

**Puyallup-White Watershed (WRIA 10)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee
DRAFT Meeting Summary**

Please send corrections to Rebecca Brown (Rebecca.Brown@ecy.wa.gov) by November 30th.

Committee website:

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias_1962/37323/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_10.aspx.

Next Meeting: December 19, 2018, 1:00 pm-4:00 pm, Puyallup Public Library

Meeting Information

Tuesday, October 30, 2018

9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Puyallup Recreation Center

Agenda

	Topic	Time	Action	Handouts	Lead
1.	Welcome	9:00 am	None	- Agenda	Chair
2.	Introductions	9:10 am	None		All
3.	Overview of Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) and Committee Purpose	9:30 am	Presentation and discussion	- Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) Overview - ESSB 6091 map	Chair/ Mike Gallagher
4.	BREAK – Ten minutes	10:30 am			
5.	Breakout session: share expectations for Committee and Plan	10:40 am	Activity and discussion		All
6.	Next steps	11:30 am		-Documents distributed following meeting	Chair
7.	Public comment	11:45 am	None		Chair
8.	Close	12:00 pm			

**all handouts are available on the Committee website*

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Lisa Tobin	Auburn	Scott Woodbury	Enumclaw
Dan Cardwell	Pierce County	Tiffany Odell (alternate)	Pierce County
Liz Bockstiegel	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	Michael Kosa	Sumner
Eric Mendenhall (alternate)	Sumner	Jason Van Gilder (alternate)	Sumner
Carrie Hernandez	Puyallup River Watershed Council	Carla Carlson (alternate)	Muckleshoot Tribe

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Ryan Johnstone	Bonney Lake	Jim Morgan	Pacific
Russ Blount	Fife	Russ Ladley	Puyallup Tribe
Ryan Mello	Pierce Conservation District	Greg Reed	Orting
Jessie Gamble	MBA Pierce	Chuck Sundsmo (alternate)	MBA Pierce
Stephane Seivert-Wilson (alternate)	Tacoma	Rebecca Brown	WA Department of Ecology

Committee Members not in attendance: City of Puyallup

Other Attendees

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Cal Taylor	Tacoma	Jerry Louthain	HDR
Tom Kantz	Pierce County	Stephanie Shelton	King County
Angela Johnson	WA Department of Ecology	Mike Gallagher	WA Department of Ecology
Lisa Dally Wilson	Dally Environmental	Mike Noone	WA Department of Ecology
Jason Hatch	Washington Water Trust	Burt Clothier	Pacific Groundwater

Presentation on ESSB 6091/RCW 90.94

Presentation available on committee webpage.

Breakout Session on Expectations and Concerns

Comments from breakout groups, grouped by topic. Flip chart images included at end of document.

Expectations	Concerns
Process	
Reach consensus on a plan and acceptance from DOE.	Don't forget to include exempt wells within the city limits.
Information sharing from other watersheds in 203 and 202 planning basins.	Scope creep beyond permit exempt wells.
Hope group really works hard up front to understand the Tribes' positions.	Lawsuits against plans.
We can land on defensible metrics re: NEB and how projects are being measured for this.	How binding is the plan.
A hope for inter-local agreements between all parties.	That we are able to defend recommendations and gain support for them.
That all entities in the law be interested in supporting the process/law.	Local health districts that provide water availability certifications are not involved in this process.
Opportunity for collaboration with other WRIAs (especially adjacent WRIAs).	Timing of coordinating with other planning efforts.
Simple as possible, ability to cross-use processes (ex. Population estimates).	What triggers rule-making?

