



# AGENDA

## WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Meeting

August 6, 2020 | 9:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m. | [WRIA 15 Committee Webpage](#)

### Location

WebEx Only  
(See instructions below)

### Committee Chair

Stacy Vynne  
Svyn461@ecy.wa.gov  
(425) 649-7114

### Handouts

- Agenda
- Meeting summaries (June and July)
- Discussion guides: Operating Principles, Plan Development, Adaptive Management, and Recommendations from Project Workgroup
- Policy and adaptive management proposals

### Welcome

9:30 a.m. | 5 minutes | Susan Gulick

### Meeting Agenda and June and July Meeting Summaries

9:35 a.m. | 10 minutes | Susan Gulick

Handouts: *Agenda, Summaries of June and July meetings*

### Updates and Announcements

9:45 a.m. | 5 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All

### Operating Principles

9:50 a.m. | 20 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion and Decision

Handout: [Discussion Guide](#)

- Remote plan approval, presumed withdrawal and resignation.

### Plan Development

10:10 a.m. | 45 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion

Handout: [Discussion Guide](#) (posted by 7/30)

- Review comments received
- Discussion
- Upcoming plan review process
  - What to expect
  - How to use comment tracker
- Next steps

### Adaptive Management

10:55 a.m. | 45 minutes | Susan Gulick, All | Discussion

Handout: [Adaptive Management Discussion Guide](#) (Posted by 7/30)

- Refine framework and develop details on adaptive management recommendations.

### Break

11:40 a.m. | 10 minutes | All

### Potential Policy Recommendations

11:50 a.m. | 25 minutes | Susan Gulick, All | Discussion

Handouts: [WRIA15 Policy Proposal Tracker](#)

- Update on status of policy proposals
- Discuss upcoming survey and next steps

### Recommendations from Project Workgroup

12:15 p.m. | 65 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion

Handout: [Discussion Guide](#)

- Update on initial [review of water rights](#)
- Does the committee want to recommend additional offset or habitat projects for detailed development for inclusion in the watershed plan? Does the committee want to stop development of any projects that don't look promising?
- Does the committee have recommendations on presentation of the project inventory in the watershed plan?

- 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?
- Discussion/Next Steps

#### **Public Comment**

1:20 p.m. | 5 minutes | Susan Gulick

#### **Next Steps and Action Items**

1:25 p.m. | 5 minutes | Susan Gulick, Stacy Vynne

- Next meeting—Thursday, September 3, 2020, 9:30 a.m.-2:30 p.m. (anticipated, **WebEx Only**)

**WRIA 15 Upcoming Meetings:** <https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15UpcomingMtgs>

#### **WebEx Information**

Meeting number (access code): 133 756 2364

Meeting password: VmRMsQyr424

**Join meeting**

#### **Join by phone**

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll

+1-206-207-1700 United States Toll (Seattle)



## MEETING SUMMARY

### WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Meeting

June 4, 2020 | 9:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. | [WRIA 15 Committee Webpage](#)

#### Location

WebEx

#### Committee Chair

Stacy Vynne McKinstry  
Svyn461@ecy.wa.gov  
(425) 649-7114

#### Handouts

- Agenda
- Discussion guide on project recommendations
- Revised technical memos
- Policy and adaptive management proposals

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Joel Purdy (*Kitsap Public Utility District*)  
David Winfrey (*Puyallup Tribe*)  
Stacy Vynne McKinstry (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Greg Rabourn (*King County*)  
Teresa Smith (*City of Bremerton*)  
Dave Ward (*Kitsap County*)  
Kathy Peters (*alternate - Kitsap County*)  
Zach Holt (*alternate - City of Port Orchard*)  
Alison O'Sullivan (*alternate - Suquamish Tribe*)  
Joy Garitone (*Kitsap Conservation District*)  
Brittany Gordon (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)  
Nam Siu (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)

Shawn O'Dell (*Washington Water Service - ex-officio*)  
Austin Jennings (*alternate - Pierce County*)  
Dana Sarff (*alternate - Skokomish Tribe*)  
Nate Daniel (*Great Peninsula Conservancy*)  
Paul Pickett (*alternate - Squaxin Island Tribe*)  
Randy Neatherlin (*Mason County*)  
David Windom (*alternate - Mason County*)  
Russ Shiplet (*Kitsap Building Association*)  
Sam Phillips (*Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe*)  
Mike Michael (*City of Bainbridge Island*)  
Bri Ellis (*City of Gig Harbor*)

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

City of Poulsbo

Mason-Kitsap Farm Bureau (ex-officio)

### Other Attendees

Susan Gulick (*Sound Resolutions, Facilitator*)  
Angela Pietschmann (*Cascadia, Info Manager*)  
Burt Clothier (*Pacific Groundwater Group*)  
Bob Montgomery (*Anchor QEA*)  
John Covert (*WA Dept of Ecology*)

Stephanie Potts (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Angela Johnson (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Paulina Levy (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Joel Massmann (*Suquamish Tribe*)  
Roma Call (*Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe*)

*\*Attendees list is based on roll call and participants signed into WebEx.*

## Meeting Agenda and May Meeting Summary

Susan summarized the last meeting and reviewed the agenda. *No revisions to the agenda.*

Stacy reviewed revisions to the May meeting summary provided by Squaxin Island Tribe and City of Bainbridge Island. 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:

- The project workgroup met on May 21 and will meet again June 29th and July 16th. Meeting notes are posted on the [Committee webpage](#).
- The competitive streamflow restoration grant round application closed on April 30, 2020. Ecology received [63 applications](#) for approximately \$88 million in total. Two applications were received in WRIA 15 (Blackjack feasibility – Port Orchard; Springbrook land acquisition – Bainbridge Island Land Trust). Ecology anticipates announcing \$22M in awards in early fall.
- Ecology developed a permit exempt well metering document as a resource for the committee, [available on Box](#).
- Do not respond to “noreplybox” email account. Ecology does not receive these emails. If Stacy is not responding to your emails, please reach out by phone!
- On May 27, 2020, Ecology adopted a rule amendment for chapter 173-501 WAC, which amends the WRIA 1 instream flow rule as directed by the legislature under the Streamflow Restoration law (RCW 90.94.020). Despite tremendous effort by the WRIA 1 planning group, they were unable to complete a watershed plan amendment by the statutory deadline of February 1, 2019. Therefore, as directed by the legislature, Ecology moved forward with rulemaking. The adopted rule, along with many supporting materials, is available on Ecology’s [website](#).
- An invitation was distributed to groundwater modelers and interested non-modelers (i.e., managers, faculty, or students who need to better understand models and the modeling process) in the Pacific Northwest to join in a regular conversation about groundwater modeling topics. If interested, please contact Kevin Hansen at Thurston County (HansenK@co.thurston.wa.us).
- Stacy distributed [WDFW’s letter regarding offset quantification of habitat projects](#). WDFW emphasizes support for inclusion of habitat projects in the plan to meet NEB but does not support accounting for offset values.

## Projects Update

Consultants and committee members provided updates on project research and opportunities. The committee discussed the project workgroup’s recommendations for projects for consultants to develop in more detail or further exploration.

### Reference Materials

- [Water Rights Assessment Information](#)
- [Project Inventory](#)
- [Discussion guide on project recommendations](#)

- [Project Resources](#)
- [Detailed Project Descriptions](#)

## Discussion

- **Water Rights Acquisition Projects**
  - PGG provided a set of revised water rights location maps and tables, divided by subbasin. HDR will add these layers to the WRIA 15 webmap.
  - PGG requests the committee review areas of interest and use their local knowledge of individual sites, water rights, and subbasins to provide guidance to PGG on which rights to investigate further.
  - The committee should further consider criteria to narrow the list to a manageable set of water rights for detailed review.
  - The project workgroup will discuss water right opportunities in more detail during the June meeting.
- **Anderson Island Projects**
  - Chuck Hinds (Anderson Island Parks) provided potential project ideas (i.e., salmon recovery work that needs to be advanced) that have good opportunities for funding. Project information is on Box and in the project inventory.
- **McNeil Island Projects**
  - McNeil Island is 70% owned by WDFW. There are two earthen dams for old reservoirs on the island that are no longer needed. WDFW is exploring options for potential water right acquisitions, streamflow benefit, and habitat improvement (e.g., dam removal and restoration work).
  - Projects on the island could put water in streams. Though fish aren't currently in these streams, the dams have been up for 100 years. Potential opportunity to create new fish habitat once streams are flowing again.
  - Ecology's Dam Safety and Southwest Regional Office staff support these projects.
- **Great Peninsula Conservancy (GPC) Projects**
  - GPC has added several projects to the inventory—ranging from conceptual to shovel-ready. Acquisition projects are focused on NEB and range from 100-550 acres.
  - GPC requests that committee members send additional land acquisition project ideas to GPC for consideration before the project list is finalized.
- **Projects to Further Explore**
  - *Filucy Bay Floodplain Enhancement (South Sound)*
    - This project is on Pierce County flood acquisition property. Pierce County is looking into more information but expects limited potential given the small site.
  - *Divide Block Habitat Acquisition and Restoration (490 acres)*
    - GPC requests further exploration by the consultants for this project.
  - *Gig Harbor Golf Course Water Use/Artondale Package (South Sound)*
    - Joel Purdy (KPUD) volunteered to take the lead on this project. Joel has connections to golf course and has previously discussed transferring water use from direct diversion of stream to a well. Joel and Bob will connect on this project and bring back information at a future meeting to see if the committee would like to move it to detailed development.
  - *Port Orchard Airport Stormwater Infiltration (South Sound)*
    - Bob, Burt, and Paul have done preliminary exploration to see what's possible at this location. The committee determined the commercial gravel pit is not worth pursuing but the site has potential for stormwater capture and infiltration.
    - The technical team will continue their research and bring back information to the project workgroup at the end of the month.

