# WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee:

## Special Meeting on Consumptive Use

**April 22, 2020**

**WebEx Only**

**Participants**

Alora McGavin (ECY), Austin Jennings (Pierce Co), Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA), David Nash (Kitsap Co), David Windom (Mason Co), David Winfrey (Puyallup Tribe), Dana Sarff (Skokomish Tribe), Dan Cardwell (Pierce Co), Joel Purdy (KPUD), John Covert (ECY), Stacy Vynne (ECY), Joel Massmann (Keta Waters, Suquamish Tribe Consultant), Mike Michael (Bainbridge Island), Parker Whitman (Aspect, Skokomish Tribe Consultant), Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe), Randy Neatherlin (Mason Co), Sam Phillips (Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe), Seth Book (Skokomish Tribe), Susan Gulick (Sound Resolutions), Joy Garitone (KCD)

**Meeting Materials**

All consumptive use materials are posted on Box: <https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15ConsumptiveUseFolder>

Materials for the meeting are posted on Box here: <https://ecy.box.com/v/22April2020ConsUseMeeting>

**Meeting Goal**

* Identify a negotiated number or range for consumptive use to provide as a recommendation to the Committee.

OR

* Identify a path forward for a negotiated number or range for consumptive use.

**Review of Where We Have Been and Where We Are Stuck**

Stacy provided an overview of what the committee has discussed over the last 9-12 months regarding consumptive use and where we have made progress. Stacy briefed the group on the three methods under discussion and where the committee has reached agreement. We will include all three methods in the plan for comparison, but need to determine which method or range to use for the consumptive use estimate. Susan shared different ways for the committee to consider uncertainty and recognized that there may be very different approaches preferred by committee members. Susan and Stacy recognized that the committee has not yet reached agreement on use of a consumptive use method nor how to account for uncertainty.

Seth and Parker discussed work that Aspect Consulting is doing to account for improved data on precipitation and irrigation. The data they are generating could be considered when accounting for uncertainty or a safety factor. Their work aligns with work that Joel M has completed for WRIAs 22/23. The Skokomish Tribe will present the information to the full committee at a future meeting for discussion on the results and consideration for inclusion in the plan.

**Proposals on the Table**

Susan reviewed all of the proposals that have come forward to the committee so far. Participants shared their perspective on what method and range they prefer. The table below summarizes the perspectives shared on the phone call as well as through follow up review of the meeting summary.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1. Participant Preference for Consumptive Use Estimates** |
| **Representative** | **Preference** | **Alternative** | **Other Comments** |
| Mason Co | USGS Method | Willing to use outdoor irrigation if do not apply additional safety factor. | Would like to use estimate closest to reality. If safety factor applied, would like to start with the metered data method or USGS and USDA data. |
| Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe | Outdoor Irrigation Method  |  |  |
| Squaxin Island Tribe | Outdoor Irrigation Method (with Safety Factor considered in future)  |  | Safety factor can be either a number or a combination of policy/regulation and/or adaptive management options |
| Kitsap PUD | USGS | Willing to use outdoor irrigation if do not apply additional safety factor. |  |
| Bainbridge Island | USGS | Willing to use outdoor irrigation if do not apply additional safety factor. |  |
| Pierce Co | USGS | Willing to use outdoor irrigation if do not apply additional safety factor. |  |
| Kitsap CD | USGS | Willing to use outdoor irrigation if do not apply additional safety factor. |  |
| Puyallup Tribe | Outdoor Irrigation Method (with Safety Factor considered in future) |  | Prefers highest possible number. |
| Kitsap Co | USGS |  | Need further internal discussions if willing to accept outdoor irrigation method. |

Discussion

* The group did not discuss focusing on a certain population growth range, but several folks seemed most comfortable starting with the medium growth. For WRIA 15, there is still a low and high growth projection under consideration based on the comfort level of the county to include (see growth projection technical memo).
* USGS biased low (low water use value, no high growth scenario, climate change not addressed)
* Adaptive management will need to consider the potential to amend the plan if assumptions are proven to be incorrect--either too high or too low.
* We should recognize that we may face a building crisis now, which could impact future water use.
* We may need to consider community buy in and incentives, and will need to clarify why we select a certain number for consumptive use.
* Consumptive use estimates are the minimum requirement for offsets and the plan must go above and beyond to meet Net Ecological Benefit.
* We need to recognize that projects are expensive. Adding more projects as safety factor will cost additional money, and this consideration should not be taken lightly.
* Projects also need to be fully developed so that committee members are confident that the projects will deliver the desired results.
* Jurisdictions that sit on multiple committees may need to consider how to justify if a committee chooses to use a different method than other committees.
* The Plans need to be a Hirst fix and offset PEW with real water and protect from future litigation.
* Tribal treaty rights must be protected through the plans by putting water in the streams for fish.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2. Annual Consumptive Use – Outdoor Irrigation Method** |
| **Lower Growth Projection** | **Medium Growth Projection** | **Higher Growth Projection** |
| 669.1 ac ft 414.8 gpm.9258 cfs | 766.4 ac ft475.1 gpm1.0605 cfs | 846.8 ac ft524.9 gpm1.1717 cfs |

**Summary and Next Steps**

* There is general “I can live with it” support for the outdoor irrigation method (122.9 gpd; see consumptive use estimates in Table 2). However, some participants want this to be the absolute high number while others want the opportunity to consider a safety factor later in the process.
* We will need to reach consensus on the final plan, not necessarily the individual pieces, and it may make sense to set the conversation aside until folks have the opportunity to see the full plan.
* All perspectives are valid. We have a diverse group and expect diverse perspectives. It is important for committee members to listen and to understand the diverse perspectives. Committee members are not expected to agree on all details within the plan, but plan approval will depend on committee members accepting details they disagree with.
* Stacy will share notes with the participants, including a summary of which proposal participants support. Participants should provide feedback.
* On May 7, Stacy and Susan will share with the committee the conclusions of this meeting and see how the Committee wants to proceed with the conversation. One approach is that we pause the conversation until the draft plan is prepared in order to better understand the project list and adaptive management components.