



AGENDA

WRIA 15 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Special Committee Meeting

October 29, 2020 | 9:30 a.m.-12:30 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
- Discussion Guides: Consumptive Use and NEB Evaluation
- Revised Chapter 6 Adaptive Management Section
- Project Updates and Recommendations Memo

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

9:30 a.m. | 10 minutes | Susan Gulick

Consumptive Use and NEB Evaluation

9:40 a.m. | 40 minutes | Stacy Vynne, Susan Gulick, All | Discussion

Handout: [Discussion Guides on Consumptive Use and NEB Evaluation](#)

- Options for how to present consumptive use in the plan
 - Input on proposed options and prepare for decision in November
 - Possible straw poll
- Addition input on approach to NEB chapter
- Next steps

Adaptive Management and Other Policy Recommendations

10:20 a.m. | 45 minutes | Susan Gulick, All | Discussion

Handout: [Updated Adaptive Management Section](#)

- Review and provide feedback on updates to Adaptive Management section
- Review any new policy proposals where proponents and opponents have new language for committee consideration
- Next steps

BREAK

Background Materials on Plan Development

11:10 a.m. | 30 minutes | Susan Gulick, Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion

- Discuss options on how to present background materials on plan development and consensus building
- Discuss options on how to present different interpretations of the law
- Updated plan development and review timeline
- Next steps

Projects Update

11:40 a.m. | 45 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion

Handout: [Project Updates and Recommendations](#)

- Update and recommendations based on project workgroup discussions
- Next steps to finalize Chapter 5 and project list

Closing and Next Steps

12:25 p.m. | 5 minutes | Stacy Vynne, All | Discussion

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

<p>WebEx Information</p> <p>WRIA 15 Special Committee Meeting Meeting number: 133 344 7913 Password: WRIA15Comm JOIN WEBEX</p>	<p>Join by phone</p> <p>+1-415-655-0001 US Toll +1-206-207-1700 United States Toll (Seattle) Access code: 133 344 7913</p>
---	--

WRIA 15 Discussion Guide: Consumptive Use Estimate

October 22, 2020

Purpose

The purpose of this discussion guide is to summarize the current status of consumptive use estimates and determine a path forward for the watershed plan. This discussion guide provides updated recommendations based on committee discussion at the October 1 committee meeting. The chair requests a decision from the committee no later than November 5, 2020 on how to address consumptive use in the watershed plan.

Background

A summary of where the committee stands on the consumptive use decision is presented in the [discussion guide](#) from the October 1, 2020 meeting. Based on previous conversations, we've narrowed it down to three choices for how to move forward.

First choice is to use the medium growth projection for the irrigated area method - 766.4 acre feet per year. While many committee representatives support using the USGS method, they've indicated they are willing to live with the higher number. The medium growth projection scenario is the most likely growth projection and is what counties are planning towards. Some members of the committee believe that the irrigated area method has a 'safety factor' built in already, and therefore a higher growth scenario under this method would be overly inflated.

Pros: Other committees are using the irrigated area method to generate a consumptive use estimate, so this approach would be consistent with other watershed plans. This approach is a compromise between committee members that may want to use the USGS method to calculate a consumptive use estimate and committee members that may want to go above and beyond the high end of the irrigated area method. Using a single number provides a clear requirement for our offset needs.

Cons: This approach is a compromise, and may not meet the needs or interests of all committee members. If growth and associated consumptive use exceed the projections, adaptive management may be necessary to increase offset benefits.

Second choice is to provide a range to incorporate the interests across the committee and the different methods and growth projections.

Pros: This approach can help reflect the interests of all committee members to incorporate the results of the different methods. This approach may also better represent the inherent uncertainty of our growth projections and consumptive use estimates.

Cons: This approach may be confusing to decision makers and reviewers of the watershed plan, as it does not provide a clear consumptive use estimate for which our projects must offset. This approach may leave some of the decision making to Ecology through the NEB determination.

Third choice is to not provide a consumptive use estimate (i.e. remain silent on a single number or specific range). The [current draft of Chapter 4](#) of the WRIA 15 watershed plan presents two methods for calculating consumptive use estimates, and a range of estimates based on the various growth projection scenarios.

Pros: This approach can help reflect the interests of all committee members to incorporate the results of the different methods. This approach may also better represent the inherent uncertainty of our growth projections and consumptive use estimates. This approach may also be appropriate if the committee cannot reach agreement on a single estimate or range.

Cons: This approach may be confusing to decision makers and reviewers of the watershed plan, as it does not provide a clear consumptive use estimate for which our projects must offset. This approach may leave some of the decision making to Ecology through the NEB determination (i.e. less deference to the committee). In addition, this approach will reflect that our committee was unable to reach consensus on a legislative requirement of the watershed plan.