- *Big Beef Acquisition and Restoration (North Hood Canal)*
  - Sam Phillips (PGST) identified an acquisition project on undeveloped land at Big Beef Creek tributary adjacent to NW Gross Road (north of Leisureland Airpark, north of Wildcat Lake).
  - Alison O’Sullivan (Suquamish Tribe) does not think the landowners are interested in giving up water rights.
  - The project workgroup will discuss this project at the next workgroup meeting.
- Additional projects are proposed for further exploration which the committee did not discuss in detail, including the Belfair Wastewater Treatment Plant and Bainbridge Island projects. Anchor QEA will continue to work with project leads to further explore project opportunities and bring information back to the workgroup and committee.
- **Projects to Develop in Detail**
  - *Big Beef Storage on DNR Property*
    - Sam Phillips (PGST) identified the storage project in the fall and Anchor QEA and PGG have done some preliminary work to look at site potential. Consultants will continue to work with Sam to develop the project in detail.
  - *KPUD stream augmentation projects*
    - KPUD has identified potential streamflow augmentation projects among satellite water systems positioned near streams that can be augmented in various places (across multiple subbasins in WRIA 15). KPUD will prepare detailed project descriptions.
    - Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe) expressed a preliminary concern that while streamflow augmentation has local/seasonal benefits, it could also impact streams farther afield (as identified in the Foster pilot groundwater modeling project).
  - *Silverdale Water District reclaimed water*
    - Silverdale Water District has plans for reclaimed water expansion and potential augmentation in areas where growth is anticipated. Joel Purdy (KPUD) will work with Silverdale Water District to develop the detailed project description.
  - *Onsite Offset (Mason Co Stormwater Capture and Infiltration)*
    - HDR is working with Mason County on the methodology to estimate offset potential for WRIA 14/15. Once this analysis is complete, the committee can determine if they are interested in moving forward with including the project in the WRIA 15 plan.
- **Habitat Projects**
  - The committee may choose a suite of habitat projects (primarily for fish and wildlife benefit) to develop in detail. The committee and workgroup will need to discuss how much consultant time to invest in habitat project development compared to offset projects. The committee will also need to discuss how to present the project list – both offset projects and habitat projects. Project list presentation is a focus of the next project workgroup meeting.
  - Alison O’Sullivan (Suquamish Tribe) does not support beaver dam analogue (BDA) projects.
    - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) noted that while BDAs don’t always work, a substantial body of literature shows that the presence of beaver ponds has a strong and beneficial effect on salmon populations. The committee could consider providing protections for beaver habitat.
    - DFW does not oppose BDAs projects to meet NEB but does not support BDAs as an offset project.

- Nate Daniels (GPC) noted that the *Little Anderson Creek Habitat Protection Project (262 acres)* and *Divide Block Habitat Acquisition and Restoration (490 acres)* projects would be good candidates for meeting NEB.

## Plan Development

The committee provided final revisions to the *Subbasin* and *Growth Projections/Consumptive Use* memos (which will form the basis of the plan's chapters). The committee discussed the timeline for chapter review and plan approval.

### Reference Materials:

- [Revised technical memos](#)
- [Plan Approval Process](#) and Timeline
- [Committee Member Plan Approval Process](#)
- [Workplan](#)

### Discussion:

- **WRIA 15 PE Growth and Consumptive Use Technical Memo**
  - Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe) requests the following revision to *Section 3.3 USGS Groundwater Model Method*: "Outdoor use was estimated for the outdoor growing season and varied by month from 4 gallons per person per day in May to 97 gallons per person per day in September; **a value of 26 gpd per person was used in the calculation.**"
  - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) responded to *Section 2.5 High and Low Growth Scenarios*: "The five percent is based on the approximate typical deviation from the County's rural growth projections and actual growths." He clarified that there is no "typical deviation;" the deviation is based on a margin of error for the County's growth projections overall.
- The committee provided no additional revisions to the subbasin memo.
- **NEB Evaluation**
  - NEB guidance recommends that committee puts forward their own NEB evaluation. Ecology is giving deference to committee on whether it has met NEB. However, the legislation does not require this evaluation.
  - If the committee chooses not to include this analysis, it will fall on John Covert (Ecology) and team to complete the evaluation/determination on whether the plan meets NEB.
- **Plan Review and Approval**
  - Stacy will provide Chapters 1 – 3 to the committee for review by mid June along with a comment tracker and additional instructions. Chapters 1-3 provide an overview of: streamflow restoration law; committee formation; WRIA 15 overview; and a chapter on subbasins (based on Subbasin technical memo).
  - Chapter 4 provides permit exempt well projections and consumptive use estimates. Ecology anticipates this chapter will be ready for committee review by mid-late July.
  - Ecology plans to distribute the compiled WRIA 15 plan by mid-August; the draft plan will have gaps (e.g., final consumptive use estimate) but will include all components that have been reviewed to date.
  - Stacy reviewed the overall committee progress and timeline, noting the February 1, 2021 target date for submission.

- The committee decided to set a special meeting in July to discuss policy proposals, review of draft chapters, and recommendations from the project workgroup. The special meeting is scheduled for July 14<sup>th</sup>.

## Policy & Adaptive Management Proposals

Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe) presented policy and adaptive management proposals for committee consideration. The committee provided feedback on these proposals and discussed upcoming proposals. Ecology requests that committee members submit any additional proposals at least eight days prior to the next committee meeting for inclusion in the meeting packet.

### Reference Materials:

- [Policy & Adaptive Management proposal folder](#)

### Discussion:

- **County Policies to Promote Connections to Group A systems**
  - Dave Windom (Mason County) supports promotion of connections to Group A systems but noted that feasibility depends on whether connections are available. Group A systems require a water right (Mason County sees more Group Bs, 2-party, and single wells).
  - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) noted that the proposal identifies counties as implementors. For Kitsap County, the implementor would be the health district, not county.
    - Austin Jennings (Pierce County) noted this applies for Pierce County as well.
    - Mike Michael (City of Bainbridge Island) noted this applies to cities in Kitsap County as well (especially on Bainbridge Island).
  - Randy Neatherlin (Mason County) does not support giving authority to create codes/regulation outside of the County itself.
  - Joel Purdy (Kitsap County) noted that some water systems have large service area boundaries but don't have water mains (i.e., there is a chance that permit exempt wells would go in within service area boundaries). He noted that there also must be a public water system in place (or someone willing to create a Group A/B water system) as well as sufficient capacity. He agrees with the concept of promoting connections to public water systems but notes there is already a lot of emphasis on this from Ecology and others. Joel would want to see further vetting to determine what parts of this proposal already exist and who has influence on whether a parcel gets hooked up to a public water system.
  - Next steps: This proposal needs refinement before inclusion as a draft plan recommendation.
- **South Sound Water Master**
  - Greg Rabourn (King County) is supportive of this proposal.
  - Zach Holt (City of Port Orchard) noted this work would be a large undertaking (spatially) for one person, requiring a lot of dynamic expertise.
    - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) noted that Water Masters in other states are composed of entire organizations, not just one person. The proposal should be specific about which path it recommends.
  - Stacy Vynne McKinstry (Ecology) noted that this proposal would require a new funding request for FTE (cannot use new positions funded through Southern Resident Orca recovery as their focus watersheds are already assigned). Number of additional FTE and funding source should be specified in proposal.



- Next steps: This proposal needs refinement before inclusion as a draft plan recommendation.
- **Study of County Planning Streamflow Restoration Effectiveness**
  - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) noted that new development in Kitsap County is required to address water onsite under the WA stormwater permit/manual. Roof water typically goes into an infiltration pit on property. Runoff from pollution generating surfaces is typically infiltrated on sites where big enough to have vegetated flow path (according to manual). The bigger challenge is retrofitting legacy development where there isn't a mechanism to retroactively bring older development up to new standards.
  - Greg Rabourn (King County) is supportive of this proposal.
  - Dana Sarff (Skokomish Tribe) is supportive of this proposal.
  - Dave Windom (Mason County) noted the benefits of this proposal would be limited and would like to focus efforts on proposals with greatest benefit to watershed.
    - Shawn O'Dell (Washington Water Service) agrees with Mason County.
  - Next steps: There is some support for this proposal but questions about whether it should be a priority. This proposal will be revisited once all the proposals are submitted so that the committee can prioritize, if necessary.
- **Drought response program**
  - Dana Sarff (Skokomish Tribe) is supportive of this proposal.
  - Sam Phillips (Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe) is supportive of this proposal.
  - Brittany Gordon (WDFW) is generally supportive of this concept.
  - Randy Neatherlin (Mason County) proposed simplifying this proposal to "stop landscape watering and reduce outdoor water use during drought."
  - Stacy Vynne McKinstry (Ecology) noted that RCW 90.94 already requires limiting use to 350 gpd during drought declarations. Further, if the committee wants to recommend rulemaking to further clarify or make the law more specific, there is no guarantee what the end result of this process will be (i.e., it may result in a rule the committee didn't intend).
  - Austin Jennings (Pierce County) noted the only change he sees in this proposal is lessening restrictions around food growth. He does not feel it is worthwhile to change the language of RCW 90.94 for an exemption that small.
  - Next steps: The committee is supportive of addressing drought but there may be better ways to do it. This will be revisited.
- **Adaptive Management Proposals**
  - *Squaxin Island Tribe Proposal*
    - Dana Sarff (Skokomish Tribe) supports this proposal.
    - Dave Windom (Mason County) is concerned that a moratorium on permit exempt wells would penalize property owners for building new homes. However, Dave supports an adaptive management approach similar to the Chehalis Basin Partnership (standing committee that works in perpetuity).
  - Susan Gulick (facilitator) also noted that based on interest expressed by multiple committees, the facilitation team is working on a common recommendation for legislative action (funding/resources) to support ongoing adaptive management. The team will work with the committee to further shape the proposal.
  - Zack Holt (City of Port Orchard) sent a notification to committee members interested in the monitoring component of adaptive management. This group has developed a draft outline that addresses some of the main components of monitoring. Zack will present his proposal at a future meeting.

- Next steps: Adaptive management will be added to a future agenda for more discussion. There is general interest from the committee to include an adaptive management recommendation in the plan.
- **Water Supply Data for Comprehensive Water Planning**
  - Upcoming proposal from Squaxin Island Tribe (will be discussed in detail at future meeting).
- **Updates / Improvements to ECY wells database**
  - Erica Marbet (Squaxin Island Tribe) and Ecology are working on this proposal (will be discussed in detail at a future meeting). There is interest from the Snoqualmie Tribe and WDFW.
  - Next steps: There is broad support for this effort. Squaxin Island Tribe will work with others on a joint proposal for multiple WRIsAs.
- **Next Steps:** Proponents of policy proposals will work with committee members to refine proposals and build consensus. In general, proposals will not be brought to the committee again until there is broad support and interest in refining the recommendation.

