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# Growth Projections

Stacy provided a quick debrief on the WRIA 15 committee meeting. HDR presented the methodology for calculating the potential for new permit-exempt (PE) wells over the next twenty years for each county.

* Each county chose their own method based on available historical data for parcel use and building permits. Counties want to ensure alignment with their comprehensive plans.
* Committee members requested time to validate whether the results were satisfactory, and whether additional scenarios should be run in order to get a margin/range of possible future PE wells.

Eric Ferguson from King County presented the Vashon-Maury 20 year potential parcels for future growth in unincorporated King County. The data provided are summarized by stream basin since Vashon-Maury Island is consider its own sub-basin. King County anticipates 383 parcels available for PE wells over the next 20 years.

Short description of King County’s work (Eric can provide a more detailed written summary):

1.            Assessment of potential parcels by stream basin

2.            The centroids of the parcels from each stream basin were determined to be ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ water district boundaries.

3.            Water Use projection by stream basin;

a. Within the water district – public water connections were calculated based on historic rates.

i. Remaining number of parcels were assigned to be PE sourced

b. PE Sourced parcels were calculated based on “outside” district boundaries plus the remaining parcels from above.

Stacy presented a potential path forward for the growth projections: 1) keep growth projections based on county methods; 2) refinement of permit exempt well projections; 3) adaptive management component to track growth and adjust as necessary. Stacy would like the workgroup come to some agreement on a path forward recommendation to the committee.

* Some members would still like to see a safety range (e.g 15-30%) in order to ensure selected projects and actions address conservative range of future PE wells.
* Other members expressed confidence in the methodology for PE Potential – furthermore, they believe the results already are conservative estimates, and expect a much lower number of actual PE wells being constructed in the coming years.
	+ Some growth projections are exponential, and that is not realistically how the growth occurs in some locations.
	+ In addition, ordinance limits were not considered, such as distance required to connect with a utility’s system.
* Committee members are still interested in a ‘deep dive’ into the growth projections and heat maps to better understand the data before having confidence in agreement on a path forward. Stacy is working with HDR on their availability and then will send out potential dates.
* With input from the counties, the workgroup came to some agreement of seeing growth and permit exempt well projections run under various scenarios:
	+ Pierce Co: Low-Med-High range based on decadal analysis of PE wells
	+ Mason Co: Single number. Potential safety factor applied after consumptive use.
	+ King Co: Single number. Potential safety factor applied after consumptive use.
	+ Kitsap Co: Low-Med-High range based on 5% (for example) plus or minus projections.
* The workgroup will meet again in late September once the data is available from HDR to inform the conversation.

# Consumptive Use Estimates

Bob provided an overview of the options for indoor and outdoor consumptive use methodology:

1. Use the Ecology recommended method
2. Use data from metering by water purveyors
3. Use data from other local resources (e.g. USGS Groundwater Model)
4. All or combo of the above

KPUD metering data is available and HDR is looking into metering data from water purveyors in other counties. The workgroup discussed looking at all 3 options as a potential starting range.

Bob talked through the methodology for outdoor irrigation parcel selection and analysis. HDR is working on writing up the methodology, which Stacy will share with the workgroup for input. HDR will consider guidelines for analyzing irrigated and non-irrigated areas of the property as well as property value. Group members recommended Google Earth for assessing if the area was historically irrigated. Note that the outdoor irrigation analysis includes gardens, not just lawns. Some members of the committee believe that outdoor irrigation is limited and we may not end up with a meaningful number. John O and Joel offered to run the analysis on the same parcels to ensure comparison with the results HDR runs.

The workgroup talked through the options (A-D) and it’s likely that we will run all options to seeing the variations and sensitivity. The workgroup will need to further discuss assumptions such as irrigation efficiency and whether there is other local data to inform consumptive use percentages. Stacy will send out the link to the USGS Groundwater Model (also available on committee webpage). Workgroup members want to ensure our numbers are grounded in real data.

# Action Items and Next Steps

The workgroup will meet again in September once the permit exempt well projections and outdoor irrigation analysis methodology are ready for review.