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# Meeting Agenda, June and July Meeting Summaries, Updates, and Announcements

Susan reviewed the agenda. *No revisions to the agenda.*

Stacy reviewed requested changes to the June and July meeting summary drafts. *Summaries approved with changes.*

Stacy provided updates from Ecology:

* **Ecology staff are furloughed** 8/31, 9/4, 10/30, 11/30. Let Stacy know if your entity is experiencing furloughs or reduced capacity so she can track for Ecology management.
* Ecology staff have completed **streamflow grant evaluations**. Ecology leadership’s evaluation is in progress and announcement of awards anticipated by October.
* Ecology has developed a [focus sheet](https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/2011083.pdf) on the implications of the **Foster Decision** and the Foster Pilot Program.
* The **Project Workgroup** will meet on Monday, 8/10. Contact Stacy if you would like to attend. The workgroup will discuss water rights, detailed project descriptions, additional projects to develop, and refinement of project list.
* The **Beaver Task Force** met on Wednesday, 8/5 and prepared a recommendation package for committee consideration. Raw notes available [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o8E8nUDPC41VX3VJQ_p8sNT7vQtfSSLdQxgHaoWUdJs/edit?usp=sharing). Draft language included in proposal survey.

# Operating Principles

The approved WRIA 15 Operating Principles state “the Committee may review the operating principles periodically. Any member of the Committee may bring forward a recommendation for an amendment to the operating principles. Amendments will be brought for discussion when a quorum (2/3 of the membership) is present and take effect only if decided on unanimously by the full Committee for inclusion in the operating principles.” Unanticipated circumstances have raised the need for the chair to bring forward a recommendation for amendments. Stacy presented draft language on remote participation, final approval of the plan, presumed withdrawal and resignation. The committee discussed revisions and agreed to the following language:

* **Remote participation.** If extraordinary events, such as a pandemic or natural disaster, require the committee to meet remotely, all meetings will be held remotely and the operating procedures will remain in force, except portions that assume in-person versus remote participation.
* **Final approval of plan.** The final plan approval may also be given verbally during a committee meeting or in writing outside of meetings when in person participation is not possible: Approve / Disapprove.
* **Removal from the Committee.** Entities must participate in the committee process after September 1, 2020 to retain membership on the committee. If an entity does not attend at least one committee or workgroup meeting over any three-month period it will be assumed they have withdrawn from the committee and will be removed as members, unless the member provides a written explanation and requests to remain on the committee. The Chair, via electronic communication, will inform any committee member who has not been participating for two months with this information to provide a minimum of one-month notice before removal.
* **Resignation.** If an entity no longer wishes to participate in the committee process or the final plan approval, they should send written notice (electronic or mailed notice) to the chair as early as possible prior to their resignation. Advance notice will support the chair and facilitator in managing consensus building and voting procedures.

**Reference Materials**:

* [Discussion guide](https://app.box.com/s/vrn7q6tavqqa455zmcgenh20lal093er)
* [Revised and Approved WRIA 15 Operating Principles (8/6/2020)](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/images/WREC/WRIA15/WRIA15Committee_OperatingPrinciples_revisedandapproved6Aug2020.docx)

**Vote on amendments to Operating Principles**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Entity** | **Representative** | **Vote** |
| Kitsap County | Dave Ward | Approve |
| Mason County | Dave Windom | Approve |
| Puyallup Tribe | Dave Winfrey | Approve |
| Pierce County | Dan Cardwell | Approve |
| Skokomish Tribe | Dana Sarff | Approve |
| Squaxin Island Tribe | Paul Pickett | Approve |
| Suquamish Tribe | Alison O’Sullivan | Approve |
| City of Bremerton | Teresa Smith | Approve |
| Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe | Sam Phillips | Approve |
| City of Port Orchard | Zach Holt | Approve |
| City of Bainbridge Island | Mike Michaels | Approve |
| Kitsap Public Utility District | Joel Purdy | Approve |
| WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife | Brittany Gordon | Approve |
| WA Dept of Ecology | Stacy Vynne | Approve |
| King County | Greg Rabourn | Approve |
| Great Peninsula Conservancy | Nathan Daniel | Approve |
| Kitsap Conservation District | Joy Garitone | Approve |