## Tribal Perspectives Presentation

Squaxin Island Tribe representatives Jeff Dickison and Sharon Hensley provided an overview of the Tribe's federal reserved rights and reason for engagement in the watershed planning process.

### Reference Materials:

- [Presentation Outline](#)
- [Water & Growth Management](#) Article [The Water Report; Dickison/Haensly; 2017]

### Discussion:

- David Windom (Mason County) asked how tribes look at salmon losses outside stream areas (i.e., in the ocean) to predation and other issues not predicated on streams?
  - Jeff Dickison (Squaxin Island Tribe) noted there are many sources of salmon mortality and we need to do our best to address all of them to support healthy fish runs that benefit tribes and residents of Washington. Tribes actively support marine water quality and are fighting the EPA over relaxing of water quality standards. The Tribe is fully engaged and pressuring the state and federal government to address overpopulation of certain species of marine mammals that eat large amounts of salmon and compete with other marine mammals (like Southern Resident orcas). We need to preserve and improve the survival rate at each increment of the salmon lifecycle.
- Brittany Gordon (WDFW) asked for the Tribe's perspective on prioritizing streams for wild fish recovery vs prioritizing systems for hatcheries and tribal fisheries.
  - Jeff noted the Tribe does not want to prioritize one over the other. The South Sound has been under a hatchery management regime since the late 1970s and early 1980s, largely dictated by WDFW. Prior to that, all management in the South Sound was based on wild fish production. If we only managed for wild fish now, there would be no fisheries anywhere (runs are too suppressed). The vast majority of salmon are hatchery produced.

## Public Comment

No public comment.

## Action Items for Committee Members

- Contact Stacy if you do not have the project workgroup meetings on your calendar and would like to join on June 29<sup>th</sup> or July 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Project leads should continue to work with consultants to further explore project ideas or develop projects in detail.
- Committee will meet on July 14<sup>th</sup> for a short meeting to discuss review of Chapters 1-3, recommendations from the project workgroup, and new policy recommendations.
- Policy recommendation leads should consider the feedback provided during the meeting and refine proposals as appropriate.
- Policy recommendation leads should send new recommendations to Angela ([angela@cascadiaconsulting.com](mailto:angela@cascadiaconsulting.com)) eight days in advance of the next committee meeting for inclusion in the meeting packet. (Send by July 6).
- Committee members should hold time in mid-late June to review Chapters 1-3 of the WRIA 15 plan.

## Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

- Stacy will provide contact information for Kevin Hanson (Thurston County) from WRIA 13 and USGS.
- Stacy and Bob will finalize the technical memos.
- Technical consultants will update the “offset estimate” column of the project inventory to capture estimated offset potential and/or benefit to fish.
- Technical consultants will develop a subset of projects in detail.
- Technical consultants will continue to work with project leads to explore a subset of projects for their offset and feasibility potential.

## Upcoming Meetings

- Next Project Workgroup meetings: Monday, June 29 and Monday July 13, 2020, WebEx.
- Next committee meeting: Tuesday, July 14, 2020, 10:00 a.m., WebEx.



# MEETING SUMMARY

## WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee Meeting

July 14, 2020 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. | [WRIA 15 Committee Webpage](#)

### Location

WebEx

### Committee Chair

Stacy Vynne McKinstry  
Svyn461@ecy.wa.gov  
(425) 649-7114

### Handouts

- Agenda
- Compiled comments on draft chapters
- Policy and adaptive management proposals
- Adaptive Management discussion guide

## Attendance

### Committee Representatives and Alternates \*

Joel Purdy (*Kitsap Public Utility District*)  
David Winfrey (*Puyallup Tribe*)  
Stacy Vynne McKinstry (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Greg Rabourn (*King County*)  
Teresa Smith (*City of Bremerton*)  
Dave Ward (*Kitsap County*)  
Kathy Peters (*alternate - Kitsap County*)  
Zach Holt (*alternate - City of Port Orchard*)  
Joy Garitone (*Kitsap Conservation District*)  
Brittany Gordon (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)  
Nam Siu (*WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife*)  
Austin Jennings (*alternate - Pierce County*)

Dan Cardwell (*Pierce County*)  
Dana Sarff (*alternate - Skokomish Tribe*)  
Seth Book (*alternate - Skokomish Tribe*)  
Paul Pickett (*alternate - Squaxin Island Tribe*)  
Randy Neatherlin (*Mason County*)  
Russ Shiple (*Kitsap Building Association*)  
Sam Phillips (*Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe*)  
Paul McCollum (*alternate - Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe*)  
Mike Michael (*City of Bainbridge Island*)  
Larry Boltz (*Mason-Kitsap Farm Bureau*)  
Dave Windom (*Mason County*)

### Other Attendees

Susan Gulick (*Sound Resolutions, Facilitator*)  
Angela Pietschmann (*Cascadia, Info Manager*)  
Burt Clothier (*Pacific Groundwater Group*)  
Bob Montgomery (*Anchor QEA*)

Paulina Levy (*WA Dept of Ecology*)  
Joel Massmann (*Suquamish Tribe*)  
Joe Hovenkotter (*King County*)

### Committee Representatives Not in Attendance\*

City of Gig Harbor  
City of Poulsbo

Great Peninsula Conservancy  
Washington Water Service (*ex-officio*)

*\*Attendees list is based on roll call and participants signed into WebEx.*

## Meeting Agenda, Updates, and Announcements

Susan summarized the last meeting and reviewed the agenda. *No revisions to the agenda.*

Stacy provided updates from Ecology:

- The June meeting summary will be reviewed and approved during the August meeting.
- Ecology staff are furloughed Fridays through July and then once a month through November (dates not set). WDFW is also on Friday furloughs. Let Stacy know if your entity is experiencing furloughs or reduced capacity so she can track for Ecology management.
- Next month the committee will hear a proposal to update operating principles to include remote voting on final plan.
- The City of Poulsbo has not regularly attended meetings since August 2019 (Stacy has sent numerous emails and voicemails to try and engage them). Next month the committee will discuss whether to update operating principles to address what to do when entities stop participating. Ecology is open to suggestions if other cities can connect with Poulsbo.
  - The City of Port Orchard has been in discussions with staff at Poulsbo and is planning to meet with them in the near future. Port Orchard will bring up their anticipated future participation in the WRIA 15 committee.
- Ecology's Director adopted the WRIA 59 watershed plan addendum on June 25, 2020. WRIA 59 was identified in Section 020 of RCW 90.94. They previously completed watershed planning under RCW 90.82 but their existing planning unit was required by the streamflow restoration law to complete a plan addendum by February 1, 2021 (similar to the Nisqually/WRIA 11 process). See links below for details:
  - <https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shorelines/Water-supply/Streamflow-restoration/Streamflow-restoration-planning>
  - <https://sccd.stevenscountywa.gov/wria-59-documents/>

## Projects Update

The Project Workgroup met on June 29 and July 13. Meeting notes for are posted on committee webpage. The workgroup discussed development of detailed descriptions for offset projects as well as those that primarily benefit habitat and project list organization. Stacy will summarize the recent workgroup discussions and recommendations in a discussion guide for the August 6 Committee meeting. Ecology provided an update on specific projects discussed at recent workgroup meetings:

- Big Beef The project workgroup and technical consultants have done a lot of research on this project, but it looks as though the benefits won't pan out. [A brief write-up is posted on Box with further details.](#) The project workgroup recommends the committee no longer pursue this project is looking into other projects that could feed Big Beef basin with greater offset potential and fewer permitting hurdles.
- Headwaters project – south near Morgan's Marsh. Skokomish Tribe is interested in proposals within southern headwaters near Morgan's Marsh area. Seth Book and Bob Montgomery to connect on details.
- Newberry storage site. This site shows promise and provides benefit in a similar area to some headland waters. The project workgroup recommends developing this project in detail.

- Bainbridge Island storage sites. These projects are looking very promising. The project workgroup recommends developing these projects in detail.
- Winslow and Belfair WWTP. HDR is looking into these projects and will bring back more information to the group in August.
- Mason County rooftop and storage. HDR is looking into this project and will bring back more information to the group in August.
- Central Kitsap WWTP / Silverdale. Many open questions remain for this project; it is in development.
- Port Orchard airport stormwater. Continued development/exploration.
- Burley Creek ag field / wetland projects. WDFW recommends further exploration of these projects (offset/storage value).
- Big Beef field / wetland projects off Peter Hagen. WDFW recommends further exploration of these projects (offset/storage value).

PGG has refined the [Water Rights Acquisition opportunities list](#) based on committee feedback. Ecology asks anyone with knowledge of the water rights to provide feedback on whether or not any of the water rights on the list are worth pursuing. PGG would like to have a narrowed list of opportunities to further describe in advance of the August 6 committee meeting. Kitsap Conservation District is currently reviewing the list and will bring forward any concerns. The list still has gaps in potential water rights on the islands.

The project workgroup discussed creating a small workgroup to discuss a beaver project and policy package to bring back to the committee for discussion (possibly generic enough that it could be shared with other committees for consideration). The beaver workgroup will meet in the coming weeks and bring a proposal back to the committee soon.

While the committee does not yet have agreement on consumptive use estimates by subbasin, Bob Montgomery pulled together an [initial inventory](#) of where we are with the projects being developed in more detail for their offset need (does not include full inventory of projects). This analysis uses the medium growth scenario and outdoor irrigation method. The law does not require us to find offsets by subbasin (although considered “higher priority”). Some members of the workgroup want commitment from the committee that we will find enough offset projects by subbasin to meet the consumptive use estimate for that subbasin. Ecology recognizes that the consequence of not finding enough projects by subbasin would mean we would not have an approved plan, but some members of workgroup stated that they would not support a plan that did not meet the offset need by subbasin. The committee will continue this discussion in August.