References

- Table 1 (end of document) shows the current WRIA 15 consumptive use estimate range for the **USGS Groundwater Method** using various PE well projections. The range is between **408.4 to 516.9 acre feet per year of consumptive use** from new PE wells by 2038.
- Table 2 (end of document) shows the current WRIA 15 consumptive use estimate range for the **Irrigated Area Method** using various PE well projections. The range is between **669.1 to 846.8 acre feet per year of consumptive use** from new PE wells by 2038.
- [Current draft of Chapter 4 is available on Box.](#)

Questions for Committee Members

How does the committee want to present the consumptive use estimate in the WRIA 15 watershed plan?

1. Could you support a consumptive use estimate of **766.4 acre feet per year** (irrigated area method, medium growth projection)?
2. If no to #1, could you support a **range, and if so, which of the options below?**
 - i. 408.4 to 846.8 acre feet per year (low growth scenarios/USGS method - high growth scenario/irrigated area method)
 - ii. 669.1 to 846.8 acre feet per year (low - high growth scenarios / irrigated area method)
 - iii. 467.8 to 766.4 acre feet per year (med growth scenario/USGS method – med growth scenario/irrigated area method)
 - iv. Do you want to provide direction to Ecology on how to apply the range in the NEB determination?
3. If you do not want to select a single number or range, or cannot reach agreement, would you prefer to leave Chapter 4 as is, in which we present the different growth projection scenarios and methods for calculating consumptive use, but do not state a consumptive use estimate?
 - i. If so, we will include a statement that the committee was unable to reach a decision on consumptive use estimate and therefore is presenting all of the information for the reviewers to consider.
 - ii. The committee will discuss if they want to direct Ecology to specific considerations in their review of the plan.

Next Steps

1. Committee members to decide on how to present consumptive use estimates in the watershed plan.
2. Stacy revises Chapter 4 of the watershed plan accordingly.

Table 1: Indoor and Outdoor Consumptive Use Estimates by Subbasin: Projections for the USGS Groundwater Model Method

Subbasin	Low-Growth Projection				Medium-Growth Projection				High-Growth Projection			
	Projected PE wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038	Projected PE Wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038	Projected PE wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038
West Sound	1,142	21.1	74.8	95.9	1,336	24.7	87.6	112.2	1,403	25.9	91.9	117.9
North Hood Canal	561	10.4	36.8	47.1	656	12.1	43.0	55.1	689	12.7	45.2	57.9
South Hood Canal	1,119	20.7	73.3	94.0	1,126	20.8	73.8	94.6	1,128	20.8	73.9	94.8
Bainbridge Island	491	9.1	32.2	41.3	491	9.1	32.2	41.3	516	9.5	33.8	43.4
South Sound	1,158	21.4	75.9	97.3	1,553	28.7	101.8	130.5	1,992	36.8	130.5	167.4
Vashon-Maury Island	368	6.8	24.1	30.9	368	6.8	24.1	30.9	368	6.8	24.1	30.9
McNeil Island, Anderson Island, Ketron Island	22	0.4	1.4	1.8	38	0.7	2.5	3.2	56	1.0	3.7	4.7
Total	4,861	89.8	318.6	408.4	5,568	102.9	364.9	467.8	6152	113.7	403.2	516.9

Table 2: Indoor and Outdoor Consumptive Use Estimates by Subbasin: Projections for the Irrigated Area Method

Subbasin	Low-Growth Projection				Medium-Growth Projection				High-Growth Projection			
	Projected PE wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038	Projected PE wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038	Projected PE wells	Indoor CU (AF/yr)	Outdoor CU (AF/yr)	Total CU (AF/yr) in 2038
West Sound	1,142	19.2	138.0	157.2	1,336	22.4	161.4	183.9	1,403	23.6	169.5	193.1
North Hood Canal	561	9.4	67.8	77.2	656	11.0	79.3	90.3	689	11.6	83.3	94.8
South Hood Canal	1,119	18.8	135.2	154.0	1,126	18.9	136.1	155.0	1,128	19.0	136.3	155.3
Bainbridge Island	491	8.3	59.3	67.6	491	8.3	59.3	67.6	516	8.7	62.4	71.0
South Sound	1,158	19.5	139.9	159.4	1,553	26.1	187.7	213.8	1,992	33.5	240.7	274.2
Vashon-Maury Island	368	6.2	44.5	50.7	368	6.2	44.5	50.7	368	6.2	44.5	50.7
McNeil Island, Anderson Island, Ketron Island	22	0.4	2.7	3.0	38	0.6	4.6	5.2	56	0.9	6.8	7.7
Total	4,861	81.7	587.4	669.1	5,568	93.6	672.8	766.4	6,152	103.4	743.4	846.8

WRIA 15 Discussion Guide: Structure for the NEB Evaluation (Chapter 7) in the Watershed Plan

October 22, 2020

Purpose of Discussion

The purpose of the discussion is to determine the structure for the NEB evaluation in the WRIA 15 watershed plan.

