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# Meeting Agenda and August Meeting Summary

Susan Gulick (Facilitator) reviewed the agenda. *No changes*. Stacy Vynne McKinstry (ECY – Chair) reviewed revisions to the August meeting summary. *Summary approved*.

**Reference Materials**

* [Approved August Meeting Summary](https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/images/WREC/WRIA15/202008/FINALWRIA15_MeetingSummary6August2020.docx)

# Updates and Announcements

Stacy provided the following updates:

* Updated Ecology furlough dates: 9/25/20, 10/30/20, 11/30/20.
* The Adaptive Management sub-group met on 9/2; will discuss later in agenda.
* The Project Workgroup will meet on 9/22 and possibly 9/28 if needed. The meeting(s) will focus on water rights, project list refinement, and projects to include for NEB.

# Plan Development

Ecology is developing a template presentation that Committee members can share with their respective entities, along with the WRIA 15 watershed plan and Committee Brochure. Stacy shared key points for Committee representatives to convey to decision-makers as they start to review the plan include:

* The plan must address indoor and outdoor household water use from new permit-exempt domestic groundwater withdrawals over the 20 year planning horizon: January 19, 2018 – January 18, 2038.
* The plan is required to provide water offset for consumptive use amount and achieve NEB (min. requirement). NEB is evaluated at the WRIA scale.
* The plan must include projects and actions to offset new consumptive water use and the offsets must continue as long as well pumping continues (i.e. projects must provide benefits in perpetuity).
* “Projects and actions identified in watershed plans are not limited to those that can provide strict in-time, in-place offsets, though projects in the same sub-basin or tributary (within the same WRIA), and during the same time that the use occurs are prioritized” (NEB Guidance).
* Plan does not obligate entities to implement projects or actions, but entities can self-obligate and the Committee may make recommendations.
* All Committee members must vote to approve the plan in order for it to go to Ecology for review, NEB determination and considered for adoption. If the Committee does not approve the plan, Ecology finishes the plan, submits to SRFB for technical review, finalizes the plan, and then the Director may initiate rulemaking. Rulemaking is a statewide process, open to statewide input.

Stacy reviewed outstanding comments on Chapters 1 and 4 in detail (see discussion below). The Committee will continue to work on additional plan elements till early November. A second (complete) draft plan will be shared in early November with a quick review turnaround. We are aiming for finalized draft available in early December for local review and approval process.

**Reference Materials**

* [WRIA 15 2020 Work Plan](https://app.box.com/s/bs8f08neukdjr45jsxq1452xstiw0pte)
* [Local Approval Process for WRE Plan](https://app.box.com/s/jy6iacdzgz6iho4zlfb5hqd99y0yvhi2)
* [WRIA 15 WRE Committee Brochure](https://app.box.com/s/suf3o9q4q9v65mbkqxvwrrl2op9hbxcw)
* Template presentation (in development)
* [Discussion Guide: Proposed Revisions to WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Chapters 1 and 4](https://app.box.com/s/d3g4zqcp6t37d5oq4p2z4e4rrl0q8mk2)