Ecology’s NEB guidance provides suggestions around tiering, sequencing, and prioritizing projects included in WRE plans (Stacy shared this [discussion guide with the workgroup](#)). There is no requirement on how we present our projects in the plan. The workgroup began discussions on how to present the project list in the plan. Potential options include:

- Organizing projects by subbasin.
- Presenting projects that are very well-developed and have high likelihood of implementation in the body of the plan (both in paragraph and table format) and then retaining all projects and concepts in the project inventory in the appendix.
- Ecology welcomes other input and ideas on how to organize the project list.

## Discussion

- **Beaver Projects & Policy Package:**

- Dave Ward (Kitsap County) has had numerous conversations with several people on this topic and identified two general approaches:
  - (1) Identify a potential site; create beaver dam analog; hope that beavers come.
  - (2) Instead of approaching on project-by-project basis, take a programmatic approach: identify potential beaver habitat (typically corresponds with salmon habitat); set up network of easements/acquisitions that would allow beavers to colonize without fear of being run off land. Treat watershed-wide network of beaver habitat the way you would any other utility easement network across the county. Allows landowners to monetize marginal land with low value for other purposes and helps mitigate the uncertainty around whether beavers will colonize / stick around (poor track record on transplanting beavers). Skokomish Tribe supports further discussion around this approach.

- **Project offset needs by subbasin**

- Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe) would like the committee to make a decision as soon as possible on whether they will commit to meeting offsets by subbasin to provide technical consultants with clear direction on priorities. Paul put forward a motion to organize the WRE plan by subbasin, clearly identifying targets for future PEW growth, and implementing projects to meet offset needs by subbasin (NEB can be met WRIA-wide).
  - Susan Gulick (facilitator) clarified the committee's consensus-based process does not include ad-hoc motions. The committee needs time to review any proposals in writing and advanced notice to include in the meeting agenda. Susan Gulick encouraged the committee to raise any concerns as soon as possible around having adequate projects/offsets in particular subbasins. She clarified that the operating procedures allow for two types of decisions:
    - (1) Formal decisions made by consensus only.
    - (2) Straw polls (not a decision but a pulse read to see where people stand).
  - Dave Ward (Kitsap County) requested fair notice for decisions affecting outcomes in significant way.
  - Joel Purdy (Kitsap PUD) agrees with concept of offsetting by subbasin but wants more time to review the proposal in advance of making a decision.
  - Randy Neatherlin (Mason County) requested advanced notice before making decisions at the committee level.
  - Greg Rabourn (King County) agrees with the concept but needs more information on what the potential downsides might be / potential ramifications from other perspectives before making a decision.
  - Nam Siu (WDFW) generally supports offsets by subbasin but is concerned that some subbasins will be constrained by project availability. He does not want to lock the committee on a path / rush the decision. He needs more time to discuss with WDFW headquarters and align response across WRIAs.
  - Seth Book (Skokomish Tribe) agrees with the concept of offsets by subbasin—particularly in the Hood Canal subbasins—and emphasized making this decision in the near future.
  - Dan Cardwell (Pierce County) requests documentation on any proposals that require a committee decision. He would like the discussion guide to detail the special circumstances for WRIA 15 compared to others.
  - Stacy agreed to prepare a discussion guide and include this topic on the August agenda for further discussion.



- Paul thanked the committee for their input and withdrew his motion.

## Plan Development

Initial comments on draft WRE plan Chapters 1-3 were due on July 2. All of the [initial comments](#) and [compiled comments](#) are posted on box. Ecology received comments from City of Bremerton, WDFW, Kitsap PUD, Squaxin Island Tribe, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, and Skokomish Tribe. The committee provided suggestions for some language refinement, additional background on wells and growth management, more information on lead entities and local integrating organizations, and other suggestions. Ecology does not have any concerns about most proposed revisions but will need to confirm the committee is comfortable with the changes as well.

Ecology is working across all WRIAs to develop some template maps (hope to have many of the WRIA 15 specific maps in the August draft). Ecology will hold on to the comments received on maps and determine if this committee would like further revisions after reviewing the draft maps.

Ecology received proposed revisions to the tribal overview sections. Ecology needs all tribal representatives to review and ensure they are comfortable with the revisions.

For Chapter 1, Ecology will take comments to management as they are reviewing all comments from WRIAs on this chapter together to identify universal revisions across committees vs for individual committees. Stacy will discuss WRIA 15's comments on Chapter 1 with management later this month.

Chapter 4 covers growth projections and consumptive use, building off of the technical memo the committee worked through in detail over the spring. This chapter will present the information we have discussed to date on the consumptive use estimate since the committee has not yet landed on a number. Stacy plans to get the draft chapter out next week (if she receives from the consultants by the end of this week).

In August, Ecology will distribute WRIA 15's draft WRE plan. There is still a lot of work to do on the plan components (e.g., finalizing project lists, policy recommendations, AM structure, and decision on consumptive use estimate). As a result, the plan will have a lot of gaps, but will present everything we have so far, including a structure for the remaining chapters with examples included where we have agreement (e.g. projects or any policy recommendations). Due to July's furloughs and staff capacity, Stacy anticipates a delay in sending the draft compiled plan, but is aiming for some time before the end of August to allow for time to review ahead of our October meeting.

The draft plan distribution date and February 1, 2021 plan submission dates are target dates, not statutory deadlines. Stacy has informed ECY management that WRIA 15 is unlikely to submit our plan by February 1, 2021. The law states that Ecology must make a decision on adoption by June 30, 2021 ([RCW 90.94.030\(3\)](#)).

### Reference Materials:

- [Compiled Comment Tracker for Discussion](#)
- [Chapters 1-3](#)

### Poll: Reasons your entity did not comment on draft WRE plan Chapters 1-3:

- City of Port Orchard: reviewed, no comments at this time.
- King County: Not enough time, still working on it.



- Kitsap County: Reviewed; it still seemed pretty drafty. Mostly background information so had no comments.

#### Discussion:

- Paul Pickett (Squaxin Island Tribe) requested more transparency and documentation around the committee's decisions for each proposal. Current process can feel fuzzy—it feels like we have no clear end points and we need to avoid having proposals float in limbo indefinitely.
- Susan Gulick (facilitator) reminded the committee we are trying to get consensus on the final plan. While people might not like a proposal and vote no every chance they get—if there's something they really want in the final plan, they may be willing to reconsider. Individual votes along the way are not necessarily a measure of whether the plan as a whole moves forward as for many committee members, it may depend on whole package.

## Adaptive Management

Susan walked the committee through the WRIA 15 Adaptive Management discussion guide (linked below).

#### Reference Materials:

- [Adaptive Management Discussion Guide](#)

#### Polls (from google slides and verbal comments):

- **What information should be tracked?**
  - City of Port Orchard: Streamflow (especially low flow criteria), high frequency temperature / stage in-situ monitoring, rainfall, development rates/habitat influence within sub watershed, etc. effectiveness monitoring of NEB projects as they relate to groundwater and habitat.
  - Ecology: Project implementation, PEW
  - DFW: Project completion stage including feasibility, funding source, everything others are saying
  - King County: new exempt wells
  - Kitsap PUD: Number of wells in each subbasin. Nearby precipitation, streamflow (if possible), number of active projects and their status.
  - Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe: streamflows; wells; projects; climate; drought. A minimum of ten years of monitoring streamflow status and trends is very worthwhile; perhaps every two-five years.
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: PE wells by subbasin as they are permitted. Status of offsets, when completed, benefits when completed. Status of habitat projects and NEB. Success of policy initiatives (e.g. conservation, entity actions to implement). Status of compliance with water use limits. Trends in streamflow with ISF rules.
  - Kitsap County: there are categories of monitoring: (1) plan implementation (e.g., what moved forward and what didn't); (2) broader status/trends – how are the watersheds doing?; (3) effectiveness of projects. Look at progress by subbasin, instead of just at the project level. Are groups of projects together achieving what we want?
  - Ecology: no restraints on committee members self-obligating to future commitments but cannot obligate others (only recommend for consideration).

- **What should happen if tracking shows significant diversion from planned outcomes?**
  - City of Port Orchard: Research possible limiting factors, regional influences on data (climate change impacts, development, etc.) affecting outcomes, identify if diversion is due to design errors, adapt, if possible, to expand scope or mitigate for diversion.
  - King County: If we fall short, add additional projects and policies to meet offsets. If exceed the outcomes, yay for the fish!
  - Kitsap PUD: Don't necessarily "adapt" on an annual basis, but only if a trend (2-5 years), maybe the 5-year report time period. Need a future planning group.
  - Pierce County: It depends on where we are in the planning horizon. 1st check-in at 5 years to review trends and review implemented projects, at 10 years review trends/implemented projects. Document challenges and perhaps revisit planned outcomes, assumptions, etc. Then after this review, identify appropriate strategies.
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: Need implementation group to plan, check, and act. Flow restrictions ramp up if offsets fall behind PE wells. If PE wells too far behind, building permits stop. The classic approach to adaptive management is "plan, do (implement), check (monitor), act (adaptively manage)." A planning group to implement the WRE plan is essential; not sure how plan could be successfully implemented without them. How would we react to a diversion from intended outcomes? This committee is the starting point, but folks should not be locked into it. Some entities want to continue their participation, but others do not. In the Nisqually, certain entities stepped up to lead the group; Chehalis is more self-guided/self-organized. Build a structure that allows to self-organize / continuity into future.
  - Mason County advocates for the Chehalis model as a continuation of this group to track implementation.
  - Pierce County advocates supporting existing groups / groups well equipped to take over where the committee leaves off (rather than forming a new entity).
- **Does the Committee support a standard request to the legislature for funding to support adaptive management?**
  - City of Port Orchard: Yes
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: Yes, but the wrong questions. PE well fee increase should be considered, as well as shared funding through an interlocal agreement.