Expectations	Concerns
Net use should be defined.	Getting consensus on given timeline.
Consistency to limit legal liability.	Will the plan stand up to scrutiny/possibility of lawsuits in the future.
Agreement on what is environmentally beneficial.	
Clear guidance of when recommendations would be overridden.	
Use Health Department definitions.	
Consider creating a 'stakeholder matrix'.	
Data, Science, and Information	
Understand the scale of impact/need. (# of wells, size of affected area).	Don't know how much water is available in basin/sub-basin, so cannot measure impacts.
Understand how permit exempt well use affect fish.	The 4 exemptions applied don't result in a net loss to the watershed.
Use data and science to drive decision-making.	Limitations of mitigating in the WRIA in time/place.
Use scientific knowledge and identified priorities of TAG Salmon Recovery Group and Citizens Advisory Committee.	How to use USGS groundwater model in timely manner.
Quantify how much water is available in a particular aquifer and sub-basin.	
All recommendations are science-based.	
To be able to quantify future uses, and put those into perspective with other uses.	
Get data on individual wells historically.	
Funding	
Once projects recommended/selected, joint effort to promote funding for them.	How are we funding and being responsible for implementing projects.
Joint NEB Project grant awarding entity.	Funding availability when the opportunity for a project or acquisition arises.
	Building up prices of water rights vs. municipal water.
	Non-NEB meeting projects getting funding.
Projects/Recommendations	
Hope that people use water more conservatively (300 gpd?)	Water use in time—storage.
Establish a water bank—flexible use of funds on a short notice.	Defining projects without land acquisition/ownership.
Outward mindset of education—big picture and their concerns.	That plans (NEB) projects not funded/implemented.
Education to change public mindset.	Recommendations to increase fees for permit exempt wells.
	That eventual plan does not have the unintended consequences of a net ecological impact/loss.

Discussion Summary

Wells

Questions around permit exempt wells in the law and the plans. According to Ecology's interpretation of 90.94 RCW, the committees' plans should offset the future consumptive use of domestic permit-exempt wells. The plans do not have to offset the future consumptive use of non-domestic permit exempt wells, such as stock water, industrial, or commercial use. 90.94 RCW does not change other appropriation laws. The law includes limits for water use. The water use limitations are per connection—the law did not change the limits of permit-exempt wells. The limits are for both Group A and Group B wells. The plans will likely be looking at small amounts of water—fractions of a cubic foot per second—per basin or sub-basin. Any negative impact caused by future permit exempt wells needs to be offset, even if it is de minimus. These small volumes can be critical at certain times of year.

The metering pilots may provide some insight into how much water is actually being used by permit-exempt domestic wells on the east and west sides of the Cascades. Currently, permit exempt domestic well use is not metered or measured. The electricity cost of pumping the water out of the ground is usually the limiting factor in water use. Ecology's water use enforcement is complaint driven, and because of limited staff, Ecology usually focuses on the biggest offenders. Metering is an option that the committee could put forth as a recommendation. The Muckleshoot Tribe has interest in including metering in the plan.

Planning Process

A bulk of the discussion focused on the committee formation and decision-making. The law required Ecology to invite all cities, counties, and tribes in the WRIA, plus the largest irrigation district, largest non-municipal water purveyor, WDFW, and representatives from the environmental, agricultural, and building industry communities. Any entity that declined to participate is not part of the committee and will not affect decision-making. The next few meetings will cover the operating principles, and identify who is a member of the committee, and the requirements to membership and voting on the final plan.

The largest non-municipal water purveyor has declined to participate in the planning process, and other committee members were concerned about their absence. The Chair will work with her Ecology leadership to address water purveyor participation.

Each committee members must work closely with their organization to ensure that their organization does not overturn the plan after the members have agreed with the direction of plan for some time. All committee members need to approve the final plan. The plan should offset 20 years of projected permit-exempt domestic well use, plus projects to support Net Ecological Benefits, and potentially, suggest rule changes. If the plan does is not fully approved, then Ecology will submit the plan to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for recommendations, then consider those recommendations, make changes to plan, and begin rulemaking to implement the plan. Ecology may also engage in rule-making if a plan is approved and adopted. The plan might include recommendations for different instream flow rules, or change the well fee and 950 gallon per day limit, all would need a rule to implement. Ecology's technical staff will be involved and reviewing draft plans throughout the process, so that a submitted plan *should* be adopted by Ecology.