# Plan Development

Ecology management has reviewed the committee’s comments on WRE Plan Chapter 1: (1) they are considering incorporating some comments as they prepare the additional sections for Chapter 1; (2) they are deferring other comments back to the committee as deemed to be WRIA or committee specific. Some comments on **Chapters 1-3** will be discussed in the September committee meeting and will need support from other entities to prepare the language if the committee agrees to the revision. Other comments will be incorporated into the August WRE Plan Draft. Stacy will make the revisions to Chapters 1-3 that were sent out for committee review in the July. Stacy will provide a track changes and clean version of the chapters. .

**Chapter 4** was distributed to the Committee on 8/4 (comments due 8/20). It was based on the technical memo the committee worked on February-June and presents multiple growth projections and consumptive use calculation methodology.

Ecology is working to share the **draft plan** with the committee by 8/28. Stacy will keep the committee updated if there is a delay in distribution. The draft will show chapter structure and examples if WRIA 15 content is not yet ready (e.g., project descriptions, policy and adaptive management recommendations). The committee will have about a 3-week review window and will review initial comments during the 10/1 committee meeting. All committee members need to agree to the plan content, so it’s important to work together on the revisions. The committee will go through a review process again in the fall with the **full plan**.

**Reference Materials:**

* [CH 1-3 draft](https://app.box.com/s/3t5q0x6xfc5lmcu4w8ifr795djdnwix3)
* [CH 1-3 compiled comment tracker](https://app.box.com/s/fqnm3nkqu17mp4nv9jrpt66nv8j0solo) [updated to reflect 8/6 discussion]
* [Chapter 4 draft and comment tracker](https://app.box.com/s/6kqxmmevrrat2s2h69x5hqlrf50bx8t6)
* [Discussion guide](https://app.box.com/s/den40wwlt44iisi1i6bge11b55f1hu7a)