Background

Ecology is required to complete a review of each watershed plan to determine whether it meets NEB (Net Ecological Benefit). To meet the NEB threshold, plans must demonstrate that offsets from projects and actions exceed projected consumptive use from new permit-exempt domestic groundwater withdrawals over the planning horizon.

At the October 1 meeting, the WRIA 15 Committee expressed support for preparing the NEB evaluation in the WRIA 15 watershed plan. By including the evaluation, Ecology will give considerable deference to our committee to decide what NEB means for our watershed.

In the [NEB guidance](#), Ecology recommends steps for planning groups to complete the NEB evaluation¹:

- Compare consumptive water use to water offset benefits generated by projects and actions at the WRIA scale.
- Compare consumptive water use to offsets within each subbasin.
- Identify the projects and actions that go beyond the needed offset in order to achieve NEB.
- Include a clear statement that the committee finds that the combined components of the plan do or do not achieve a NEB.
- If desired, include adaptive management.

[Sample Chapters from WRIAs 8 and 9](#) were provided as a completed example of this approach (note that these are draft chapters and are actively undergoing revisions by the committees).

Planning groups may choose not to include a NEB evaluation. Ecology will review plans that do not include a NEB evaluation, as well as any plans that include a NEB evaluation that does not meet the standards described in the NEB guidance.

Proposal by the Squaxin Island Tribe as an Alternative NEB Evaluation

The Squaxin Island Tribe proposes the following process as an alternative to the steps outlined in Ecology's [NEB guidance](#):

7.2 Evaluation of Quantitative Streamflow Benefits to Offset Projected Consumptive Use

- Compare the total WRIA offset to the total WRIA consumptive use estimate.
- Compare the total WRIA offset to the safety factor/offset target if applicable.
- Determine if the plan has succeeded in offsetting the impacts at the WRIA level.
- Compare the offset to the consumptive use estimate by subbasin.
- Evaluate the factors increasing the likelihood of, or creating barriers to, the project being completed as planned.

¹ This is a summary. For details, see the Final NEB Guidance page 14.

- Evaluate the benefits of the projects to the key ecological functions.
 - Specifically evaluate if the plan will result in increases in streamflow, and if those increases in streamflow occur where salmon habitat will benefit.
- Evaluate potential negative impacts of projects to key ecological functions.
 - Specifically evaluate where the implementation of the plan is unlikely to improve streamflows, and the salmon habitat impacted in these areas.
- Determine if benefits are likely to occur and exceed negative impacts, in order to contribute to a net ecological benefit.

7.3 Evaluation of Projects that Improve Habitat to Meet NEB

- Summarize types of habitat projects, and the anticipated benefits and potential impacts to ecological functions.
- Summarize the distribution of projects among the subbasins and streams, and the specific benefits and impacts to ecological functions.
- Evaluate the factors increasing the likelihood of, or creating barriers to, the project being completed as planned.
- Evaluate the benefits of the projects to the key ecological functions.
- Evaluate potential negative impacts of projects to key ecological functions.
- Determine if benefits exceed negative impacts, are likely to occur, and provide a net ecological benefit.

7.4 Policies and regulatory actions

- Evaluate the extent of benefits to ecological functions that policies and regulatory actions provide.
- Evaluate negative impacts to ecological functions from policies and regulatory actions.
- Compare benefits to negative impacts and assess net benefits.

7.5 Adaptive Management

- Reference Chapter 6 and evaluate:
 - Where ESA listed or Treaty protected species are present, is the plan “precautionary” where there is uncertainty, i.e., is it skewed in favor of the species?
 - Does the adaptive management component of the plan increase certainty of achieving NEB?
 - How do different levels of implementation (little, partial, full) affect the ability to achieve NEB?

7.6 NEB Evaluation Findings

- Overall NEB for the Plan:
 - Compare net benefits for all projects together
 - Evaluate added net benefits of policy and regulatory actions
 - Compare the location and extent of areas where streamflow improvement is expected versus areas without streamflow improvements, in terms streams where the salmon habitat will improve, or streams lacking benefits.

- Evaluate the likelihood of implementation and if NEB is met at different levels of implementation.
 - Determine if the Plan, under likely levels of implementation, will meet the goal of streamflow restoration.
- Provide a summary of the results of the analysis. Include a clear statement of the Committee’s finding that the combined components of the plan, if implemented, do or do not achieve a NEB, and the level of implementation necessary to achieve NEB. For example: “The WRIA 15 Committee finds that this plan achieves a net ecological benefit, as required by RCW 90.94.030 and defined by the Final NEB Guidance (Ecology 2019), if the plan is fully implemented.”