## Additional Policy Proposals

- [New Policy Proposals](#)
- [WRIA15 Policy Proposal Tracker](#)

### New Proposals (comments from google slides and verbal comments):

- **P45 - Adapt & Update Instream Flow Rules: King County**
  - City of Port Orchard: agreed.
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: consistent with my proposal for ISF rule review, and Water Master proposal.
- **P46 - Recycled Water: King County**
  - City of Port Orchard: Please consider an in-depth monitoring component for all CEC's and nontypical pollutants to determine potential impacts to receiving GdH20.
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: Consistent with Tribal goals.
- **P47 - Support for ECY to Maintain Robust Water Mgmt. Efforts: King County**

- Squaxin Island Tribe: Support purpose and approach. Appreciate King County putting forward; consistent with what Squaxin would like. May have more specific comments later.
- WDFW: Would policies like this roll into the NEB category? Since there is really no guarantee of how much offset they would provide since it is all dependent on how much development occurs?
  - Ecology: NEB guidance discusses projects and actions. If proposals fall into action realm – the committee can identify direct offset/habitat benefit in plan.
- **P07 - Funding Plan: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - City of Port Orchard: Might be difficult to justify?
  - Kitsap PUD: Cart before the horse. We are asking for more money before we even know what we are going to spend it on.
  - WDFW: support an increase in the well fee (no opinion on what is a "reasonable" amount). For reference, I paid \$500 for a road approach permit to widen my existing driveway in Kitsap County. In my mind, a new well permit should be significantly more than that.
  - City of Bainbridge Island: On the fee, if it was closer to on par with Group A hook-up fees, it would provide an additional benefit of directing site with the option to go either with PEW or a Group A connection toward the Group A.
- **P33 - Instream Flow Rule Revisions: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - No comments
- **P44 - PEW Withdrawal Limits: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - Kitsap PUD: 500 gpd for indoor use is not really a limitation, when total usage (outdoor and indoor) averages about 200 gpd.
  - Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe: Dungeness Basin is limited to 150 gpd with higher amounts allowed by purchasing mitigation credits.
  - Ecology: WRIA 15 law limits indoor domestic use to 950 gpd, without exceedance of 5,000 gpd; this proposal would be a decrease.
- **A11 - Plan Implementation Durability: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - Squaxin Island Tribe: need input from counties to refine this proposal. To make a robust plan, we need good open conversation, honest dialogue, and specific ideas.
- **A20 - Monitoring & Research: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - City of Port Orchard: Agree with this. Need to define methods and resolution of data. (QAPP?) This data would be incredibly useful for future planning...
- **A04 - Upgrade Well Reporting: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - City of Port Orchard: sounds useful
  - Kitsap PUD: This has been a desire for decades. The location part of Ecology's database is kind of embarrassing given available technology.
  - Ecology: Snoqualmie Tribe put forward a similar proposal. Ecology is taking suggestions and moving forward in coordination with the Tribe. Will likely present proposal in August draft plan. Seems to have general support, not controversial, likely to move forward unless committee has concerns/revisions.
- **A23 - Water Supply Data: Squaxin Island Tribe**
  - City of Port Orchard: Agree with KPUD. I believe that purveyor data is already available and could be used for comparisons? Would be nice to see/model impacts to develop projections for future?
  - Kitsap PUD: I find it interesting that you are asking for water use data but are not considering water users or water purveyors as key players. Where else is the data going

to come from? Each Group A system already has to have a plan for future water use in the water system planning process.

## Public Comment

No public comment.

## Action Items for Committee Members

- Review the list of potential water rights acquisition opportunities and provide feedback based on local knowledge to further narrow down the list.
- Seth Book to connect with Bob Montgomery on potential projects within southern headwaters near Morgan's Marsh area.
- Two phase homework for plan review:
  - Review proposed changes to Chapter 1-3 before August 6 committee meeting. Notify Stacy if you have any concerns with making those revisions, primarily the yellow/green comments. Stacy will make it very clear in the document where your input is needed.
  - Stacy will bring back a discussion guide for comments that need to be discussed with the whole committee prior to making the revision.
- Provide proponents of policy proposals feedback and ideas for refining the proposals.

## Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

- Ecology will add Seth Book (*alternate - Skokomish Tribe*) to upcoming project workgroup meetings.
- Ecology will redistribute the water rights acquisition opportunities list and summarize feedback received.
- Ecology will summarize project updates in a discussion guide and bring to the August meeting for further discussion and agreement where appropriate.
- Ecology will send out a beaver project and policy package meeting notice to the entire committee in case other folks are interested in joining.
- At the August committee meeting, Ecology will present a discussion guide on the proposal by some workgroup members to find enough offset projects by subbasin.
- Ecology will summarize recommendations from the project workgroup on project list organization in the WRE plan for discussion in August and put forward some examples in the August plan draft.
- Ecology to resend compiled comment tracker for draft WRE plan Chapters 1-3.
- Bob Montgomery to connect with Seth Book on potential projects within southern headwaters near Morgan's Marsh area.
- Susan will develop a framework for the adaptive management component of the plan for further discussion.

# Discussion Guide: Proposed Operating Principle Revisions

WRIA 15 Committee Meeting August 6, 2020

## Purpose of Discussion

The committee can periodically review the operating principles and make amendments as needed. Unanticipated circumstances have raised the need for the chair to bring forward a recommendation for an amendment regarding: remote participation in the final approval of the plan and addressing members that stop participation in the committee.

## Background

The WRIA 15 Operating Principles were approved for signature by all committee members on February 12, 2019. (Note that the operating principles were never deemed “effective” as not all members signed.) The 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.” (pg 1)

## Considerations for the Committee

It is unlikely that the committee will meet in person for a final plan approval vote due to the global pandemic. Therefore, the committee may want to consider a revision to the operating principles to formalize and clarify the allowance of remote participation and voting. In addition, to reduce complications during a final plan approval vote, the committee may want to consider a revision to account for members that stop participating in the committee process or those that would like to resign ahead of a final plan approval vote.

Below, the current related sections of the operating principles are shown in *italics*. The suggested revisions to the sections on remote participation and final approval of the plan are shown in red underline. The proposed revisions are also included at the end of this document as revisions to the full operating principles.

## Suggested Revisions

### *Remote Participation*

*It is the expectation that Committee representatives shall attend all meetings in person. In person participation is essential to efficiency, clarity, and honest communication. Although it should not be routine, remote participation can be accommodated when necessary to facilitate Committee member participation and when possible given technology availability. Remote participants may engage in decision-making; however the primary purpose of remote participation is listening to the Committee meeting, as it may be difficult to fully participate in discussion. If there are difficulties with technology, the chair’s priority is to continue the meeting with the in-person participants and not delay the meeting to address technology challenges. Representatives are strongly encouraged to attend meetings in-person.*

*The Committee chair will allow for remote participation (e.g. via phone, web, video conference) if:*

- *Notice is provided to the chair or facilitator at least 1 week in advance of the meeting (except in the case of emergencies such as illness, weather event, etc.), AND*
- *Representative and alternates are not available to attend in person, AND*
- *Meeting room accommodates remote participation. (pg 4)*

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 the plan*

*RCW 90.94 (3) states that “... all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption.” This means that each and all committee members get to record their decision (quorum is not applicable for final approval) and that all committee members must support the plan in order for it to be approved and provided to Ecology for “net ecological benefit”<sup>1</sup> review and potential adoption by Ecology.<sup>2</sup>*

*The final plan approval will be shown by hands:*

- *Thumbs up – approval*
- *Thumbs down – disapproval*

The final plan approval may also be given verbally when in person participation is not possible:

- Approve
- Disapprove

*The facilitator will record all decisions.*

#### Withdrawal/Resignation

NOTE: The operating principles do not currently contain a section on members that stop participating in meetings or a process for resignation. The proposed revisions are included in the Alternates and Latecomers sections:

*If the primary representative and alternates are no longer able to attend (staffing change, ongoing scheduling conflicts), the government or organization shall work with the chair to quickly identify alternative representation from the same government or organization. If no alternative representative is available from the government or organization, an alternate entity that can represent the same interest*

---

<sup>1</sup> Per RCW 90.94, Ecology shall review the watershed restoration and enhancement plan to ensure it meets net ecological benefit. Ecology shall provide the Committee with a definition and guidance of net ecological benefit.

<sup>2</sup> RCW 90.94.030 does not require local jurisdiction approval prior to plan adoption.

*is allowed and shall be brought forward by the departing entity to the chair for approval. Replacement members are subject to latecomer provisions.*

*Ecology invited all entities identified in 90.94.030 to participate on the Committee and all entities in WRIA 15 have accepted the invitation to participate. A replacement entity is allowed to join the Committee at a later date under the following conditions:*

- 1. The entity cannot request to revisit items previously decided on by the Committee;*
- 2. The entity signs an intent to participate, provides primary and alternate Committee representatives;*
- 3. The entity agrees to and abides by the operating principles; and*
- 4. The entity joins the Committee and participates in meetings no later than six months prior to final plan approval.*

#### **Presumed Withdrawal from the Committee**

Entities must participate in the committee process for the six month period prior to the final plan approval in order to vote on the final draft plan. ("Participate" means partaking in a minimum of one full committee or workgroup meeting, engaging over email or phone. It does not mean presence at every committee meeting with the understanding that entities may need to occasionally miss committee meetings.) If an entity does not respond to communication over email or phone, or does not attend committee or workgroup meetings, during the six month period prior to the vote on the final plan, it is assumed that they have withdrawn from the committee. The chair will send an electronic notice to all entities providing this information no later than August 31, 2020. The chair will send electronic notice to all entities providing this information at least two months prior to the anticipated vote on the final plan and no later than January 31, 2021.

#### **Resignation from the Committee**

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.

#### **Questions for the Committee**

1. Does the committee feel that it is necessary to make the changes highlighted below to the operating principles?
2. If so, do we have 2/3 of membership present and in full agreement?
3. Are there other revisions that committee members see necessary to make at this time or for consideration at a future meeting?

# FULL OPERATING PRINCIPLES WITH PROPOSED REVISIONS ARE INCLUDED BELOW

## Watershed Restoration Enhancement Committee

### Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 15

#### Operating Principles

Approved Version Sent for Signature February 12, 2019

Effective xx, 2019 (date by which all members have signed)

#### *SECTION 1: PURPOSE*

The purpose of the operating principles is to establish the watershed restoration and enhancement committee, as authorized under RCW 90.94.030, for the purpose of developing the watershed restoration and enhancement plan. The document sets forward a process for meeting, participation expectations, procedures for voting, structure of the Committee, communication and other needs in order to support the Committee in reaching agreement on a final plan.