**Discussion of comments on Chapters 1-3 of draft plan**:

* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: Insert information on all WRIA 15 streams that are 303d listed or have TMDLs completed, and the status of current TMDL studies and implementation plans. Also mention Ecology's south sound nutrient planning. Include a figure with a map of 303d and TMDL stream reaches.
  + **Ecology**: Ecology is concerned with extensive coverage of this topic as it goes beyond the scope of RCW 90.94.030 (unless considered for specific projects).
  + **Squaxin**: low flows affect water quality, relevant for plan. Include brief summary (i.e., a table of streams on the 303d list / TMDLs). Provide links to info on Ecology website.
  + **Kitsap County**: no objection; avoid including too much ancillary information (tie to NEB).
  + **Bainbridge Island**: include basic info on water quality issues but limit scope.
  + **Ecology** will include revision in WRE Plan Draft.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: Instead of: "The complexity, physiography and dominance of localized groundwater and surface water systems have resulted in the subdivision of WRIA 15 into many different hydrologic scales of subareas for different studies." Replace with: "Addressing the complexity of groundwater and surface water systems in WRIA 15 requires analysis at many different hydrologic scales depending on the needs of the studies."
  + **Mason County**: agree with plain language accessibility (reduce jargon).
  + No concerns expressed by committee.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: We should include a discussion of the flow duration method for setting instream flows in the document and compare it with habitat assessment methods (i.e., PHABSIM). Present and discuss the flow duration curves that Jim Pacheco developed.
  + **Squaxin**: Jim Pacheco created graphs that provide background information worth including in plan. Squaxin can provide a footnote on the dataset for the site they are monitoring. In plan section about water resources, provide additional context to explain how instream flows are set in rules (e.g., X method was used in the ‘80’s but today we would use Y method).
  + **PGST**: tradeoffs between flow duration method vs hydro / habitat mode.
  + **Kitsap PUD**: ensure that Jim’s graphs are accompanied by data caveats/considerations.
  + **Ecology** will include revision in WRE Plan Draft.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: The sentence starts with "East Kitsap drainages", but Coulter, Rocky, and Minter Creeks are south sound drainages. Since this section is about hydrology, create another subsection about salmon restoration needs, and organize it by lead entity areas.
  + **Ecology**: Stacy will discuss drainages with Bob. Ecology + tech consultants working to prepare an additional section on salmon recovery (e.g., species, usages, life history). Planning to include in Chapter 2 and in project chapter and NEB evaluation.
  + **Kitsap County** be clear when discussing Puget Sound drainages vs Hood Canal drainages. Don’t want to lose sight that this work is driven by salmon; defer to plan editors on how to incorporate salmon (could fit in Chapter 2 or NEB chapter).
  + **Squaxin**: Consider specific context coming out of salmon planning in East Kitsap drainages.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: Suggest reviewing the [Northwest Climate Toolbox](https://climatetoolbox.org) for projections on the Kitsap peninsula.
  + **Squaxin**: University of Idaho’s Climate Toolbox is very easy to use. Pull out a few temperature/precipitation projections for trends.
  + **PGST**: agree with this idea. Consider tableau tool from Climate Impacts Group (highest resolution downscaled data).
  + **Mason County**: don’t spend too much time quoting from one source as projections change frequently.
  + **Anchor QEA:** will review the Climate Toolbox to bolster this section; he recalls that the Climate Toolbox doesn’t have a streamflow example (closest was Skokomish river) but will confirm.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe**: Add two more bullets to "Other considerations were": "alignment of subbasins with Tribal Usual and Accustomed (U&A) fishing areas"; and "adjustment of boundaries to take County jurisdictions into account"
  + **Ecology:** This chapter was developed from the committee approved subbasin technical memo; these considerations were not discussed in the memo.