Options for Committee Consideration

1. **Include a NEB evaluation within the plan, following the steps outlined in Ecology’s NEB guidance, (similar to the structure used in the WRIAs 8 and 9 examples).**

Potential reasons to support this option: Ecology will review our plan with considerable deference in light of the knowledge, insights, and expertise of the local partners and stakeholders who influenced the preparation of the plan. A watershed plan that includes a NEB evaluation based on this guidance significantly contributes to the reasonable assurances that the offsets and habitat improvements described within the plan will occur. Technical consultant resources are available to complete the review as outlined in the NEB Guidance.

Potential reasons to oppose this option: The structure as outlined in the Final NEB Guidance may not meet the committee’s needs for achieving NEB in WRIA 15.

2. **Include a NEB evaluation within the plan but follow the analysis proposed by the Squaxin Island Tribe or an alternative.**

Potential reasons to support this option: This allows our committee to create our own framework for an analysis without being bound to Ecology’s steps.

Potential reasons to oppose this option: It may take time and effort for us to agree on a revised framework, complete the work, and reach consensus on the evaluation. Adding additional components or deviating from the steps will complicate Ecology’s NEB evaluation and may result in less deference to the plan’s evaluation. There are also limitations on the available technical consultant resources to support the NEB evaluation.

Questions for committee discussion

- Does the committee support following the steps in the Ecology’s NEB Guidance, the steps proposed by the Squaxin Island Tribe, or an alternate approach?
 - Does the committee have any modifications to the preferred approach?
 - Is there specific content or analyses that are a priority for committee members to include?

Next Steps

1. Stacy will work with the technical consultant team to draft Chapter 7 of the watershed plan.

DRAFT: WRIA 15 Adaptive Management Section

The WRIA 15 Committee recommends an adaptive management process for implementation of the WRIA 15 watershed plan. Adaptive Management is defined in the Final NEB Guidance as “an interactive and systematic decision-making process that aims to reduce uncertainty over time and help meet project, action, and plan performance goals by learning from the implementation and outcomes of projects and actions” (Ecology, 2019).

Adaptive management will help address uncertainty, provide more reasonable assurance for plan implementation, and help:

- Ensure that the goals of the watershed plan and intent of the law are being met.
- Provide information to improve implementation of streamflow restoration projects and actions.
- Track implementation costs and developing grant funding opportunities; and
- Adaptively manage emerging plan implementation needs.

1. Project, Policy, and Permit-Exempt Well Tracking

[Unresolved issue for Committee consideration: the Squaxin Island Tribe would like to add tracking and reporting of building permits with water rights (in addition to permit-exempt wells). Should this addition be included?]

It is important to track the growth of permit-exempt (PE) wells in the watershed as well as the projects and policies that were planned to offset the impacts of these PE wells. This data will allow the Committee to determine whether planning assumptions were accurate and whether adjustments to plan implementation are needed.

A. The WRIA 15 Committee recommends tracking the following information on an ongoing basis:

- New building permits issued that include permit-exempt wells.
- Status of implementation for each project included in the plan.
- Status of policy recommendations included in the plan.
- An ongoing list of new PE wells in the WRIA since the enactment of RCW 90.94.
 - If feasible, the lists of building permits and projects will be organized by subbasin and represented on a map that includes subbasin delineations. Many counties are not currently providing geographic information in their reports to Ecology so this recommendation would require more detailed reporting.

B. To assess the status of project implementation, the Committee recommends using the Salmon Recovery Portal (<https://srp.rco.wa.gov/about>), managed by the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), to support project tracking.

- The Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW), in collaboration with the Washington Department of Ecology and RCO, will coordinate the implementation of project tracking through the Salmon Recovery Portal.
- Project sponsors are expected to support project tracking efforts and data sharing.
- Local salmon recovery Lead Entity Coordinators will not be expected to provide ongoing support for project entry, maintenance, or reporting. To improve harmonization of

- 41 streamflow restoration with ongoing salmon recovery efforts, local salmon recovery
 42 Lead Entity Coordinators will be consulted prior to initial data uploads.
 43 • University of Washington data stewards, contracted by WDFW, will conduct data entry,
 44 quality assurance, and quality control. If this approach changes, WDFW will propose an
 45 alternative method for completing this task.
 46 • Entities with representation in the WRIA 15 Committee (or an implementation group, if
 47 created) will assist as needed with coordination, data gathering and input, and tracking.