#### *Section 2. Agreement and amendments to the operating Principles*

The formal establishment of an agreement to the operating principles will take place via a member decision, with all members of the watershed restoration and enhancement committee (Committee) approving the operating principles. Participants will work in good faith to participate productively in the development of the operating principles. By approving the operating principles, members of the Committee agree to uphold the principles as outlined in this document.

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.

Nothing contained herein or in any amendment developed under the Agreement shall prejudice the legal claims of any party hereto, nor shall participation in this planning process abrogate any party's authority or the reserved or other rights of tribal governments, except where the obligation has been accepted in writing.

#### *Section 3. PARTICIPATION expectations And Ground Rules*

##### *Participation expectations*

Each entity invited by Ecology to participate on the Committee, and which has responded indicating their commitment to participate, shall identify a representative and up to two alternates to participate on the Committee. Committee members will, in good faith and using their best professional judgement:

- Actively participate in Committee meetings;
- Review materials in preparation for the meetings;
- Review materials following the meetings;



- Engage in workgroups (if applicable);
- Come prepared for discussions and decisions (when applicable); and
- Commit to implementing the Committee ground rules (see below).

The chair will consult with the Committee to ensure that adequate time is given for review of materials. The chair will provide meeting materials at least 7 days before meetings, with additional time given for longer documents. The chair recognizes that members may need to discuss decisions with their organizations prior to bringing forward a decision to the Committee and the chair and facilitator will work with Committee members to establish reasonable review time for materials prior to reaching a decision. Members of the Committee will actively work with their decision making authorities to receive feedback on decisions in a timely manner as to not delay decisions coming before the Committee. When possible, Committee members will provide the chair reasonable notice if additional review time is needed prior to making a decision.

Committee meetings will take place on a monthly basis for an initial period, with the interval of meetings being modified as needed to meet the deadlines (either more or less frequently). The chair will hold meetings at a convenient location in the watershed. Meetings are expected to last for approximately 4 hours, with the length modified as needed to meet deadlines.

The chair or facilitator will contact Committee members that miss meetings. A lack of participation does not mean the process to develop the plan will be stalled. However, it is recognized that if a quorum is not present, meetings may be cancelled or decisions postponed which may impact the overall timeline for plan approval. If an entity misses multiple meetings, the chair or facilitator will work with the entity to identify reasonable accommodations to support reengagement.

#### Remote Participation

It is the expectation that Committee representatives shall attend all meetings in person. In person participation is essential to efficiency, clarity, and honest communication. Although it should not be routine, remote participation can be accommodated when necessary to facilitate Committee member participation and when possible given technology availability. Remote participants may engage in decision-making; however the primary purpose of remote participation is listening to the Committee meeting, as it may be difficult to fully participate in discussion. If there are difficulties with technology, the chair's priority is to continue the meeting with the in-person participants and not delay the meeting to address technology challenges. Representatives are strongly encouraged to attend meetings in-person.

The Committee chair will allow for remote participation (e.g. via phone, web, video conference) if:

- Notice is provided to the chair or facilitator at least 1 week in advance of the meeting (except in the case of emergencies such as illness, weather event, etc.), AND
- Representative and alternates are not available to attend in person, AND
- Meeting room accommodates 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.

## Ground rules

Water management is inherently complicated and the Committee is striving for consensus on the watershed restoration and enhancement plan. Therefore, given the range of members' diverse perspectives, the Committee has established the following to ensure good faith and productive participation amongst its members:

### 1. Be Respectful

- Listen when others are speaking. Do not interrupt and do not participate in side conversations. One person speaks at a time.
- Recognize the legitimacy of the concerns and interests of others, whether or not you agree with them.
- Cooperate with the facilitator to ensure that everyone is given equitable time to state their views. Present your views succinctly and try not to repeat or rephrase what others have already said.
- Silence cell phones and limit use of cell phones and laptops during the meeting.
- Respect other communication styles and needs.
- Assume good intent of other Committee members.

### 2. Be Constructive

- Participate in the spirit of giving the same priority to solving the problems of others as you do to solving your own problems.
- Share comments that are solution focused. Avoid repeating past discussions.
- Do not engage in personal attacks or make slanderous statements. Do not give ultimatums.
- Ask for clarification if you are uncertain of what another person is saying. Ask questions rather than make assumptions.
- Work towards consensus. Identify areas of common ground and be willing to compromise.
- Minimize the use of jargon and acronyms. Attempt to use language observers and laypersons will understand.
- It is okay to disagree, but strive to reach common ground.

### 3. Be Productive

- Adhere to the agenda. Respect time constraints and focus on the topic being discussed.

### 4. Bring a Sense of Humor and Have Fun.

## Interpersonal conflict resolution

In the event a conflict arises amongst members or established workgroups of the Committee, the following steps should be taken by individuals:

1. Communicate directly with the person or persons whose actions are the cause of the conflict.
2. If the circumstance is such that the person with a conflict is unable or unwilling to communicate directly with the person or persons whose actions are the cause of the conflict, the person shall speak with the Committee chair and facilitator.
3. The conflict should first be brought up verbally. If this does not lead to satisfactory resolution, the impacted parties should describe the conflict in writing to the chair.

4. If such matters are brought to the chair and facilitator, the chair in consultation with the facilitator, will address the conflict as appropriate and may seek outside or independent assistance as needed.

#### *Section 4. Alternates, EX OFFICIO membership AND WORKGROUPS*

##### **Alternates**

Committee members shall provide to the chair, in writing, up to two designated alternate committee members from their organization or government. Committee members shall inform the chair in writing of any changes to the main representative or alternates. If the primary representative cannot attend a meeting, they should, if possible, send the designated alternate and notify the Committee chair and the facilitator as early as possible. It is the responsibility of the primary representative to brief the alternate on previous meetings and key topics arising for discussion in order for the alternate to participate productively.

Representatives may call on alternates that attend the meeting at any time to speak. Only one representative from the government or entity shall sit at the table and participate in a decision. If the primary representative and alternates are no longer able to attend (staffing change, ongoing scheduling conflicts), the government or organization shall work with the chair to quickly identify alternative representation from the same government or organization. If no alternative representative is available from the government or organization, an alternate entity that can represent the same interest is allowed and shall be brought forward by the departing entity to the chair for approval. Replacement members are subject to latecomer provisions.

##### **Latecomers**

Ecology invited all entities identified in 90.94.030 to participate on the Committee and all entities in WRIA 15 have accepted the invitation to participate. A replacement entity is allowed to join the Committee at a later date under the following conditions:

5. The entity cannot request to revisit items previously decided on by the Committee;
6. The entity signs an intent to participate, provides primary and alternate Committee representatives;
7. The entity agrees to and abides by the operating principles; and
8. The entity joins the Committee and participates in meetings no later than six months prior to final plan approval.

##### **Presumed Withdrawal from the Committee**

Entities must participate in the committee process for the six month period prior to the final plan approval in order to vote on the final draft plan. ("Participate" means partaking in a minimum of one full committee or workgroup meeting, engaging over email or phone. It does not mean presence at every committee meeting with the understanding that entities may need to occasionally miss committee meetings.) If an entity does not respond to communication over email or phone, or does not attend committee or workgroup meetings, during the six month period prior to the vote on the final plan, it is assumed that they have withdrawn from the committee. The chair will send an electronic notice to all entities providing this information no later than August 31, 2020. The chair will send electronic notice to

all entities providing this information at least two months prior to the anticipated vote on the final plan and no later than January 31, 2021.

### **Resignation from the Committee**

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.

### **Ex-Officio and Ad-Hoc Members**

The Committee may decide by full consensus to invite an additional entity to join the Committee as an *ex officio* non-voting member. *Ex Officio* members are invited to sit at the Committee table and participate actively in discussions and review of documents, but shall not make decisions on any items.<sup>3</sup> Ex-officio members shall adhere to the operating procedures.

The Committee may decide by consensus to invite an individual or organization to participate in select meetings or agenda items where additional expertise or perspective is desired. Ad hoc members will be invited by the chair to sit at the Committee table, participate actively in discussions, and review of documents for the specified agenda items. They shall not make decisions on any items.

### **Workgroups and Advisory Groups**

The Committee may establish workgroups or subcommittees as it sees fit. Workgroups may be temporary, established to achieve a specific purpose within a finite time frame, or a standing workgroup addressing the goals of the Committee. The decision to form a workgroup is not required by the legislation and may be developed at the discretion of the Committee or the chair in order to support Committee decision making. All Committee workgroups are workgroups of the whole, meaning their role is to support the efforts of the Committee and all Committee members are welcome to participate in any workgroup formed by the Committee. The chair or Committee may also engage established workgroups in the watershed or invite non-Committee members to participate on the workgroups if they bring capacity or expertise not available on the Committee. No binding decisions will be made by the workgroups; all issues discussed by workgroups shall be communicated to the Committee as either recommendations or findings as appropriate. The Committee may, or may not, act on these workgroup outcomes as it deems appropriate.

### ***Section 5. Role of the chair and committee support***

RCW 90.94.030 (2b) states that “The department shall chair the watershed restoration and enhancement committee...” Ecology’s streamflow restoration implementation lead chairs the Committee on behalf of the agency. In the event that the chair is unable to attend a scheduled meeting due to illness or other unanticipated absence, Ecology will designate an interim chair to avoid cancelling the meeting. The interim chair may make decisions coming before the Committee.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ecology leadership has determined that additional voting members will not be invited to join the committees in order to stay true to the legislation and keep the Committee size manageable. However, the Committee may decide to include non-voting members if they choose.

The chair shall make decisions on all items coming before the Committee.<sup>4</sup> The role of the chair is to help the Committee complete the plan with the goal to attain full agreement from the Committee members. If full agreement cannot be obtained, the chair shall ensure all opinions inform future decision making for the final plan.

The chair, with assistance from Ecology technical staff, contractors, members of the Committee, and/or workgroups, shall prepare the watershed restoration and enhancement plan for the Committee's review, comment, and approval.

Ecology may provide the Committee a facilitator. The role of the facilitator is to focus on process and support the Committee in productive discussions and decision-making. Ecology will provide administrative support for the Committee as well as technical assistance through Ecology staff and consultants.

Ecology may provide the Committee with technical support in the form of Ecology staff or hired consultants. Ecology will seek input from the Committee on consultant selection prior to entering into contract.