**Discussion (by proposed revision):**

* **Pierce County: Line 62** – “*All projections have uncertainty because they incorporate assumptions...could it be written because of the nature of the assumptions...or to recognize the effect of the assumptions?*”
	+ Committee did not object to this revision. Stacy will address with other considerations (see below) on uncertainties and limitations.
* **WDFW: Line 72** – “*Concur with Squaxin Tribe that a high growth scenario should be considered for Mason Co. The County's justification was that they have not seen that level of growth in WRIA 15 historically and that soil conditions and critical areas will limit development. However, using historic trends in Mason Co seem unreliable. Kitsap County home prices have increased, and developable lands inventory is growing slim. Mason County (Belfair Area) is a likely next area for development, and development on constrained parcels can still be allowed through variances and reasonable use exemptions.*”
	+ **Squaxin Island Tribe** would like the committee to further discuss how a safety factor could address concerns around uncertainty of growth/other projections.
	+ **Mason County** would like to use the medium growth projection to align with their Comprehensive Plan. They would not consider a safety factor in addition to using the high growth projections. **Kitsap County** agrees.
	+ **Ecology** will highlight unresolved considerations in plan. As the Committee continues to discuss projects, they will revisit potential safety factors and choice of growth projections in broader context of the consumptive use and projects chapter (further discussion in October).
* **WDFW: Line 81** – “*A section discussing the uncertainties and limitations of these assumptions would be useful (like you have for the consumptive use section). For example, zoning is subject to change (and does frequently). A more conservative approach would be to include commercial and industrial zoned parcels in unincorporated areas, as these are sometimes downgraded to residential zoning.*”
	+ **King County’s** PE well growth projections were 83% greater than the actual number of PE wells installed from Jan 2018 to June 2020.
	+ **Kitsap County** noted residential zoning in rural areas requires a Comprehensive Plan change (not something that happens ad-hoc).
	+ **Suquamish Tribe** noted to be compliant with the Growth Management Act, most growth should be focused in Urban Growth Areas, which would be on public water systems. Don’t imply unrestricted rural growth in WRE Plan.
	+ **Pierce County’s** projection methods did not rely on underlying zoning information, just historic PE well trends.
	+ **Mason County** does not support including this language in WRE Plan.
	+ **Ecology** will discuss with technical consultants and county reps to work on language. Stacy will address with other considerations on uncertainties and limitations. We want to recognize assumptions to inform future adaptive management but we do not want to undermine our plan by including so many caveats.
* **PGST: Line 204** – “*We need to acknowledge the uncertainty in the assumption that 90% of indoor use returns to the 'immediate water environment' via septic drain field. While the water may enter the drain field and soak into the ground, it is likely that water would travel laterally once it encounters a low permeability layer. There is little evidence that 90% of the water is subsequently contributing to streamflow or is recharging aquifers which supply wells*.”
	+ **PGST** would like to acknowledge the assumption that indoor water use is 10% consumptive because it is not well verified in literature. Include language explaining this is a working number and additional context.
	+ **Ecology** recommends using the 10% assumption (aligned with USGS).
	+ **City of Port Orchard** suggested including a statement in the Adaptive Management chapter of the plan to address PGST’s concern (i.e., if better data/assumptions emerge).
	+ **Pierce County** would like to avoid undermining the plan with caveats on every number included in plan (all estimates). **Mason County** agrees.
	+ **Squaxin Island Tribe** believes it’s scientifically robust and transparent to document assumptions – a list of terms used could be noted. The projection of consumptive use for the next 20 years is a critical item, although in the end the entire plan is a package where consumptive use is balanced with projects, policies, and adaptive management.
	+ **Skokomish Tribe** would like to strike a balance between including context on assumptions and not undermining plan.
	+ **Ecology** will work with technical consultants to discuss how the Adaptive Management chapter could address some of these concerns. Stacy will include clear statement around the assumptions and resources.
* **PGST: Line 210** – “*add "metered water use is paid for by the gallon, often with increasing rates for higher water use tiers. The cost factor of water use is implicit to the USGS groundwater model method. Permit exempt wells are unmetered, and therefore it is reasonable to assume those would use more than a metered user where cost is a factor."*”
	+ **Ecology** will note the USGS model uses metered water system data.
* **WDFW: Line 214 –** *“Additional elements of the outdoor irrigated method that may reasonably influence the final estimated average irrigate acreage should be discussed in this section. Currently, this section only describes two aspects of the methodology that contribute to the general uncertainty of outdoor irrigated acreage estimates: (1) a small sample size, and (2) assumptions of irrigation rates and efficiencies. While this does not need to be an exhaustive list, the overarching assumptions and uncertainties of the technical approach should be described. Other points of uncertainty within the method may include: counting parcels with no visible irrigation as a zero value, suitability of the method in heavily treed areas or parcels without irrigated lawns, and a lack of field validation to confirm the accuracy of estimates.”*
	+ **Ecology** will flag comment for consideration as part of overall uncertainty/assumptions discussion (potentially include/acknowledge in Adaptive Management chapter). See notes above.
* **PGST: Line 234** – “*In reality, households apply water to their lawns and gardens in many different ways. Some outdoor irrigation methods may be more efficient than a 25 percent water loss and some may be less efficient. For example, rotary spray heads are more efficient than misting heads, but less efficient than drip systems.*”
	+ The Committee agreed to include an overarching statement/language in the plan that broadly addresses uncertainties, assumptions, averages, and past trends used to develop estimates in the plan (potentially in Adaptive Management chapter). See relevant comments and notes above.
* **Pierce County: Line 236** – “*Our Director has asked on several occasions for a breakdown of per-connection use in gallons per day (GPD). Is it possible to incorporate a figure in this chapter that summarizes the per-connection use in gallons per day, broken out by indoor, outdoor, and total use for both the proposed CU methods? It would be helpful context for our decision makers.*”
	+ Committee did not object to this revision. Ecology will work with technical consultants to include additional presentations of data.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe: Lines 5-7** - “*Lines 5-7 misinterpret the plain language of RCW 90.94.030(3)(e) by restricting estimates to new domestic permit-exempt wells. The statute’s plain language requires estimates of all new cumulative consumptive water use impacts over 20 years, “including” permit-* *exempt withdrawals. This underestimate calls into question the entirety of Chapter 4 and undermines the statutory mandate to restore and enhance streamflows.”*
	+ **Ecology** will work with tribes (and other entities if applicable) to discuss how to capture different interpretations of the law.
* **Squaxin Island Tribe:** “*Some explanation should be provided for what "low, medium, and high" represent. I'd suggest: "low estimates are based on assuming that estimates may be overestimates of future growth. Medium estimates are the Committee's most likely scenario. High estimates are intended to represent future conditions producing higher growth than the assumptions for medium growth."*”
	+ **Kitsap, Mason, and Pierce Counties** object to this framing/language.
		- For Kitsap, “high” and “low” estimates are an assumed +/- 5% margin of error from the actual growth target (“medium”).
		- Mason County uses OFM’s medium growth projections.
		- Pierce County’s estimates are based on a set period of time in the past.
	+ **Squaxin Island Tribe** noted that there was a distinction between how the numbers were developed versus what they mean for our projections to the future.
	+ **Ecology** will work with technical consultants and counties to ensure high, medium, and low are accurately defined for each county. There remains an outstanding comment on whether we include a general description/definition for how we are presenting the high/med/low scenarios in the plan.