48 Table 1 summarizes the entities responsible for implementing the tracking and monitoring
 49 recommendation and associated funding needs.

50 *Table 1. Implementation of Tracking and Monitoring Recommendation*

Action	Entity or Entities Responsible	Funding Considerations
Track building permits issued with PE wells.	Ecology (via reporting from counties and cities).	The number of building permits and associated fees are transmitted to Ecology annually. No additional funding is needed.
Maintain an ongoing list and map of new PE wells within each sub-basin.	Ecology	Information included with data on new PE wells, provided by local governments. No additional funding is needed.
Maintain a summary of the status of implementation for each project.	WDFW via the Salmon Recovery Portal, with support from project sponsors	WDFW may need additional funding to support maintaining the Salmon Recovery Portal.
Maintain a summary of the status of each policy recommendation.	<i>[to be completed after policy recommendations are finalized]</i>	<i>[to be completed after policy recommendations are finalized]</i>

51 **2. Reporting and Adaptation**

52 The data collected above will be provided to Committee members and other interested parties through
 53 annual reporting and a self-assessment, which will occur every five years. These reports and
 54 assessments will help determine whether the plan’s recommendations are being implemented and
 55 whether they are having the intended impacts.

- 56 A. The WRIA 15 Committee recommends **annual reporting** as follows:
- 57 • By September of each year, **Ecology** will prepare an annual report that includes:
 - 58 ○ A list of total building permits issued in the prior calendar year along with the total
 59 number of associated new domestic PE wells, using the information provided to
 60 Ecology by the local jurisdictions.
 - 61 ○ A brief description of the status of WRIA 15 projects and actions included in this
 62 plan (descriptions may be drawn from the Salmon Recovery Portal, if available).
 - 63 ▪ If the project as implemented differs significantly from the original
 64 description and assumptions included in the plan, the annual report will also
 65 include an estimate of changes to the offset benefit.

- 66 ○ Other implementation actions to date, including any changes in approach since the
67 last report and any challenges identified that may require adaptation in plan
68 implementation.
- 69 ○ Monitoring data on the status of water resources and water quality in the basin over
70 the past year that has been collected by Ecology or provided by Kitsap Public Utility
71 District (KPUD), Squaxin Island Tribe, and any other jurisdictions collecting flow data
72 under an approved Quality Assurance Project Plan. Partner jurisdictions are
73 encouraged to provide relevant data to Ecology for inclusion. Monitoring of
74 streamflows, groundwater, precipitation and drought conditions, water usage, and
75 water supply could be included.
- 76 ● If feasible, the lists of building permits will be organized by subbasin and represented on
77 a map that includes subbasin delineations. Many counties are not currently providing
78 geographic information in their reports to Ecology so this recommendation will require
79 more detailed reporting.
- 80 ● The first annual report should include an estimate of expenses necessary for plan
81 implementation and associated funding options. Funding options could include:
- 82 ○ Local or state fees, including PE well fees
- 83 ○ Grants
- 84 ○ State funding
- 85 ○ Other options
- 86 ● Ecology will share the report with Committee members and other interested parties.
87
- 88 B. The WRIA 15 Committee recommends preparing a **self-assessment every five years** as follows:
- 89 ● By September of 2026, and every five years thereafter during the planning
90 horizon period, Ecology will compile and report:
- 91 ○ All cumulative information required in the annual report.
- 92 ○ Estimated water offset quantities, consumptive use, and instream flow benefits,
93 realized through implementation of projects and actions identified in this plan.
- 94 ○ A comparison of each item above to the original assumptions included in the
95 plan and a summation of overall ecological benefit (i.e., greater than expected,
96 less than expected, or about the same as expected).
97
- 98 C. The WRIA 15 Committee believes a group of engaged stakeholders and tribal representatives
99 are needed to continue collaboration on the implementation of this plan. The Committee
100 recommends continuing to meet as needed, with participation from all interested WRIA 15
101 representatives.
- 102 ● WRIA 15 Committee members will convene annually via telephone to:
- 103 ○ Review and discuss the annual report.
- 104 ○ Share updates on project and policy implementation.
- 105 ○ Discuss or develop recommendations for revisions, additions, or deletions to
106 planned projects or actions.
- 107 ● Every five years the WRIA 15 Committee will hold a series of meetings to conduct the
108 self-assessment, which includes:
- 109 ○ Reviewing the five-year assessment report from Ecology.
- 110 ○ Developing recommendations to adapt projects and actions to meet NEB.
- 111 ○ Updating data and assumptions.
- 112 ○ Other items identified by Committee members.