### *Section 6. Decision making*

This planning process, by statutory design, brings a diversity of perspectives to the table. It is therefore important the Committee identifies a clear process for how it will make decisions. Committee members shall always strive for consensus, and when consensus cannot be reached, the chair and facilitator will document agreement and dissenting opinions. The reason why Committee members will strive for consensus is that the authorizing legislation requires that final plan itself must be approved by all members of the Committee prior to Ecology's review (RCW 90.94.030[3] "...all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption"). Therefore it follows that consensus during the foundational decisions upon which the plan is constructed will serve as the best indicators of the Committee's progress toward an approved plan.

### *Quorum*

A quorum is constituted when two-thirds of the entities represented on the Committee are present (either in person or on the phone). A quorum must be present for decisions to occur. Each member of the Committee may record a single formal opinion.

### *Decisions leading up to the final plan approval*

In recognition that consensus can be difficult to achieve and in some cases decisions need to be made within a limited period of time to stay on track to meet the plan deadline, the following process will be used to make decisions leading up to plan approval:

---

<sup>4</sup> RCW 90.94 (3) states that "the department shall prepare and adopt a watershed restoration and enhancement plan for each watershed listed under subsection (2)(a) of this section, in collaboration with the watershed restoration and enhancement committee. Except as described in (h) of this subsection, all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption." Based on input from the Attorney General's office, because Ecology is a member of the Committee and must ultimately vote on whether or not to approve the plan, Ecology shall vote on all items coming before the Committee.

1. The Committee will strive toward consensus.<sup>5</sup> The levels of consensus include:
  - I can say an unqualified "yes"!
  - I can accept the decision.
  - I can live with the decision.
  - I do not fully agree with the decision; however, I will not block it.
2. The Committee will spend adequate time<sup>6</sup> for substantive discussion of issues prior to asking for a decision. After substantive discussion, the chair will ask consensus.
3. When consensus cannot be reached, the facilitator will identify the members in disagreement<sup>7</sup> at the meeting. The chair and/or facilitator will support coordination of the following actions, but the responsibility is on the disagreeing members. Disagreeing members agree to:
  - a. meet within seven days of the meeting;
  - b. develop a summary paper on the issue and needs; and
  - c. develop a draft timeline for resolution or a recommendation back to the Committee.

As appropriate, the chair and/or facilitator will work with the parties in disagreement to reach a resolution using whatever means are necessary and within reason (in person meetings, conference calls, identifying additional research needs, etc.). Members unable to reach consensus must agree to work cooperatively with the chair and facilitator in this process. The Committee recognizes that flexibility is needed in terms of timeline and presentation of resolution depending on the nature of the disagreement. If requested, Ecology may provide a facilitator to help develop the compromise language.
4. If the compromise fails to reach consensus within the identified timeline, the Committee will agree to allow the process for developing the plan to move forward while the work toward consensus continues. The Committee agrees to revisit decisions where consensus is not reached at a later date.
5. Throughout the process, the chair and facilitator will ensure that areas of concern and disagreement are documented within meeting summaries and other materials as necessary.

### ***Decision process***

- Thumbs up – approval
- Thumbs down – disapproval

---

<sup>5</sup> Definition of Consensus: Consensus is a group process where the input of everyone is carefully considered and an outcome is crafted that best meets the needs of the group as a whole. The root of consensus is the word consent, which means to give permission to. When members consent to a decision, they are giving permission to the group to go ahead with the decision. Some members may disagree with all or part of the decision, but based on listening to everyone else's input, all members agree to let the decision go forward because the decision is the best one the entire group can achieve at the current time.

<sup>6</sup> The chair will identify definitive deadlines by which decisions need to be made in order to stay on track to meet the plan deadline.

<sup>7</sup> If much of the group is in agreement and only one or two members are in disagreement, individuals may be selected to negotiate on behalf of the larger group.

- Thumbs sideways – (accept, can live with, will not object)
- Five fingers – abstain

The facilitator will record all decisions and, where there are dissenting or ambivalent opinions, the meeting summary will document the concerns.

### Conflict of Interest

Committee members shall abstain from making a decision if they have a vested personal financial interest in a decision. The committee acknowledges that each entity represents stakeholders that have an interest in the outcomes of this process.

### Electronic decision making

In the case a decision is needed prior to the next Committee meeting, the chair can request an n opinion or decision via email or survey. This approach will only be used for time-critical items or when a quorum was not present to come to a decision. The chair will allow a minimum of 3 working days for responses. A non-response is considered an “abstention”.<sup>8</sup>

The result of an electronic decision will be reported at the next Committee meeting and the chair or facilitator may request a decision to reaffirm the electronic decision.

### Straw poll

From time to time, the chair or the facilitator may ask for a straw poll to gather information on group needs. These polls do not need to follow the formal decision-making protocols of this section. Informal polls will be used solely for information-gathering and will not result in a decision.

### Letters of Support for Projects

The Committee may choose to submit a letter of support for streamflow restoration projects applying for funding through Ecology’s Streamflow Restoration Funding program or other sources. The decision to submit a letter of support on behalf of the Committee shall be by consensus. If the Committee does not approve a letter of support for a project, individual Committee representatives may submit a letter of support from their entity or government.

### Final approval of the plan

RCW 90.94 (3) states that “... all members of a watershed restoration and enhancement committee must approve the plan prior to adoption.” This means that each and all committee members get to record their decision (quorum is not applicable for final approval) and that all committee members must

---

<sup>8</sup> If an ‘out of office’ message is received for the primary representative, the alternate representative(s) will be contacted. The chair and facilitator will make at least 3 points of contact with each Committee member and alternates before marking them as an abstention (e.g. phone, email, text).

support the plan in order for it to be approved and provided to Ecology for “net ecological benefit”<sup>9</sup> review and potential adoption by Ecology.<sup>10</sup>

The final plan approval will be shown by hands:

- Thumbs up – approval
- Thumbs down – disapproval

The final plan approval may also be given verbally when in person participation is not possible:

- Approve
- Disapprove

The facilitator will record all decisions.

### *Section 7. Public comments and public meeting notice*

The agenda will provide time for public comment at each meeting. Members of the public may only speak during public comment. The chair and facilitator will determine the time and extent of the public comment period based on the agenda for each meeting, with input from the Committee. While the Committee is not explicitly required to follow the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act, reasonable efforts will be made to post information and materials on the pertinent website in a timely manner to keep the public informed.

### *Section 8. Committee and media communication*

To support clear communication with the Committee, Ecology will:

1. Operate a listserv for Committee members and interested parties;
2. Develop and manage a website for members of the Committee to access documents such as agendas, meeting summaries, technical reports, calendar, and other items as requested by the Committee;
3. Conduct briefing calls with the Committee ahead of each meeting; and
4. Conduct follow up calls with Committee members unable to attend meetings or with differing opinions.

The facilitator and Ecology shall prepare, distribute and post on the Committee webpage a written meeting summary for each Committee meeting within 10 business days of the last Committee meeting. The summary, at a minimum, will include a list of attendees, decisions, discussion points, assignments, and action items. If comments are cited in such summaries, each speaker will be identified as appropriate or requested. Meeting summaries will capture areas of agreement and disagreement within the group. The Committee will approve the meeting summary at the following meeting.

---

<sup>9</sup> Per RCW 90.94, Ecology shall review the watershed restoration and enhancement plan to ensure it meets net ecological benefit. Ecology shall provide the Committee with a definition and guidance of net ecological benefit.

<sup>10</sup> RCW 90.94.030 does not require local jurisdiction approval prior to plan adoption.



### Communication with the media

When speaking to the media or other venues, the Committee members will clearly identify any opinions expressed as their personal opinions and not necessarily those of the other Committee members or the Committee as a whole. The Committee members will not attempt to speak for other members of the group or to characterize the positions of other members to the media or other venues. Comments to the media will be respectful of other Committee members.

Following significant accomplishments, the Committee may request Ecology to issue formal news releases or other media briefing materials. All releases and information given to the media will accurately represent the work of the Committee. Ecology will make every effort to provide the Committee with materials in advance for input, recognizing that media timelines may not allow for adequate review by the Committee.

# Discussion Guide: Projects for Detailed Development, Project List Organization and Offsets by Subbasin

WRIA 15 Committee Meeting August 6, 2020

## Purpose of Discussion

The committee will need to select a subset of projects to develop in detail for consideration of their offset or habitat value for the watershed restoration and enhancement plan. The purpose of today's discussion is to review recent discussions and recommendations from the project workgroup and determine if:

- 1) The committee wants to recommend additional offset or habitat projects for detailed development for inclusion in the watershed plan and if the committee wants to stop development of any projects that don't look promising;
- 2) The committee has recommendations on presentation of the project inventory in the watershed plan; and
- 3) The committee may want to consider a formal commitment to find enough offset projects by subbasin to meet the anticipated consumptive use estimate for that subbasin.

## Background

The Streamflow Restoration law (90.94.030) lays out minimum requirements for watershed plans. The law states that: *"The watershed restoration and enhancement plan should include recommendations for projects and actions that will measure, protect, and enhance instream resources and improve watershed functions that support the recovery of threatened and endangered salmonids. Plan recommendations may include, but are not limited to, acquiring senior water rights, water conservation, water reuse, stream gaging, groundwater monitoring, and developing natural and constructed infrastructure, which includes but is not limited to such projects as floodplain restoration, off-channel storage, and aquifer recharge. Qualifying projects must be specifically designed to enhance streamflows and not result in negative impacts to ecological functions or critical habitat."* (90.94.030 (3)(a)). In addition, *"At a minimum, the plan must include those actions that the committee determines to be necessary to offset potential impacts to instream flows associated with permit-exempt domestic water use."* (90.94.030 (3)(b)). The projects must also meet a net ecological benefit (90.94.030 (3)(c)).

Ecology has hired HDR as the technical consultant firm to support development of components for the plan. HDR is able to support the committee in exploring project ideas, and developing a subset of projects in detail to evaluate their offset or habitat benefit, feasibility for implementation, and alignment to committee priorities. We have budget to develop up to ten projects in detail. (A sample of a detailed project description for the Kingston Wastewater Treatment Plant Reclaimed Water Project is [available here](#).) The consultants are able to gather more information about a larger set of projects to help the committee discern which projects merit detailed development, but the consultants will not be able to develop more than ten projects in detail.