*The Committee ran short on time for this discussion and will continue to discuss open comments on Chapter 4 during the October Committee meeting.*

# Projects

Stacy provided an update on **water right acquisition opportunities**:

* Ecology received draft descriptions for 13 water rights from PGG last week.
* Committee members need to review and flag (1) concerns; (2) which rights to move forward.
* Ecology Water Resources staff are reviewing for red flags, but PGG believes these 13 have the best potential. Joy (KCD) shared that a number of the water rights are of concern because they are in use for agriculture. Stacy will follow up with Joy.
* Ecology is working with King County to identify more opportunities on Vashon-Maury.
* Current list is speculative; looking for committee feedback before discussing with landowners.

Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA) provided updates on several projects:

* **Bellfair Wastewater Treatment Plant**: technical team had a call with Mason County and Squaxin Island Tribe to discuss. Belfair has Class A wastewater treatment and currently sprays the water onto a field adjacent to the treatment plant. Technical team is reviewing to determine whether this water could provide an offset (increasing infiltration or exchanging for a current water right).
* **Winslow Wastewater Treatment Plant**: the City of Bainbridge Island needs to upgrade this WWTP to meet new discharge requirements for Puget Sound. Potential to use treated wastewater on island to offset/replace current recharge. In preliminary development (no timeframe for implementation yet).
* **Bear Creek Forest Stand Rotation**: Great Peninsula Conservancy is considering acquiring forested areas with intent to increase rotation from 40 years to 80+ years (or place into permanent trust). GPC interested in acquiring parcels in Newbury Woods and Bear Creek. Under initial discussion and review (project limitations).
* **Mason County Rooftop Infiltration**: under review by Mason County. Stacy will distribute when ready.
* **Miller Road MAR project:** location of project is close to the mouth of Manzanita Creek and Puget Sound. Need to determine benefit to streamflow given proximity to Sound (how to translate into PE well offsets).
* **M&E Farms Storage MAR project:** preferred to downstream Miller Road MAR project (more benefits to streamflow, no water rights issues, captures stormwater recharge).

