are greatest.

# Growth Projections and Consumptive Use Assumptions

Bob Montgomery provided a summary of the current status and next steps for the growth projections and consumptive use estimates. Materials were submitted by the consultant and distributed to the committee on July 31. Initial growth projections estimate over 7000 new permit-exempt wells in WRIA 15 over the next 20 years. HDR’s next steps in the process are to create growth projection “heat maps” for King and Kitsap counties, consider different growth projection scenarios, and to consider assumptions for the consumptive use estimates. The workgroup and committee will discuss both scenarios and assumptions over the next couple of meetings.

Reference Materials

* HDR memo on growth projections includes “heat maps” for Pierce and Mason counties (note the memo provides information for WRIAs 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15)
* HDR spreadsheets of growth projection (includes information for WRIAs 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15)
* WRIA 15 CU Estimates spreadsheet (“plug and play”)
* Mason County Culmulative and Eventual white paper
* Mason County Letter from Commissioner Neatherlin
* Squaxin Island Tribe Memo on Consumptive Use

Discussion

* For consumptive use estimates, Ecology recommendeds methods in the NEB guidance but committees can use other methods with justification or numbers using local data. Ecology needs to be comfortable with the number put forward for offset – any additional buffer needs to be achievable.
* The committee discussed some potential corrections to the numbers (e.g. Kitsap PUD data) and methodologies for calculating irrigation.They also discussed the difference in water use levels for permit exempt well users and system users with metered water and tiered rates.
* The consultant will look at an average lawn size for home with permit exempt wells to estimate outdoor irrigation.
* Some committee members expressed a desire to not avoid assumptions or uncertainty to make our number smaller and find less projects; they feel it is better to ~~overshoot~~ make conservative (and realistic) assumptions and have a comfortable “buffer”.
* There is a risk that the Plan may notfind enough projects tomeet NEB. If we don’t find enough projects or meet NEB, Ecology will need to pick up where the committee left off and prepare a plan that does achieve NEB prior to entering rule making. Ecology will consider all of the technical work that went into plan development if the committee does not come to agreement on a plan that meets NEB and Ecology must enter rulemaking.
* The legislation does not require us to consider drought and climate change, this is a critical issue for some members of the committee. Stacy is preparing a document on considerations for how the committee could address climate change in the plan components.
* Considerations as we look at buffers and uncertainty may include:
	+ Different population growth scenarios.
	+ Climate change impacts.
	+ Affluence and its impact on lawn size and water use.
	+ Other considerations.

# Overview of Site Visits

The committee visited three sites:

* **Kitsap Conservation District Facility**: Tour of the facility and the low impact development improvements, including rain gardens, permeable paving, green room, and rainwater cisterns. More information available: <https://kitsapcd.org/>
* **Clear Creek Restoration Projects:** Viewed several projects in the area including floodplain restoration and beaver reintroduction; learned about the master plan for restoration and mitigation work along the creek. More information on the floodplain restoration project available:[**http://kitsap.paladinpanoramic.com/project/2231/44029**](http://kitsap.paladinpanoramic.com/project/2231/44029)
* **Port Gamble Resource Recovery Facility:** Toured a reclaimed (recycled) water facility for Port Gamble community, which is used to recharge the aquifer and is managed by Kitsap PUD. More information available: <https://www.kpud.org/wastewater.php>

# Public Comment

Jacki Brown shared that the Puget Sound Regional Council’s draft Vision 2050 plan is available and recommended jurisdictions review the document. More information available: <https://www.psrc.org/vision>

# Action Items for Committee Members

* Next meeting: September 5, Kitsap County Commissioner’s Chambers, Port Orchard.
* Technical workgroup will meet on August 21 (contact Stacy for information) to discuss growth projection scenarios and buffers or assumptions for consumptive use.
* Committee members should send Stacy any considerations for scenarios, buffers or levels of uncertainty to discuss with the workgroup.
* Project workgroup subgroups will meet during the month of August.
* Committee members should review the [Final NEB guidance and policy interpretations](https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shorelines/Water-supply/Streamflow-restoration/Streamflow-restoration-planning) ahead of the September meeting.
* Committee members should review the updated committee calendar and determine which items up for approval need further vetting internally.
* Committee members should contact Stacy if they want to be added to a project workgroup subgroup (See Project Workgroup Overview).
* Committee members should send project ideas to Stacy. She will share with project subgroups or consultant as appropriate.

# Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

* Ecology will work with the consultant to provide access to GIS layers from webmap. (carryover from June)
* The consultant will distribute population growth heat maps for King and Kitsap counties once available. They will also look into posting heat maps on their WebMap application.
* Ecology will distribute the detailed growth projection and consumptive use spreadsheets.
* Ecology will respond to questions regarding offset “credits” for different projects. (carryover from June)
* Ecology will distribute documents shared by committee members via Box once available. (carryover from June)