Revisions to final WRIA 15 draft plan (version 3/1/2021)

Last Updated 4.14.2021

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed revision | Page number | Requested By | Completed/Action |
| AFY – shorted ourselves by 10 AFY – Vashon Maury and some rounding errors throughout the subbasin tables. Add up to 1076.7. need to fix all numbers in Executive Summary, Chapter 5 and NEB chapter. | Throughout plan | Ecology | Completed |
| One minor thing, on page two, could you change the photo credit to "Curley Creek Courtesy of Great Peninsula Conservancy"? Kenna Cox was a GPC employee at the time she took the photo (and I don't actually think she took that photo). | 2 | GPC | Completed |
| Why does Figure 13 have “Minter Creek MAR” while Figure 21 does not? | Fig 13 | Squaxin | tables, just not a space to space out minter, change made |
| “**Error! Reference source not found.**” | 60, 62, 93, 96, 97, | multiple | generated by PDF and removed link |
| is it 177 gpd or 195 gpd?” | Page xi (end of 4th paragraph): | COBI | Confirmed with Bob, comment added |
| typo - “the highest priority projects are those ~~in~~ that provide...” | Page 4 (end of 1st paragraph): | COBI | completed |
| “conversion between units is a bit confusing as written. Last sentence could clarify this a bit by adding the word “annual” between “outdoor” and “consumption”.” | Page 39 (end of last paragraph); Page 40 | COBI | Bob provided revision to clarify |
| yet again a different “units” in the discussion | Page 42 (last sentence above section 4.3.2) | COBI | Bob provided revision |
| this footnote seems like it would be better as a final paragraph in section 4.3.1 | Page 42 (footnote | COBI | Angela flagged in plan but did not make change |
| “this watershed plan uses a consumptive use estimate of 766.4 af/yr, based on the moderate ~~for~~ growth projection...” | Page 51 (first sentence | COBI | completed |
| Bainbridge Island is circled – comment = “high growth # presented here, not moderate” | 53 | COBI | yes, this is the higher estimate and is included in the table, no change needed |
| seems like text is out of place | Page 79 | COBI | Angela flagged in plan but did not make change |
| This watershed plan also has an offset target of 1,218 AF/yr for project implementation in order to benefit ~~to~~ streams. | Page 83 (second sentence): | COBI | completed |
| Bainbridge Island is circled – comment = “high growth # presented here, not moderate | Page 107 | COBI | This is high growth table, no change needed |
| Need to fix maps with the moderate well numbers not the higher well numbers, and the CU estimate; Need to update maps with revised surplus/deficit numbers | Throughout | Ecology | Change needed, will be made after final meeting |
| Revise highlighted text with date plan was approved by committee. (Anticipated April 26) | Throughout | Ecology | Change needed, will be made after final meeting |
| Discussion with WDFW: Since the term consensus as the Committees have been using them is defined in the operating principles, we’d like to suggest that we add a footnote in the plan for the first instance of “consensus” that points to the appendix instead of adding the term to the glossary. |  | WDFW | completed |
| After consultation with other Tribes, we are proposing some small changes to the language regarding Tribal Treaty rights:  *The Tribes hold Treaty-reserved water rights in WRIA \_\_ under federal law that are necessary to support healthy salmon populations; to support and maintain hunting, fishing and cultural resource harvesting right; and to meet all homeland purposes reserved by the Treaties.  These reserved water rights are necessary to fulfill the promises and purpose of the Treaties.  Federal Indian water rights retain a senior priority date over all other federal and state water rights holders and state instream flow rules.  Although federal Indian water rights in WRIA \_\_ have yet to be adjudicated, these rights are senior to all other rights and have not been accounted for by the State of Washington in the way in which the State determines water availability, over appropriation, and instream flow rules.* |  | Squaxin | Completed |
| Consider removing the word ‘likely’ from the second sentence | P. 18 – Section 2.1.4 | COBI | Angela flagged in plan. Response: That may be pulled from the report that is cited, but I can confirm and mention to the committee the proposed change to make sure no issues. |
| Consider adding QA1 to the list of sources to the recharge and baseflow in the fourth paragraph. | 22 | COBI | Angela flagged in plan. Response: No issue with this, I can confirm with HDR and let the committee know of the change. |
| Consider including a better explanation at the beginning of the report about why 766 AF/yr and 1218 AF/yr are both used as offset targets. Then consistently use the same language to describe the two targets throughout the report. | Throughout | COBI | Response: We attempted to do this. 766 is the CU estimate and 1218 is a higher offset target. Are there places in the plan where we weren’t consistent? We worked very carefully with the committee on how we presented these two numbers: if there are proposed revisions, please provide so we can bring to the committee for discussion. |