Two projects in the inventory were flagged by Ecology Water Resources staff as **potential Foster conflicts (source switches in closed basins)**. Stacy is working with technical consultants and project proponents to attempt to revise, but may need to drop projects:

* **Gig Harbor Golf Course/ Artondale Creek:** surface to groundwater change is challenging to approve without mitigation to account for new hits on the stream that will now be felt during the non-irrigation season (if the surface water body is either closed or instream regulated). Depending on the depth of the new well and the distance from the original point of diversion, there may be new impacts on adjacent regulated water bodies that could make processing difficult.
* **Johnson Farm, Bainbridge Island**: no immediate water right processing concerns associated with the stormwater management/infiltration/MAR part of the proposal. The surface to groundwater challenges may face the same challenges as described in the Gig Harbor project above, depending on the regulated status of the subbasin where the pond is located (i.e., where would the water go if it were not collected in the pond) and the distance from the diversion location and well depth for the new point of withdrawal. It’s likely that this could impair adjacent regulated water bodies and therefore require mitigation.

Joel Purdy (KPUD) provided an update on the **KPUD stream augmentation project:**

* KPUD has put forward a project to augment streamflow at several potential sites. KPUD would add water to streams within their service are using their existing water rights (spans across the watershed). Diverts groundwater that would otherwise have gone to homes indirectly into streams, especially during summer low flows. Supports fish and habitat.

**Reference Materials**

* [Updates on water rights](https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15WRAcquisitionsAssess)
* [Updates on detailed project descriptions](https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15DetailedProjectDescr)
* [KPUD stream augmentation project](https://app.box.com/s/g8y3jfs0dfsqbu5jrztrildnll6ag4mm)
* [Status of projects and offsets by subbasin](https://app.box.com/s/5ednny272a3q8aq2pjc13nl611rleydx)

**Discussion**

* **Suquamish Tribe** has concerns (temperature / personal care products) with direct discharge of purple pipe water to streams/wetlands. For augmentation, water should be infiltrated (not injected). It needs to be Class A water. Tribe is on the fence regarding augmentation projects (ok if infiltration happens prior to augmentation). Uncertain about offset estimates.
* **City of Port Orchard** noted data related to contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) and their effects on aquatic systems is limited. Regarding infiltration, the vadose zone needs to be deep enough to provide adequate treatment for recycled water to prevent groundwater contamination.
* **Belfair Wastewater Treatment Plant**:
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe noted that this project has two components (1) increasing the amount of infiltration the plant provides and (2) increasing the number of hookups. To get infiltration benefits, need more hookups. Need details on where industrial plant operates for a potential “purple pipe” project. Maybe also talk to the fish center to see if there is a source replacement opportunity.
	+ Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA) noted Mason County is concerned with cost as they are already struggling to pay for an expensive facility.
	+ Anchor QEA is meeting with Mason County to follow up. Stacy can follow up with Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group if appropriate to discuss the water rights.
	+ Could be included in plan as a potential future project if information is not gathered in time for approval.
* **Mason County Rooftop Infiltration**:
	+ Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA) noted the potential offsets from this project are “above and beyond” what is required by Ecology’s stormwater manual (outside of UGAs/urbanized areas based on population density). Mason County has not adopted Ecology’s stormwater manual for rural areas.
	+ HDR and Mason County are working together on offset estimates. Ecology will circulate the technical memo on this proposal with additional detail when it’s ready.
* **Gig Harbor Golf Course:**
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe identified potential for a restoration project on nearby patch of unused land (e.g., mini MAR; reduce summer pumping by storing water from winter in pond from winter).
		- Bob Montgomery (Anchor QEA) noted the golf course does have a pond to pump to / pump out of but unsure how it affects diversion.
	+ Ecology noted this project could be retained on inventory as a potential option if the law changes in the future.
* **Skokomish / Bremerton projects:**
	+ The City of Bremerton was approached by Skokomish Tribe and Aspect Consulting to determine feasibility of reclaimed water and stormwater infiltration projects in the city. High salinity is a challenge for reclaimed water projects, based on feasibility studies. The City is open to further conversations with Aspect and Skokomish Tribe.
	+ Skokomish Tribe and Aspect also in preliminary conversations with Gold Mountain Golf Course (owned by City).
	+ Suquamish Tribe requested to be included in reclaimed water discussions within the City of Bremerton (within the Tribe’s U&A).
* **KPUD stream augmentation project:**
	+ Great Peninsula Conservancy is looking to acquire 240 acre parcel on Little Anderson Creek. KPUD noted this parcel would be relevant to the Silverdale reclaimed water expansion project.
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe is concerned by potential far field effects of groundwater (i.e., augmenting one creek/subbasin but creating problems for others). Similar to the issue raised with Artondale Creek project. Also, trying to offset PE wells by pumping from a deeper well with broader effects, using inchoate water rights, is like “robbing Peter to pay Paul”. Suggest keeping on list but with Committee concerns noted. More discussion is needed.
		- Ecology did not identify red flags from a water resources/rights perspective; KPUD would be using existing water right (contrary to Artondale source switch). KPUD has a water right in good standing and could choose to serve more customers with it or augment streamflow (volunteering to augment streamflow). Augmentation considered a municipal purpose (not change in use designation).
	+ Skokomish supports clean, usable water being discharged to Little Anderson Creek (has salmon streams) as a benefit to the North Hood Canal subbasin (short on projects). However, concerned about using groundwater to make up for impacts happening currently or future. Support reusing water; deeper aquifer needs protection.
	+ Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe supports this project; small quantity relative to what’s already being produced out of the same aquifer.
	+ Suquamish Tribe noted the annual cost of this project was estimated to be $8,000 per year and KPUD is willing to cover costs after 20 years. How would this agreement be memorialized? KPUD unsure at this time.
	+ Kitsap County is on the fence; comes across as band-aid solution that does not address the core problems causing degradation of streamflow. Concerned about potential long-term consequences and public perception.
	+ WDFW also on fence; will need to check with headquarters.
	+ Ecology will work on developing a discussion guide with additional context to help address concerns at October Committee meeting and determine whether or not to include the project for its offset benefits.
* **Project Inventory**:
	+ Kitsap County proposed including a section in plan for projects considered but not selected for inclusion in the WRE Plan, with rationale. List would be available for reference/consideration in future.
		- Ecology envisions the body of the Plan including a summary of projects needed to meet offset and NEB requirements (approved by Committee) but retaining the full project inventory in appendix to potentially pursue in future.
	+ Kitsap Conservation District has five additional raingarden/stormwater projects for consideration in the West Sound Subbasin. Joy to connect with Stacy and Burt.
		- Kitsap County would support measurable water infiltration; (voluntary) retroactive fixes on existing properties.
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe requested additional detail on how offsets were calculated and how uncertainty was addressed for projects in inventory. Concerned by list of projects in South Sound (a lot of uncertainty).
		- Ecology can circulate detailed project descriptions for feedback. Some numbers are a “best guess”. Ecology wants “reasonable assurance”. Committee must determine and agree upon reasonable offset assumptions for inclusion in plan. Current offset benefits based on best professional judgement and available resources.