- 113 • Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.
- 114 • Members should consider:
 - 115 ○ Self-organizing and identifying an organization to coordinate and facilitate
 - 116 meetings.
 - 117 ○ Redefining the WRIA 15 Committee, which could include a new name, charter,
 - 118 and supporting interlocal agreement.
 - 119 ○ Identifying funding mechanisms to provide capacity for the Committee
 - 120 members and facilitator.

122 Table 2 summarizes the entities responsible for carrying out the reporting and adaptation
 123 recommendation and associated funding needs.

124 *Table 2. Implementation of Reporting and Adaptation Recommendation*

Action	Entity or Entities Responsible	Funding Considerations
Annual Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local jurisdictions provide building permit information to Ecology. • WDFW provides information on project status, drawn from the Salmon Recovery Portal. • Entities provide monitoring data to Ecology for inclusion in reports. • Ecology combines monitoring data from within the agency with data provided by other entities. • Ecology compiles information into a single report for distribution to the Committee and other interested parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local jurisdictions are already required to provide building permit information to Ecology (no additional funding needed). • Ecology staff would compile reports using existing resources. • WDFW may need additional funds to manage the Salmon Recovery Portal.
Five-Year Self-Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local jurisdictions provide building permit information to Ecology. • WDFW provides information on project status, drawn from the Salmon Recovery Portal. • Entities provide monitoring data to Ecology for inclusion in reports. • Ecology combines monitoring data from within the agency with data provided by other entities. • Ecology prepares estimates of the quantity of water, instream flow, and habitat benefits realized through implementation of projects and actions identified in this plan. • Ecology compiles information into a single report for distribution to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local jurisdictions are already required to provide building permit information to Ecology (no additional funding needed). • Ecology may need funding to complete the estimate of realized benefits. • State funding or staff support will be needed to reconvene a group to prepare recommendations. • Committee members who cannot participate in meetings using existing resources will need additional funding.

Action	Entity or Entities Responsible	Funding Considerations
	Committee and other interested parties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRIA 15 Committee convenes to prepare adaptation recommendations on changes to planned projects or actions. 	

125

126 **3. Funding**

127 *[note this funding section is specific to funding for adaptive management; other funding requests will be*
 128 *included in policy chapter]*

129 The WRIA 15 Committee recommends ongoing implementation oversight and a process to adaptively
 130 manage the plan as new information emerges. The Committee recommends the Legislature provides
 131 funding for monitoring and adaptively managing the plan, including:

- 132 • Annual tracking of new PE wells and project implementation by subbasin.
- 133 • Staffing for the ongoing committee.
- 134 • Ongoing committee member participation; and
- 135 • Developing a process to adaptively manage implementation if NEB is not being met as
 136 envisioned by the watershed plan (e.g. identification and development of alternative projects,
 137 etc.).

138 Table 3 summarizes the entities responsible for carrying out this recommendation and associated
 139 funding needs.

140 *Table 3: Funding Recommendation*

Action	Entity or Entities Responsible	Funding Considerations
Funding of Adaptive Management	Legislature	The legislature should provide funding and authorize plan implementation to adaptively manage implementation if NEB is not being met as envisioned by the watershed plan.

141

142 **WRIA 7 DRAFT Adaptive Management Language for Committee Consideration:**

143 *[The **draft** language below is from WRIA 7, provided here for Committee consideration as requested at*
144 *the last WRIA 15 Committee meeting. Does the Committee want to include any of this in the adaptive*
145 *management section?]*

- 146 • During the annual meeting, the committee recommends reserving the right to come together to
147 adaptively manage the sequencing of projects for streamflow restoration program funding. The
148 prioritization, location, offset potential, unintended (positive or negative) consequences of
149 project types may inform how this plan is managed and what projects are put forward for
150 funding by Ecology or other funding programs.
- 151 • The committee recommends that the legislature allow Ecology to accept, review, and approve
152 addendums to the watershed plan. Addendums may include the addition of new projects, with
153 justification and approval by the full Committee as part of an adaptive management process.
- 154 • This watershed plan is narrow in scope and is not intended to address all water uses or related
155 issues within the watershed. If a more comprehensive approach is developed to improve
156 coordination of water resources for both instream and out of stream uses that result in
157 improvements in WRIA 15 watershed health, the Committee will support development of a
158 similarly collaborative and comprehensive planning process. It is expected that the planning
159 process would need to expand to include representatives of all relevant entities in order to
160 address all water resource needs, ensure sustained cooperation, and ultimately improved
161 streamflow.