| The rationale for how uncertainty was calculated could use a little more detail. A statement should be considered that addresses why this “conservative” methodology was used in lieu of other methods. Can it include a description of how the result comes out with a conservative estimate, based on previous conservative calculations earlier in the process? | 199 | COBI | Angela flagged in plan. Response: I think I would need more discussion on this topic and a better understanding of what is being proposed. Our consultant proposed a discounting of the potential offset benefit based on the conceptual nature of many of the projects. A discount percentage was proposed that was supported by the committee. |
| If the Johnson Farm project is considered a category V project should the offset be removed from the total offset anticipated for the island? I think it is currently included. Also, add ‘MAR, will benefit Springbrook Creek’ to project description column of Johnson Farm. We understand that a small portion of the offset for Johnson Farm project was included even though it is legally precluded from implementation at the moment. Can we have a notation about this showing that it is discounted 90% because it could be legal in the future or because there might be a way to redesign (reimagine) it to be legal now despite Foster | 68 |  | Response: We went back and forth on whether to include the Johnson Farm project for offset benefits. Ultimately, we felt that the uncertainty of the project moving forward (due to “foster” limitations) was covered through the discounting of the project. Some of the other Category IV projects have greater barriers (e.g. not full committee support). If COBI recommends we remove it from offset benefit calculations, we can do so but will need to recalculate the project numbers. We can add in the information to the project description.  Change needed: add a footnote to the Johnson MAR project that we’ve discounted it at 90% because the project is not currently legal but may be implementable in the future. Angela added footnote |
| Is there a possibility of cleaning up the legend and adding a better caption for what the figure is showing? | 230 | COBI | Flag for HDR. |
| In the first paragraph ‘Johnson creek’ should be changed to ‘tributary to Springbrook Creek’. | 232 |  | Response: We can make this change. Angela flagged in plan. |
| For Table ES-1, somewhere note in the heading or the description that the habitat benefits column includes all projects from the plan (categories aren’t yet described).  In West Sound the benefits should be changed to: Projects would provide direct streamflow benefit, protection and restoration of habitat for fish critical streams. Projects include over 2800 feet of stream restoration, provides access to an additional 3.5 miles of habitat, riparian restoration, over 100 acres of land protection, and over 40 acres of habitat restoration.  Salmonberry had 90 acres of protection only, it was double counted as restoration and you were missing the 3.5 miles of access improvements. | Executive Summary: | ECY | Completed. |
| Under the community forest projects (in the table) change “Tahuya Headwaters” to “Tahuya River” – there are opportunities outside of the headwaters that GPC is pursuing. | Chapter 5; page 60 | Project workgroup | Change needed. Angela made change in track changes. |
| add the description back to the beginning of the Rudy Creek | Appendix H | Ecology | Completed |
| Revise the following definitions   1. **Stream Flow**: a specific flow level measured at a specific location in a given stream, usually described as a rate, such as cfs.  Stream flow is the actual amount of real water at a specific place and at a given moment.  Stream flows can change from moment to moment. 2. **Instream Flow**: a designated flow (also in cfs) that is set by rule as the amount of water needed to protect beneficial uses and used for determining whether there is water available for appropriation.  Flow levels set as Instream Flows do not reflect the actual amount of water flowing at a given time.  They are designated, or administrative numbers (flow levels) that are set for periods of time (bi-weekly to several months) throughout the year.  The instream flows vary by season and account for different instream resource needs (such as fish spawning, rearing and migration).  When (actual) stream flow is lower than the Instream Flow, there is not water available for appropriation (Instream Flows are not being met) and water users whose water rights are junior to the Instream Flows must discontinue water use under that right. 3. **Instream Flow Rule**: An administrative rule that establishes Instream Flows.  See Instream Flows. | Glossary | Ecology | Completed |
| Changes to Pierce Co Assurance of Implementation: For consistency with the narrative portion I’ll provide below, and with the bullet points that are included in the WRIA 12 plan, **we’ll need it to say:\***   * Approve this watershed plan by resolution, formalizing our support of the plan contents. * Use the plan as a source document for new projects, to be considered bi-annually for inclusion in the Surface Water Improvement Plan (SWIP). * Support and participate in implementation activities as staff capacity allows, including:   + Participating in annual implementation group meetings.   + Coordination between meetings, including:     - Supporting project development and seeking project opportunities.     - Seeking and supporting funding opportunities to achieve implementation.     - Tracking implementation and identifying areas for improvement. | Chapter 6 | Pierce Co | Completed |