# Adaptive Management

The Committee discussed the key sections of the Adaptive Management Chapter, drafted based on 9/2 Adaptive Management Subgroup meeting.

**Reference Materials**

* [Adaptive Management Chapter Draft](https://app.box.com/s/i3ha8fhqaxi6cvgghrtxby0khnj9rxjr)

**Discussion**

* **Project, Policy, and PE Well Tracking**
	+ The Committee does not support putting the burden of WRE Plan project related data stewardship on Salmon Recovery Lead Entities.
		- Squaxin Island Tribe believes the Committee needs to decide who the data steward might be. This could be linked to the question of an implementation group.
	+ Ecology will clarify the questions from the Adaptive Management Subgroup / Committee with WDFW (Tristan) regarding the Salmon Recovery Portal (SRP):
		- Will SRP include measuring project effectiveness (i.e. estimating offset)?
		- How will the data stewards be funded/maintained over the long-term?
		- Who will manage this effort over the long-term? Is WDFW prepared to do that?
		- How easy will it be to download information from the SRP to include in the WREC reports (see below)?
* **Monitoring & Research**
	+ Susan will continue drafting this section of the chapter.
* **Reporting**
	+ Susan will update draft to remove language implying any additional work for counties. Updated language will simply acknowledge what reporting counties are already required to do under the law. If Committee members would like counties to do additional reporting, those members need to propose language to be discussed by the Committee. Recommendation will focus on how Ecology should compile and present the information provided by counties.
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe disagrees with removing a county role for reporting. They may submit recommendations for additional county reporting for Committee review.
* **Oversight & Adaptation**
	+ Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe would like a reference to reviewing streamflow status and trends in this section (every five years). Sam Phillips noted that the monitoring component refers to collection of data while the adaptation piece includes the review of that data to determine whether goals are being met and taking action as needed.
	+ The Committee supports continuing to convene the participating WRIA 15 Committee entities regular (predetermined intervals). Facilitation team will work on updating language in draft chapter with planned (1) brief annual meetings (by phone); (2) more in-depth meetings every five years; and (3) examples of what would be covered at each interval. The Committee may decide to meet more frequently during annual and 5-year check-ins.
		- Mason County supports an entity like the Chehalis Basin Partnership leading this effort going forward.
	+ Kitsap County requested more specificity in Table 2 (first row) on what counties are expected to provide input on.
	+ Pierce County is interested in determining the process for amending plans into the future. Ecology noted that while no action is *required* after June 2021, nothing holds the Committee back from meeting in the future or self-obligating. WRE Plans for WRIAs 1 & 59 had reporting requirements but did not include consequences for failing to meet requirements. The WRIA 15 Committee, however, could make a recommendation.
* **Funding**
	+ The Committee needs to have a discussion on funding (in addition to this request to the legislature) for plan implementation. Items to be discussed include (1) increasing fees for wells; (2) inter-local agreements.
	+ The Committee requested removal of language asking the legislature to provide a structure to monitor plan implementation.