  + **Mason County:** is not concerned about county jurisdictions as a consideration for subbasin delineation (headwaters in 1 county, consumptive use in another). U&A seems immaterial to outlining subbasins, which were defined by flows and geography with input from tribes.
  + **Kitsap County:** does not recall considering U&As or country jurisdictions as part of subbasin delineation on this committee.
  + **PGST:** need to put more thought into this; tribal U&A fishing areas are a red flag for Tribe.
  + **Squaxin:** U&A was definitely a consideration for tribes in delineating subbasins and they do align; for example, the South Sound subbasins align with U&A. Less concerned with county considerations, but Pierce County did not want to split Gig Harbor Peninsula between subbasins.
  + **Ecology:** suggest adding a sentence that acknowledges some members considered U&A + county jurisdictions in their deliberation and consideration of subbasins, but without implying the full committee was aware of these considerations.
  + **Kitsap County:** more comfortable with this framing.
  + **Squaxin:** Likes this suggestion.
  + **Ecology** will update language and flag in draft plan for further review; revisit as needed.
* **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe**: I would like to see a table of each watershed assessment units (WAU) with an estimate of the impact of permit exempt wells in each, expressed as a proportion of the summer baseflow estimated using Streamstats or Mastin, 2016. The table should be in the Subbasins chapter.
  + **Ecology**: Subbasins not based on WAUs. Committee does not yet have an impact of PE wells by subbasin (presented with consumptive use chapter).
  + **PGST**: WAUs are most granular scale. Could use heat map or parcel data to visualize the number of wells that go into each WAU. Express estimated offset quantity as a proportion of summer base flow using regression equations for ungauged streams (widely used in region). Would not be exact or verified but would provide a general idea of impact.
  + **Anchor QEA**: will look at the size of WAUs to determine how precise estimates of PE wells would go in. With groundwater, impacts could be felt further away / not in WAU. Lots of uncertainty and assumptions.
  + **Bob and Sam** will work together on this request; **Ecology** will include a comment in draft plan as a placeholder for this information.
* **Pierce County**: How about wells associated with group A water systems? Should the story tell the whole story re: group A, group B and permit exempt wells…and then clarify this planning only addresses consumptive use from new permit exempt wells.
  + **Pierce County**: would like to note in plan that there are more straws in the ground than just PE wells (e.g., various Group A/Bs, ag straws). Not necessary to quantify, just provide a brief background that acknowledges the committee mitigated for PE wells, but other wells may have an impact as well.
  + **Squaxin**: this suggestion is consistent with the proposal Squaxin developed around additional well data.
  + **Mason County**: agrees with Pierce County. Additional growth doesn't necessarily mean more Group A wells, just more connections.
  + **Kitsap County** agrees with Pierce County that this additional context is appropriate here, recognizing that many people who will be signing off on this plan are not water systems experts so this context could be valuable, especially when projects/actions pertain to connecting to Group As.
  + **City of Bainbridge Island** agrees with Kitsap County.
  + **Ecology** will reach out to Department of Health and work with Bob M. to develop a generic paragraph that could be used here and in other WRIAs to provide brief explanation that permit exempt wells are a small piece of the water use puzzle.
* **Pierce County:** How is it coordinated? Perhaps reflects the comprehensive plans or incorporates assumptions that reflect comp plan goals and policies. Wouldn't it be appropriate to mention what brought this planning to be...meaning reference to the appeal of a rural element of a County's comp plan...and how it would support the growth? Could say a little more straight forward that the comp plans identify where and how future population, housing, and job growth is planned.
  + **Ecology**: Some of this content is being covered with additional sections being prepared for Chapter 1. Looking to counties to provide additional context that links this work to Comprehensive Plans.
  + **Kitsap County**: no objection; can help draft this content.
  + **Squaxin**: more coordination is good.
  + **Ecology** will include revised language in August plan draft; may reach out for support from counties.