Aside from the final plan approval, other decision points along the way include deciding on sub-basins (very important and should align with other Ecology sub-basin planning efforts), growth projections and

consumptive use estimates, and the project list. Many of these topics will be covered in committee training opportunities.

The plans will include which entity is responsible for each project, and Ecology is putting \$300 million towards projects, most of which will be in plans. The first funding cycle is underway, because wells are currently going in without projects to offset them

Information needs

Information needs and requests included a map with the size and location of water systems (*see website for updated map*). USGS model is slated to be completed late 2019, and the process should include the model. Ecology is not funding the USGS model.

Action Items

- Chair will schedule the next meeting for early to mid-December. Starting in January, we anticipate having a set day of the month and a set location for future meetings.
- The next meeting will focus on operating principles. Chair expects committee members to review the draft document, provide input ahead of the meeting, and come prepared to discuss at the December meeting.
- Ecology will set up a number of trainings over the next few months to bring everyone up to a similar level of base knowledge to ensure we can have informed discussions and decisions going forward.
- Ahead of the December meeting, Committee members should consider:
 - Formal or informal engagement with other collaborations/committees (e.g. salmon recovery lead entities, local integrating organizations, etc.). What would engagement look like?
 - Is there interest in a new name for the committee?

Flipcharts from breakout sessions

EXPECTATIONS & HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Get DATA on Individual wells Historically. - OUTWARD MINDSET of Education BIG PICTURE & Their concerns. 	

2018.11.14 8:22

EXPECTATIONS & HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AGREEMENT on What is ENV. Beneficial - Establish a WATER BANK - Flexible use of Funds on Short NOTICE. - Clear GUIDANCE of When Recommendations Would Be OVERRIDDEN. - Education to change PUBLIC MINDSET - NET USE should Be DEFINED. - USE Health department DEFINITIONS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are we Funding & Being Responsible for Implementing Projects - WATER USE IN TIME - & storage - DEFINING Projects Who Land Acquisition/Ownership? & Available when the opportunity ARISES. - Bidding UP Prices of WATER RIGHTS vs. MUNICIPAL water.

EXPECTATIONS & HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand scale & impact/need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # wells - Size of affected area - Hope that people use water more conservatively (300 gpm?) - Understand how permit-exempt well use affect fish - Use data & science to drive decision-making - Reach consensus on plan & acceptance from DOE ✓ - Information sharing from other watersheds in 203 planning process 202 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to mix USGS groundwater model in timely manner - Timing of coordinating w/ other planning efforts - What triggers rule-making? - Getting consensus on given timeline - Will the plan stand up to scrutiny/possibility of lawsuits in the future - Limitations of mitigating in the WRIA - in time/place

2018.11.14 8:21

EXPECTATIONS and HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be able to quantify future uses, & put those into perspective w/ other uses - That all entities in the how be interested in supporting the process/law - opportunity for collaboration w/ other WRIAs (esp adjacent WRIAs) - Simple as possible, ability to cross-use processes - pop estimates For ex - consistency to limit legal liability - Joint WRIA project grant awarding entity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't forget to include exempt heads in your estimates - scope creep (beyond PE wells) - lawsuits against plans - legal liability of parties - how binding is plan - that plan/NEPA/etc not funded/implemented - non-WRIA meeting priority getting funding. - Recs to ↑ fees for PE wells

Expectations/Hopes	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantify how much water available in a particular aquifer and subbasin A hope for interlocal agreements between all parties Once projects rec'd/selected joint effort to promote funding for All recommendations are science-based We can land on defensible metrics re: NEB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> how projects are being measured for this Consider creating a stakeholder matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't know how much avail., can't measure impacts The 4 exemptions applied don't result in a net loss to the watershed That eventual plan does not have the unintended consequences of a net ecological impact/loss That we are able to defend recs and gain support for them (Local Health District) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LHDs that provide water avail. cost are not involved in this process

EXPECTATIONS/HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hope group really works hand up front to understand the Tribes positions Use scientific knowledge + Identified priorities of TAG Salmon Recovery Group + Citizens Advisory Committee 	