162 Other Issues and Recommendations

163 *[Items below will be merged into the plan once they are finalized, possibly into a new section or chapter.*
164 *They are not intended to be part of the Adaptive Management section, but they did come out of*
165 *Committee discussions around Adaptive Management.]*

166 1. Assurance of Plan implementation

167 By approving this plan, WRIA 15 Committee members commit to the following actions to support
168 watershed plan implementation:

169 *[the list below is a series of place-holders for each entity to add text]*

- 170 1. Department of Ecology
- 171 2. WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife
- 172 3. King County
- 173 4. Kitsap County
- 174 5. Pierce County
- 175 6. Mason County
- 176 7. City of Bremerton
- 177 8. City of Port Orchard
- 178 9. City of Bainbridge Island
- 179 10. City of Gig Harbor
- 180 11. Kitsap Public Utility District
- 181 12. Kitsap Conservation District
- 182 13. Kitsap Building Association
- 183 14. Great Peninsula Conservancy
- 184 15. Skokomish Tribe
- 185 16. Squaxin Island Tribe
- 186 17. Suquamish Tribe
- 187 18. Puyallup Tribe
- 188 19. Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe

189 **2. Summary of Ecology Rulemaking**

190 *[Insert cross reference to any recommendation in the plan that will require rulemaking.]*

191 **3. Summary of Legislative requests**

192 *[Insert cross reference to any recommendation in the plan that will require legislative action.]*

193 **Potential New Policy Recommendation:**

194 *[Unresolved issue: this recommendation below was proposed as addition to adaptive management but*
195 *fits better as a policy recommendation. At the last WRIA 15 meeting, the Squaxin Island Tribe described*
196 *why including this recommendation is important to the Tribe. Other Committee members believe this*
197 *recommendation goes beyond the requirements of the law. Should it be included in the plan as a policy*
198 *recommendation?]*

199 **Additional Water Resource Information**

200 By September of 2026, Ecology will compile and report the following information with the support of
201 the State Department of Health and local jurisdictions:

- 202 • Estimates of:
- 203 ○ The total number of connections to PE wells currently in use, as described in RCW
204 90.94.030(3)(b).
 - 205 ○ The number domestic and municipal water rights in use and their current quantity of
206 use, including estimates of inchoate water remaining in municipal water rights, and
207 categorized by whether they are mitigated or not and which subbasin they are in, as
208 described in RCW 90.94.030(3)(c).
 - 209 ○ The cumulative consumptive water use impacts on instream flows from all pre-2018 PE
210 wells and unmitigated municipal water rights, as described in RCW 90.94.030(3)(d)(e).
- 211 • An evaluation of the costs of offsetting all new domestic water uses over the next 20 years, as
212 described in RCW 90.94.030(3)(d). The initiation of adjudication would be considered an
213 acceptable substitute for this study.

To: WRIA 15 Committee

From: Stacy Vynne McKinstry

Date: October 22, 2020

Re: Updates on Project Development and Recommendations from Project Workgroup

The WRIA 15 project workgroup met on October 20th. The topics covered include water rights assessment, offset benefits for projects, and project inventory clean up. This memo provides a summary of the workgroup discussions and recommendations coming from the workgroup to the committee. The committee will discuss the recommendations at the October and November committee meetings. Any errors or misrepresentations of the workgroup discussions presented in this document are my mistake and will be clarified by members of the workgroup during the committee meeting.

All of the detailed project write ups are available on Box:

<https://ecy.box.com/v/WRIA15DetailedProjectDescr>

Water Right Assessment

Updates

- The workgroup discussed updates to water rights in the following subbasins: Vashon Maury, South Sound Islands, Bainbridge Islands, and South Sound.
- The McNeil Island water right provides no offset benefit for the island (no planned development) and may no longer be valid. WDFW's water rights point person does not recommend further pursuing.

Recommendations and Action Items

- Do not pursue the McNeil water rights further.
- The workgroup discussed a **package of water rights for Vashon Maury** ([See draft write up on Box here](#)) which includes 27 potential water rights. It was recommended to revise the general Vashon Maury water right package to cover habitat benefits of land acquisition and conservation easements. The water rights currently provide potential offset benefit of 279 acre feet per year.
 - **The committee can determine what percentage of the water right acquisition opportunities to include for offset benefit. The committee may want to consider a range of 10%¹ to 25%, or 27.9 to 67.9 acre feet per year for inclusion as an offset benefit. What does the committee recommend?**
- Burt will update the Bainbridge Island water right descriptions with the most recent information obtained from the City of Bainbridge Island and Ecology's Water Resources program.
- Bob will reach out to the South Sound water right holder to see if the opportunity is worth further exploration.

¹ The Nisqually watershed plan addendum included a number of potential acquisitions. In Ecology's review, they accounted for 10% of the acquisitions to move forward.

- Stacy and Paul will reach out to Chuck Hinds to identify additional opportunities on Anderson Island.