# Adaptive Management

The committee discussed a proposed framework for draft adaptive management recommendations for inclusion in the WRIA 15 Plan. The framework includes the following key components:

* **Tracking/Monitoring:** What data should be gathered by what entities?
* **Reporting:** How should that data be reported (i.e. who prepares the report, how often, what do reports include)
* **Adaptations:** What actions are needed to respond to the reporting?
* **Funding:** How can the adaptive management components be funded?

**Reference Materials**:

* [Discussion guide](https://app.box.com/s/9hh43oyfy5izws4kaxgc05boz7dpnmoz)

**Discussion**:

* **Tracking + Monitoring**
  + *Need committee to provide information on* ***existing monitoring*** *in watershed.*
  + **Ongoing list and map of new/historical PE wells within each sub-basin.**
    - **Kitsap County**: historical PE well data will vary by jurisdiction / health district and difficult to obtain.
    - **Mason County**: stick to what legislation requires (new PE wells, not historical).
    - **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe**: Erica Marbet (Squaxin Island Tribe) and Ecology are working on collecting historical well information.
    - **Kitsap County**: challenging to quantify based on existing records; at best, could develop an estimate.
    - **Suquamish Tribe***:* review the number of parcels in rural areas that are not connected to a PUD or Group A/B system to estimate historical PE wells. Would not capture multiple wells on same property. How would this information be used going forward?
    - **Pierce County***:* concern around validity of an estimate based on multiple assumptions (what is margin of error?). Concern that others who read plan could make assumptions using these estimates.
    - **King County***:* agree with Kitsap County. Obtaining historical well data would be challenging and labor-intensive. King County could easily develop a range of total PE wells on Vashon Island.
    - **Susan (facilitator)**: more offline / subgroup conversations would be needed to include this information in adaptive management chapter; would need methodology to estimate historic wells; would need to be clear about purpose for including in plan.
  + **Status of implementation for each project (not started, in progress, complete).**
    - **Suquamish Tribe**: concerned with relying solely on Salmon Recovery Portal for tracking implementation status for each project. Will offset projects (not habitat related) be tracked?
    - **Ecology**: intent of SRP is to track all projects, not just habitat. WDFW is currently piloting for streamflow with Nisqually. Committee would need to determine appropriate metrics for streamflows projects.
    - **WDFW**: Brittany Gordon can confirm internally.
    - **King County**: reporting on project status can be onerous without funding/support. Consider only reporting on those projects that have actually moved forward vs. all projects.
  + **Streamflow/temperature monitoring, precipitation/drought conditions, climate indicators:** 
    - **Pierce County**: what is purpose of gathering this data within the context of PE wells? How would it be used for planning?
    - **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe**: connected to enforcement/water master tracking instream flows to ensure if water levels are too low, we can curtail water use in basin.
    - **Kitsap County**: Lots of information would be nice to know and might have broader uses—but is the WRE plan the place to do that? Adaptive management for this plan should process information and monitor efforts through the project implementation lens (i.e., are projects having intended effects?). Tracking other information may be difficult.
    - **Squaxin Island Tribe**: agree with Kitsap County that detecting changes in streamflow is difficult but tracking the status/completion of project implementation is key to determining whether projects are producing expected amounts of water. Revised Squaxin Monitoring & Research proposal suggests strategies for an overarching program that would be developed after the WRE plan is implemented.
    - **King County**: determine which tracking/monitoring is required (short list) vs recommended. Lots of great suggestions in discussion guide but cannot require if entities do not have the resources to implement.
    - **Susan (facilitator) summarized that** *these Committee member suggestions will be included for further discussion (potentially as “aspirational”).*
* **Annual reports to Ecology.**
  + - A description of the “status” of each project. “Status” refers to whether the project is in progress, not started, or complete.
    - **Kitsap County**: cannot commit counties to monitoring projects that fall within county if they are not the project lead.
    - **City of Bainbridge Island** agrees with Kitsap County.
    - **Susan (facilitator)** will change entity responsible to “implementers” instead of counties/cities.
    - **Pierce County:** assuming projects that receive streamflow grant funding from Ecology could provide regular status updates. Funding could also be provided to counties/cities/other entities as well.
    - **Ecology:** could report on projects that received streamflow grant funding; program does not have direction to report on projects funded by other sources. Salmon Recovery Portal could be used to track all projects, regardless of funding source. No one is currently on point to generate a report from the portal and incorporate it into the 5-Year Assessment.
    - **Pierce County:** what will happen to annual report after it is submitted to Ecology?
    - **Susan (facilitator)**: report could be made available so that all those engaged in this work would receive an annual update. Primary focus would be on the 5-Year Self-Assessment (deeper assessment by counties/cities).
    - **Squaxin Island Tribe**: the law requires a plan with projects that offset water to compensate for PE well growth over the next 20 years but does not require implementation and monitoring. Down the road, if unable to show that the plan helped achieve intended results, open to another lawsuit. We may want an implementation committee to do this work. In WRIA 1, what will Ecology do if the projects in the plan do not provide real water?
      * **Ecology**: Whatcom County through the WRIA 1 lead entity is doing reporting. What happens next is unclear (do not have future commitments with funding/staff to take action).
      * **King County**: all entities are facing the same reporting budget uncertainties as Ecology. Ecology should ultimately be responsible for compliance and reporting.
* **Adaptation Strategies**
  + **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe** supports reconvening WRE committee annually with Ecology as the chair.
  + **Mason County**: supports assigning responsibility to group similar to Chehalis Basin Partnership (a group that has worked in this space for nearly 20 years with institutional knowledge of what’s going on in the basin). Would meet more than annually and require funding. Ecology would be a partner at the table; elected chair would work with consultants and Ecology (more community driven).
  + **Pierce County**: participates in four WRE committees and wants to be consistent in its approach across all. Would like to explore opportunities to leverage an existing group, but not familiar with which groups would be a good fit.
  + **Kitsap County**: if the default assumption is that counties will own adaptive management, how will that be organized -there are four different counties in this watershed alone? Existing groups that might be a good fit for leading this effort include LIOs / Lead Entities (i.e., Hood Canal Coordinating Council / West Sound Partners for Ecosystem Recovery) who already have systems for prioritizing projects and monitoring progress.

# Potential Policy Proposals

Ecology will distribute a survey to gauge support for policy and adaptive management proposals (open from 8/10-8/21). Survey feedback will help determine which proposals to include in the draft plan and which proposals to bring back to the committee for further discussion in September and the fall.