\*From Pierce Co:

Context related to the above changes:

For context, this is the additional language that’s in the WRIA 10/12 plans (Section 2.2.2). It provides a bit more detail for how our project planning process works. I’m not sure we need to incorporate it into the document, since Section 2.2.2 currently is generic enough to apply to all 3 counties. If you feel like we need to work it in, I’m open to suggestions – the important thing is that we get 6.3 updated so that it’s consistent across all 3 Pierce County WRIAs as described above.

“This watershed plan incorporates assumptions that reflect the Pierce County comprehensive plan goals and policies. The comprehensive plan sets policy for development, housing, public services and facilities, and environmentally sensitive areas, among other topics. The comprehensive plan identifies where and how Pierce County plans for future population, housing, and job growth. This plan used the Pierce County zoning districts and Group A water system service areas as the basis for estimating the likely areas of future PE wells.

As a component of a comprehensive plan, a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) identifies public facilities that will be needed to ensure service levels keep pace with expected development. It includes projects from a range of County functions, including: airport/ferries, emergency management, general administration, parks, roads, sewer, sheriff/court/correctional facilities, and surface water management. The CFP must identify the location and cost of capital facilities, as well as the sources of revenue that will be used to fund them. The plan is updated annually and appropriates funding for the following year. If the costs exceed the revenue, the County must reduce its level of service, reduce costs by implementing noncapital alternatives or other methods, or modify the land use element to bring development into balance with available or affordable facilities.

Projects may also fall under the noncapital category. Noncapital alternatives include programs, strategies, and methods other than ‘brick and mortar’-type capital improvement to achieve the County’s required level of service. This category includes programs like education and outreach, improvements to existing facilities, and projects to improve natural drainage as an alternative to engineered solutions (e.g., levees and dikes).

Capital projects (structures or engineered improvements to land) identified through the watershed plan may be evaluated and prioritized for placement into the CFP. Most proposed projects will fall under the category of Surface Water Management. Pierce County’s Surface Water Management Division (SWM) uses the Surface Water Improvement Plan (SWIP) as its primary basis for project implementation planning. Not all projects listed in the SWIP make it into the CFP, but the SWIP informs which projects are incorporated. The SWIP is also a six year plan that is updated bi-annually. Projects come from existing, County-approved plans and are ranked for their ability to address flooding, water quality, habitat, and other factors. Limited available funding and new mandatory obligations also factor into capital project prioritization. If approved, the watershed plan will become one of the guiding project implementation plans for the SWIP.”