The NEB Guidance states that there is no minimum requirement for the number or distribution of offset projects or actions within each WRIA. Chapter 90.94.030 RCW allows offsets for permit-exempt domestic wells to occur anywhere within a WRIA, provided the watershed plan achieves a NEB within the given WRIA (although the law does state that higher priority is given to projects that occur in the same time and place as the anticipated impact).<sup>1</sup> This means committees have significant latitude to place offset projects at desired locations (e.g. most beneficial to fish, meet local feasibility considerations, etc.) regardless of whether these provide offsets within each of a WRIA's subbasins (NEB Guidance pg.9).

Committees also have full discretion in terms of how they present the project list for the NEB determination as well as for consideration in future funding opportunities. The NEB guidance speaks to three ways of organizing the project list in the watershed plan, which are presented as options and not requirements:

- a. High priority and lower priority: to identify which projects provide water offset "in-time" and "in-place" (higher priority)
- b. Tiering: reflect likelihood of implementation or contribution to achieving NEB, to influence technical consultant focus for project development.
- c. Sequencing: most to least estimated project benefit contributing to achieving NEB, to influence future funding decisions.

The committee can determine the most appropriate way to organize the projects in the watershed plan.

Discussion 1: Does the committee wants to recommend additional offset or habitat projects for detailed development for inclusion in the watershed plan? Does the committee want to stop development of any projects that don't look promising?

The WRIA 15 [Project Inventory](#) currently contains over 120 projects that provide offset or habitat value. The committee has discussed many projects on the list in detail as committee members and partners have brought forward the projects for consideration. At this time, projects will only be removed from the list if they raise a concern from a committee member. The committee needs to identify a subset of

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 90.94.030(3) (b) At a minimum, the plan must include those actions that the committee determines to be necessary to offset potential impacts to instream flows associated with permit-exempt domestic water use. The highest priority recommendations must include replacing the quantity of consumptive water use during the same time as the impact and in the same basin or tributary. Lower priority projects include projects not in the same basin or tributary and projects that replace consumptive water supply impacts only during critical flow periods. The plan may include projects that protect or improve instream resources without replacing the consumptive quantity of water where such projects are in addition to those actions that the committee determines to be necessary to offset potential consumptive impacts to instream flows associated with permit-exempt domestic water use.

(c) Prior to adoption of the watershed restoration and enhancement plan, the department must determine that actions identified in the plan, after accounting for new projected uses of water over the subsequent twenty years, will result in a net ecological benefit to instream resources within the water resource inventory area.

projects that HDR can develop in more detail for further consideration in the plan and their contribution towards offset or habitat improvements.

The workgroup met on June 29 and July 13 to hear updates from the technical consultants on project development. Recommendations for next steps on select projects are included below.

- 1) Current list of project with **completed** [detailed project descriptions](#):
  - a) Kitsap PUD Streamflow Augmentation (Kitsap County – wide): augment streamflow within existing water right.
  - b) Central Kitsap Wastewater Treatment Plant/Silverdale Reclaimed Water Expansion (West Sound and North Hood Canal): expansion of purple pipe with streamflow augmentation and infiltration.
  - c) Kingston Wastewater Treatment Plant Managed Aquifer Recharge (West Sound): use reclaimed water for summer irrigation on the White Horse Golf Course and infiltrate water to benefit Grovers Creek.
- 2) List of **projects to develop in detail** for consideration in the plan:

NOTE: *this list does not consider water right acquisition assessment recommendations forthcoming from PGG; this list can be added to by the committee over the next few months.*

  - a) [Gig Harbor Golf Course Water Use/Artondale Package](#) (South Sound): package of projects to open the floodplain, abandon a surface water diversion, and restore stream and floodplain.
  - b) [Port Orchard Airport Stormwater](#) (South Sound): stormwater collection pond and potential infiltration.
  - c) [Bainbridge Island Storage Projects](#) (M&E Farm, Johnson Farm, Manzanita, Bainbridge Island): multiple storage and infiltration opportunities.
- 3) The following projects are still being **explored** and the consultants will share additional information with the committee as it is available:
  - a) Water rights (WRIA-wide). PGG working on list refinement based on committee feedback.
  - b) Belfair Wastewater Treatment Plant (South Sound). HDR further investigating.
  - c) Winslow Wastewater Treatment Plant (Bainbridge Island). HDR further investigating.
  - d) Mason County rooftop capture and storage (South Hood Canal, South Sound). HDR assessing offset value.
  - e) [Butterworth Dam Removal](#) (South Sound Islands).
- 4) The following projects do not look to be promising and are **not recommended for further development**:
  - a) [Big Beef DNR Parcel Storage Project](#) (North Hood Canal). Due to closures and permitting, this project is unlikely to provide a reliable source of water to provide offset benefits.
  - b) Gold Mountain Golf Course Water Right and Project (on inventory and water rights opportunity list): The City of Bremerton requests removal of this project because they already curtail water use during high demand or water shortage periods and to restrict water use to the minimum needed as determined by evapotranspiration rates and the needs of the species of turf. They are currently negotiating a formalized water conservation plan with the Parks Department.

- 5) The workgroup **does not recommend further detailed development of habitat projects.**<sup>2</sup> However, for the South Sound Islands, there are limited projects identified. If no additional projects are identified that provide direct streamflow benefit, the **following project could be quantified for offset value for the floodplain restoration component:**
- a) [Schoolhouse Creek](#), Anderson Island (South Sound Islands). Floodplain restoration, stream habitat improvements.

### Questions for the Committee

1. Are there any additional projects on the project inventory that should be considered for:
  - a. Further exploration?
  - b. Detailed development?
2. Are there any projects listed above that you don't feel are worth time by the consultants to further explore or develop in detail?
3. Recognizing we have limited budget for developing projects in detail, does the committee want to have any habitat projects developed in detail?
4. Does the committee have any concerns about quantifying the streamflow benefits from the Schoolhouse Creek project if no other offset projects are identified for the South Sound Islands?

### Discussion 2: Does the committee have recommendations on presentation of the project inventory in the watershed plan?

As discussed above, the NEB guidance provides suggestions on ways the committee can organize the project list for presentation in the plan. The workgroup discussed project list organization and suggested the following considerations:

1. Present projects by subbasin.
2. Present projects by project type (e.g. "projects contributing towards offsets" and "projects contributing towards habitat improvements").
3. Describe the likelihood of implementation, sponsorship, funding status, and stage of project development.
4. Present projects in a way that is easy for decision-makers to understand and provide feedback.
5. Retain all projects in the project inventory to include in an appendix.

Additional input from the committee will help with presentation of projects in the August draft plan. Based on suggestions from the workgroup, the following is one example of how we could present the projects.

---

<sup>2</sup> The workgroup feels the projects that primarily provide habitat improvements, and not direct streamflow benefit, are fairly well developed in the project inventory. Technical consultant resources are best spent on development of the offset projects. The workgroup recommends retaining all projects in the project inventory unless a concern is raised about a project.

- A. In Chapter 5 (Projects and Actions) provide a 1-2 paragraph summary of each of the offset projects developed in detail.
- B. In Chapter 5 (Projects and Actions) provide a table of the additional projects that provide streamflow and habitat benefit that developed beyond the conceptual level (e.g. have a description, sponsor, cost estimate, etc). Use the suggestions from the workgroup and committee to inform the table components. **(See some examples of tables following the questions below.)**
- C. In an Appendix, present the full project inventory including projects that are just at the conceptual level.

#### Questions for the Committee

- 1. Does the committee have additional suggestions on project content to include in the body of the plan or appendix?
- 2. Does a mix of paragraph format and table format for the body of the plan work for the committee and your decision makers?

Table 1. Sample table for presentation of projects contributing toward consumptive use offset in the body of the plan.

Project Number	Project Name	Offset Type and brief description	Sub-Basin(s)	Water Offset (Annual AF / cfs)	Projected Timing of Benefit	Additional Benefits	Project Sponsor	Optional Elements (cost, tier, readiness to proceed, priority)
[insert project details]								
	Subtotal By Subbasin							
	WRIA 15 TOTAL WATER OFFSET	Cumulative from above						
	WRIA 15 Consumptive Use Estimate							

Table 2. Sample table for presentation of projects contributing towards habitat improvements in the body of the plan.

Project Number	Project Name	Description	Sub-Basin(s)	Ecological Benefits (included streamflow benefits and timing of benefit if applicable)	Project Sponsor	Optional elements (cost, tier, readiness to proceed, priority)
Reference to project number unique to the plan	List all habitat projects here by subbasin					

### Discussion 3: 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?

As footnoted above, RCW 90.94.030 does not require that offsets be met by subbasin; instead, the offsets and NEB are evaluated at the WRIA scale (although higher priority can be given to projects that are in the same time and same place as the anticipated impacts). (See RCW 90.94.030 3(b) and (c).) Ecology's Final NEB Guidance states, "There is no minimum requirement for the number or distribution of offset projects or actions within each WRIA. Chapter 90.94 RCW allows offsets for permit-exempt domestic wells to occur anywhere within a WRIA, provided the watershed plan achieves a NEB within the given WRIA." (pg 9)

However, the WRIA 15 Committee has discussed a commitment to finding offset projects closest to the anticipated impact (projected permit exempt wells). In the final subbasin technical memo (approved by the committee at the June 2020 committee meeting), it states that the committee agreed to the larger subbasins for WRIA 15 with the following understanding:

- Considerations for subbasins include starting large, using a nesting approach, and ensuring that there is justification for offset projects outside of a subbasin.
- Committed to finding projects closest to the impact and revisiting subbasin delineations throughout the process. (pg 2)

There was discussion at the July 13 workgroup meeting and July 14 committee meeting about making a formal agreement that the committee will find enough offset projects in each subbasin to meet the consumptive use estimate. ***While the Squaxin Island Tribe has withdrawn their request for taking a vote on this subject, we committed to bring this topic up to the committee for further discussion at the August 6 meeting.***

### Questions for the Committee

- 1) Does the committee want to take a formal vote on this issue or is the existing informal commitment to find offset projects closest to impacts sufficient for now?