Offset Benefits for Projects

Updates

- A subset of committee representatives from WRIAs 14 and 15 met October 13th to discuss concerns with the [Mason County rooftop infiltration project](#). Revisions are underway to the method and project description based on feedback. Questions remain regarding whether the project is valid under RCW 90.94 and whether there is support for the project in principle. A deep dive meeting to discuss the project in detail will be scheduled once the revised write up is prepared.

Recommendations and Action Items

- The workgroup reviewed the **MAR package proposal** ([available on Box here](#)). The package brings together the larger projects that the committee has discussed over the last few months, as well as smaller MAR projects that were on the project inventory. The document also provides an approach for assigning an offset value for the projects based on their feasibility and likely time horizon for implementation (10%- low probability for implementation; 50% medium probability; 80% high probability). The workgroup did not have any concerns with the MAR package proposal, but recommended the addition of potentially important sites, sponsors and landowners (where available). The package is recommended for inclusion in the plan unless there are further revisions by the committee.
 - **Does the committee have any proposed revisions to the package of projects?**
 - **The package currently recommends inclusion of 582 acre feet per year for offset benefit across the WRIA. Does the committee have any concerns with including this offset benefit?**
 - **Are there additional areas that the committee wants to include for future consideration of MAR projects?**
- Bob is working to reframe the **Beall Creek Stream Restoration project** (Vashon Maury) and will share an updated description with the committee. We anticipate this project will provide an additional offset benefit for Vashon Maury.
- The workgroup reviewed the **Kitsap Conservation District Raingarden and LID Project** ([available on Box here](#)). The workgroup is generally supportive of the project but had some questions about the data and would like to see some targeted areas for raingardens. Additional feedback and revisions are sought by the committee. The project currently provides a potential offset value of 29 acre feet per year across Kitsap County. This is approximately 50 raingardens, LID improvements, or other “applications”.
 - **Does the committee have any concerns with inclusion of this project?**
 - **Does the committee have any revisions to the project description?**
 - **We recommend a target of approximately 20 applications for the North Hood Canal subbasin, 5 applications for the Bainbridge Island subbasin, and 25**

applications for the West Sound subbasin per year. Does the committee have any revisions to this recommendation?

- Bob prepared a **Community Forest Package** ([available on Box here](#)). There were some revisions requested to the framing of the Dewatto forest project (habitat benefit only), but in general, the workgroup was supportive of including the portfolio of projects.
 - **The project package includes a total of approximately 178 acre feet per year of offset across WRIA 15. Does the committee have any revisions to this recommendation?**
 - Stacy and Paul will reach out to Chuck Hinds to identify opportunities on Anderson Island.

Project Inventory Clean Up and Organization

Updates

- Stacy has [updated the project inventory](#) to begin categorizing projects and flagging projects for removal. Please do not make edits directly in this project inventory as it is actively being revised.

Recommendations and Action Items

- Subbasin workgroups and those with knowledge of certain projects should review the project inventory and provide feedback. Stacy will distribute the inventory broken out by subbasin.

Other Items

- Our anticipated **offset benefits by subbasin** are [presented on Box here](#).
- The Project Workgroup may no longer need to meet and instead discussions can be held with the committee going forward.
- General Statements in Support of Project Types. The workgroup discussed two potential statements and provided feedback. Revisions are presented here for committee discussion and feedback. These statements (if supported by the committee) would be included in Chapter 5. **Does the committee have further revisions to these statements?**

Water Right Acquisitions: The WRIA 15 Committee supports the acquisition of water rights to increase streamflows and offset the impacts of PE wells. Water rights should be permanently and legally held by Ecology in the Trust Water Rights Program to ensure that the benefits to instream resources are permanent. The WRIA 15 Committee acknowledges that all water right transactions rely on willing sellers and willing buyers. The WRIA 15 Committee recognizes the importance of water availability for producers and the limited available water supply. *[Paul requested more specifics on opportunities here, but I would recommend keeping it simple and broad – we support water right acquisitions; we recognize the need to support local food production.]*

Land Acquisitions and Conservation Easements: The WRIA 15 Committee supports acquisitions and conservation easements of land to increase streamflows and offset the impacts of PE wells. The WRIA 15 Committee recommends focusing acquisitions and

easements in areas with wetlands and headwaters, for the purposes of preventing new permit exempt wells, decommissioning old permit exempt wells, and for extending time between harvest of timber.

Potential general statement on climate resiliency *[this could be included as a general statement; Paul has requested we include for each project but that level of detail might be best incorporated at the grant stage]:* The WRIA 15 Committee recognizes the potential impacts of climate change on streamflow. The WRIA 15 Committee recommends that projects and actions include components that help improve the resiliency of our stream systems, but also for projects and actions themselves to be resilient to the impacts of climate change. [cite resources – Beechie, LE salmon recovery resiliency project, etc]