**Reference Materials**:

* [Policy Proposal Tracker](https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15ProposalTracker)
* <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WRIA15PolicyProposals>

# Recommendations from Project Workgroup

Stacy is discussing some of the projects with the Ecology‘s Water Resources program as there may be conflicts with the Foster decision (Gig Harbor Golf Course, Bainbridge Island Storage Projects). If these projects are deemed as not legally possible to implement now, the committee could still include in the plan for *future consideration* (assuming a future resolution to Foster). Ecology will share more with committee following the review. Even if these projects are pulled from the plan, there are other projects to help get to offset in each subbasin.

Ecology received initial comments on water rights acquisition opportunities and will continue to discuss during 8/10 project workgroup meeting. One example of how to present the water right information in the plan includes:

* Include short summaries of “**Tier 1**” water rights (12 or less). Conduct initial outreach with landowners and provide feedback to group. Confident enough to present in plan (and count towards offset). Burt will develop short summaries (amount of detail provided in plan will depend on amount of outreach).
* Group “**Tier 2**” water rights by scale smaller than subbasin and provide a generic description of opportunities in a basin, focusing on projects that are within a certain area of anticipated growth/impact. Burt to develop list, which would be archived with generic description provided in plan (not specific water rights). Likely not counting towards offset.
* Pursue any water rights in “**Tier 3**” headwaters or within a stream reach in WRIA 15 as there are likely few rights that become available. Burt to develop list, which would be archived with generic description provided in plan (not specific water rights).

**Reference Materials**:

* [Discussion guide](https://app.box.com/s/2j8khll8l6hhxhy6j5svr1jn9bowq0ge)
* [Water Rights Opportunities + Comments](https://app.box.com/s/h8gkxk2fcadeorod5awilt78q02w330e)
* [Project Inventory](https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15ProjectInventory)