# Policy Recommendations

Stacy noted that including policy and adaptive management recommendations in the WRE Plan is above and beyond the requirements of the law and puts the Committee at risk of not reaching completing the plan or reaching agreement (due to the time needed to negotiate and work through concerns). Proposed next steps for policy and adaptive management proposals (based on survey results):

* **Proposals with no issues flagged by Committee** were included in draft plan (only the well tracking database improvements proposal fell into this category).
* **Proposals flagged by Committee for refinement** will need collective input. The Committee and facilitator will work on revisions to the extent there is time for review during October and November Committee meetings. Stacy and Susan will work on revisions and bring back to the Committee for discussion in October.
* **Proposals with red flags/blocks from Committee** will no longer have dedicated Committee meeting time for discussion. Proposal proponent can work one on one with the entities that flagged the proposal and bring the revised proposal back to the committee in October or November if concerns are resolved.

**Reference Materials**

* [WRIA 15 Policy Proposal Tracker](https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15ProposalTracker)
* [Summary of Survey Results](https://app.box.com/s/jk1b2xn3tj9n8810owgk2k5rrka7b965)

**Discussion**

* Squaxin Island Tribe’s “County Policies to Promote Connections to Group A systems” proposal was not included in the survey. Paul Pickett will send an email with the proposal to the Committee asking for input.
* Squaxin Island Tribe asked if entities who expressed “blocks” on proposals were willing to continue discussions.
	+ Several members said they would be willing to discuss them.
	+ Members discussed the idea of a subgroup meeting to continue discussion on proposals.
	+ Squaxin Island Tribe will pursue 1:1 conversations before the subgroup meeting.
	+ Ecology and Susan will work on next steps.

***Update since the Committee meeting***

* *Ecology/facilitation team will distribute an invite to full committee for 9/28 to determine whether the proposals (1) can be revised and included in the Plan or (2) should be removed from list. Attendance from proposal proponents and Committee members who opposed the proposals especially important.]*

# Public Comment

No public comment.

# Upcoming Meetings

* Next Committee meeting: Thursday, October 1, 2020, 9:30 a.m., Webex
* The Project Workgroup will meet on 9/22 and possibly 9/28 if needed. The meeting(s) will focus on water rights, project list refinement, and projects to include for NEB.
* Policy/Adaptive Management proposal discussion on 9/28 to determine whether the proposals (1) can be revised and included in the Plan or (2) should be removed from list.

# Action Items for Committee Members

* Review and provide comments on Draft WRE Plan by 9/21/20.
* Paul Pickett to send email with Squaxin’s “County Policies to Promote Connections to Group A systems” proposal to the Committee asking for input.

# Action Items for Ecology and Consultants

* Distribute Mason County’s checklist for approving/not approving policy and adaptive management proposals in WRE Plan.
* Update WRE Plan Chapters 1 and 4 based on Committee feedback.
* Update Adaptive Management Chapter Draft.
* Once competitive streamflow grants are awarded, share with the Committee whether the Nisqually application to fund planning was selected.
* Develop KPUD stream augmentation project discussion guide for October Committee meeting.
* Stacy and Burt to connect with Joy/Kitsap Conservation District on additional projects for consideration in the West Sound Subbasin.
* Provide detail on how project offsets were calculated in inventory (i.e., detailed project descriptions).