**WRIA 15 Project Workgroup Meeting**

January 14, 2020

Participants: Christian Berg, Bob Montgomery, Burt Clothier, Stacy Vynne, John Covert, Zach Holtz, Nate Daniel, Joel Purdy, Paul Pickett, Sam Philipps, Jon Turk, Brenda Padgham, Alison O’Sullivan, Nam Siu, Brittany Gordon

**Project Updates**

The group provided updates on project ideas they have been developing. Stacy will add details as appropriate to the project inventory spreadsheet: <https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15ProjectInventory>

* Sam visited the Big Beef DNR Parcel. It is about 300 acres and has potential for BDA, water storage. Seems like a good opportunity.
* Bainbridge Island Land Trust closed on the Springbrook property, which includes 23 acres of forest and wetlands. They are seeking funding through RCO and possibly streamflow restoration. The property is a priority for water storage on Bainbridge Island. There is an opportunity to visit the property.
* There are discussions happening on reclaimed water facilities in Kingston and Silverdale. Ecology and technical staff will follow up with partners to further discuss potential for including as part of the plan.
* KPUD is looking at stream augmentation opportunities.
* Stacy has added projects from other or previous planning processes and has begun trying to pull in details for some of the projects. The workgroup and committee will need to start focusing on development of projects that have a likely contribution to our planning process.

**Managed Aquifer Recharge and Gravel Pits** – presentation and discussion

John Covert provided an [overview presentation](https://app.box.com/s/81g922p9mk2959oqedlmjgcn6ctzj9xq) on MAR projects. The presentation covered the basics of MAR projects and provided examples from around the state. John presented very initial concepts for 6 MAR projects in WRIA 15 for the committee to provide feedback on. The potential WRIA 15 sites include:

* Gorst Cr
* Union R
* Grovers Cr
* Minter Cr
* Judd Cr
* Tahuya

These sites are very preliminary and need to be discussed for their feasibility and potential contribution to streamflow. In addition to engineered (“plastic”) projects, the group discussed whether there are natural options. While there are natural options, they can be challenging for quantifying the amount of streamflow. Building and maintaining the projects is not cost-prohibitive, but the main costs come with water quality testing. If we use a more natural approach, there would obviously be less or no operations and maintenance costs.

* There were some questions about the Gorst site and that there may be infiltration happening nearby led by Bremerton.
* The soils considered for the MAR project are typically outwash deposit.
* Fish screens are essential for MAR projects.
* Flooding of property has been seen in some areas of the state (like Yakima) and we are able to quantify. Not sure if there are opportunities in WRIA 15.
* Benefits from MAR projects are very localized, unless we want to pipe it to another stream.
* Our projects need to be developed with a “reasonable assurance” that they can be implemented and deliver the results they anticipate.
* John provided some initial thoughts on how to approach gravel pits, such as looking at access, capacity to store, and alleviating water quality concerns.
	+ Sam mentioned a potential headwaters opportunity on L. Anderson.
	+ Kitsap Co has a potential site near the Port Orchard airport.
	+ Bob is working to have gravel pit information added to the webmap.
	+ There was interest in doing a pilot project with gravel pits.
* The workgroup discussed having the consultant team look into MAR and gravel pit opportunities, but we also want to have them look at floodplain and other project types.
* The reasons MAR projects typically fail are due to infiltration rates and water quality.
* Lateral transport issues are typically looked at when we have a specific project to consider.
* Temperature is not usually an issue for spreading basins as they are filled with water in the winter and dry in the summer (used to recharge the aquifer). If you do use them to pump into the stream, you can typically draw cooler water from the bottom and monitor it to ensure there are not temperature issues.
* Can lakes be used for MAR? This may be complicated, but something to consider. There may be issues with a water right for diversion and the geology.

**Screening Criteria**

The workgroup had a very brief conversation on the screening criteria and the exercise completed to score sample projects. The group discussed looking at pros and cons across the projects and having everyone add comments for discussion. This approach may help to whittle down the list to a manageable number of projects. We may also want to consider (prioritize) projects that are in headwaters or that benefit multiple basins. The workgroup will work as subgroups or independently to start adding comments into the project inventory to identify pros and cons, which projects may be priority, or which projects may cause concern or be a ‘red flag’ for an entity.

**Action Items:**

1. Send Stacy additional thoughts on MAR and gravel pit projects, particularly reactions to the potential projects John presented on and details on any projects in the inventory.
2. Subgroups and individuals should fill out a pros/cons column that will be added to the project inventory (Stacy will send notice when ready).
3. Stacy will talk more with Sam about potential next steps to explore the gravel pit near L. Anderson.
4. Stacy to talk with Teresa regarding Gorst site and whether there is already infiltration happening.
5. HDR to add gravel pit information to webmap.

**Questions for the Committee:**

1. Do we want to do another site visit of potential projects for our plan in the spring? If so, Stacy can work on coordinating logistics and reaching out to potential project sponsors.
2. How do we want to focus the consultant time on project development? We have time for the consultants to identify about 20 projects and further develop about 10. The workgroup discussed casting a “wide net” and looking at a range of projects.
3. How does the committee want to engage in further developing the project list (e.g. adding comments in pros/cons, flagging priority projects or projects of concern)?