**Discussion**:

* *Does the committee want to recommend additional offset or habitat projects for detailed development for inclusion in the watershed plan?*
  + **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe**: Squaxin’s [Forest Stand Age + Flow Restoration Project](https://app.box.com/s/98rgsj14yxzhakbmkl7y1j4euminkp0b) may need further development. Could be more feasible in South Kitsap Peninsula on Hood Canal side (still some forest landowners but may be all DNR).
    - **Suquamish Tribe** likes concept. It came from Nisqually who had control over forest land. Need more information on how it could work with small forest owners. Would not want extended stand rotation to be mandatory; development pressures are already heavy and don’t want to see forest lands sold to build houses.
    - **Squaxin Island Tribe**: project is currently a categorical / programmatic placeholder but there may be opportunities in the future to link to other projects. It would require a different model from Nisqually; opportunity for GPC or others to acquire land and take it out of timber production into conservation status. Quantify streamflow benefits of managing long standing / old growth vs previous timber harvest.
    - **Kitsap County**: county is already moving towards documenting stand age, structure, height, and condition under Natural Resources Assess Management Program.
    - **Ecology** will flag this project for further discussion during 8/10 project workgroup meeting.
* *Does the committee want to stop development of any projects that don’t look promising?*
  + Big Beef DNR Parcel Storage Project – recommendation to stop development due to stream closure and permitting challenges.
  + Gold Mountain Golf Course Water Right and project – concern from City of Bremerton, conservation efforts underway.
* *Recognizing we have limited budget for developing projects in detail, does the committee want to have any habitat projects developed in detail?*
  + **Ecology**: tech consultants did not dig deep into any projects unless there was a request from committee. Other WRE committees have chosen to develop habitat projects in detail (similar to detailed project descriptions for offsets). Anchor QEA has salmon expertise they could utilize to develop those projects with their sponsors in more detail. Note this would shift resources away from developing offset projects (limited budget to spend on project work).
  + **Squaxin Island Tribe**: Quantification of Anderson Island projects can be on back burner. Try to focus effort by subbasin. Could combine South Sound Islands with rest of South Sound if needed (few salmon streams/projects on islands).
  + **WDFW**: would like to see the upper Big Beef project offsets quantified. Likely a wetland storage type project, which may be quantifiable. Similar comment for the Burley Creek ditched wetland restoration project.
* *Does the committee have recommendations on presentation of the project inventory in the watershed plan?*
  + Options proposed by project workgroup:
    - Present projects by subbasin.
      * **Squaxin Island Tribe**: suggest including tables for each subbasin.
      * **Ecology** will organize recommendations by subbasin in next draft plan.
    - Present projects by project type (e.g. “projects contributing towards offsets” and “projects contributing towards habitat improvements”).
    - Describe the likelihood of implementation, sponsorship, funding status, and stage of project development.
    - Present projects in a way that is easy for decision-makers to understand and provide feedback.
    - Retain all projects in the project inventory to include in an appendix.
  + Table 1 = sample for projects contributing towards consumptive offset.
    - **Suquamish Tribe**: concerned with “Additional Benefits” column header. When elected officials review plan, “benefits” have many different connotations. Consider including the county’s Land Use Table with checkboxes for general categories. Elected officials won’t review technical detail (especially in these tables). Should ensure tables summarize the projects as clearly as possible (even if we have to sacrifice some detail).
      * **Ecology**: additional benefits could include number of riparian mile or acres planted, etc. Flag specific categories we should include in next draft plan. Determine what will be measured to assess the outcome of a specific project. Qualitatively describe what we expect to see if no metric.
* *Does the committee want to make a formal commitment to find enough offset projects by subbasin to meet the anticipated consumptive use estimate for that subbasin?*
  + **Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe** makes sense to have formal commitment to find enough offset projects by subbasin, given the committee has supported this from the beginning.
    - **Ecology**: language in subbasin memo states the committee will ensure there is justification if offsets are not met by subbasin (with limited exceptions).
  + **Great Peninsula Conservancy**: concerned there will be issues if committee falls short of offsets in one basin after making a formal commitment. Can the committee instead agree (informally) that our goal is to offset by subbasin?
    - **Mason and Pierce County and City of Bainbridge Island** agree.
    - **Squaxin Island Tribe** disagrees and believes it is important to formalize commitment to emphasize the importance of having projects in each subbasin. Cannot approve plan if there are no projects in South Sound that help streams in the Squaxin’s U&A (could be a red flag issue). Whether or not committee votes—it’s critical to find projects in every subbasin.
    - **Skokomish Tribe**: concerned there are no projects in Hood Canal subbasin.
    - **Ecology** will share updated project inventory with committee (which includes a handful of projects in North and South Hood Canal). Critical that committee raises any gaps or concerns ASAP when reviewing inventory.
  + **Susan (Facilitator)** noted it is important to hear from entities that feel they cannot approve a plan unless offset is met by subbasin (nothing prevents them from not approving the plan if it doesn’t meet offset by subbasin). She recommended the committee redirect its time towards identifying projects in subbasins where there are gaps instead of using the time to formalize commitment language.
    - **King County**: agrees with this approach. The requirement is necessary but without seeing a close to final list of projects by subbasin, unsure whether that is feasible.
    - **Susan (Facilitator)** suggested the project workgroup and/or committee goes over the project inventory by subbasin. The committee can provide input on which subbasins they are concerned about and identify any gaps/issues.
  + **Stacy (Ecology), Susan (Facilitator), and Paul** **(Squaxin Island Tribe)** no longer think a formal vote is necessary, but there is an understanding that this committee is aiming to meet offsets by subbasin. Bring forward any gaps so resources can be dedicated towards finding projects in those subbasins.

# Public Comment

No public comment.

# Action Items for Committee Members

* Review [Chapter 4](https://app.box.com/s/6kqxmmevrrat2s2h69x5hqlrf50bx8t6) and provide comments by 8/20.
* Complete [survey](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WRIA15PolicyProposals) by 8/21.
* Review draft compiled WRE Plan (anticipated distribution on 8/28).

# Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

* Schedule a sub-group meeting to further discuss adaptive management components in advance of the September committee meeting.
* Stacy will work with Bob + HDR to update project ledger with offset need by subbasin and share with committee at September meeting.

***Next committee meeting: Thursday, September 3, 2020 – 9:30AM – 2:30PM***