

**Kennedy-Goldsborough (WRIA 14)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee
Meeting Summary**

Committee website:

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias_1962/37326/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_14.aspx

Next Meeting: December 6 2018, 9 am – 12:30 pm – Location, TBD

Meeting Information

Wednesday, October 31, 2018

9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Shelton Civic Center

525 W Cota St., Shelton, WA 98584

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
Angela Johnson	Department of Ecology	Ron Gold	Mason PUD No. 1
Jeff Dickison	Squaxin Island Tribe	Erin Hall	Olympia Master Builders
Barbara Adkins	Mason Conservation District	John Bolender	Mason Conservation District (alternate)
Kevin Shuttly	Mason County	Dave Windom	Mason County (alternate)
Theresa Nation	WDFW	Darrin Masters	WDFW (alternate)
Craig Gregory	City of Shelton	Jason Dose	City of Shelton (alternate)
Alex Gouley	Skokomish Indian Tribe	Randy Lumper	Skokomish Indian Tribe
Cindy Wilson	Thurston County (alternate)	Shelley Spalding	Washington State Chapter Sierra Club

Other Attendees

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Mike Gallagher	Department of Ecology	Mary Verner	Department of Ecology
Rebecca Brown	Department of Ecology	Mike Noone	Department of Ecology
Megan Kernan	WDFW	Sharon Haensly	Squaxin Island Tribe
Andrew Graham	HDR	Kell Rowen	Mason County
Josie Cummings	Building Industry Association of Washington	Bill Young	Washington State Chapter Sierra Club

[Presentation on ESSB 6091/RCW 90.94](#)

Presentation available on committee webpage.

Breakout Session on Expectations and Concerns

Comments from breakout groups, with duplicate comments merged. Flip chart images included at end of document.

Expectations	Concerns
Give land use permit applicants a realistic assessment	Not enough time for data gathering
Regulatory certainty	Excess bed-loading (aggregate)
Available science and data	Lack of historical habitat
Fund hydrological studies	Adequate funding for all watersheds (projects and data)
Long term monitoring and enforcement	Representation of rural homeowners
Effective measures of success	Can't come to agreement, no progress
Set "sideboard" to achieve progress	Rulemaking done before data collection is done to ensure adequate information
Be able to use previous watershed plan	Clarifying who "sits" at the table – main, alternates
Provide WRIA committee funding/NEB policy documents and expert presentations	Clarification on decision-making process
Set up data collection procedures and adaptive management after the fact	Not enough time and funding for data gathering
Technical coordination among parties	How does the group measure success?
Stay within scope of law	One entity can prevent consensus
Keep the "parking lot" even if item not answered	Legal concerns about going too far out of the scope of RCW 90.94
Actions to answer parts of parking lot items	
Get a handle on existing conditions in the WRIA	
Get historical perspective	
Data consistency	
Stick to timeline	
Clearly understood and communicated guidelines for operating	
Use science and not emotion in decision-making	
Projects identified in plans are implemented – done so in a way that unfunded mandates aren't put upon local jurisdictions	
Consensus is a primary role of the group	
Water quality, quantity, and salmon habitat will be protected	
Note dissent along the way	
The group will go on field trips	
Televis (web) each committee meeting	
Public input on every meeting agenda	

Discussion Summary

Committee Chair Angela Johnson introduced the Committee and discussed goals for the group as well as next steps. Mike Gallagher (Ecology) gave a presentation on ESSB 6091/RCW 90.94, with a focus on WRIA 14. Throughout the meeting, Committee members raised several questions and concerns.

An issue was raised concerning clarification on WRIA 14a and 14b and how that will affect planning efforts under RCW 90.94. WRIA 14b drains into Lower Hood Canal, and was previously grouped with WRIA 16 for prior watershed planning efforts under RCW 90.82. The Committee will discuss this issue in more detail at future meetings.

The USGS is developing a groundwater model in Mason County. The timeline for this project and how it can inform the WRIA 14 planning effort will continue to be discussed.

The \$300 million in funding authorized for the next 15 years is a new statewide funding source. We expect that some projects will apply for funds from this new Streamflow Restoration Grant Program as well as other existing funding sources. Eligible projects include water projects and non-water projects, such as habitat restoration. Water projects are prioritized for funding. Projects in basins undergoing planning and basins with endangered fish species are also prioritized for funding. The first grant round closed on October 31, 2018. For the first round, the focus was on “wet water, shovel ready” projects in the priority basins. Final decisions on projects awarded by Ecology will be made in early 2019. Some Committee members have expressed disagreement with project eligibility under the interim guidance, for example funding for studies.

Concerns were raised regarding Ecology’s interpretation of RCW 90.94, along with a disagreement that the law limits the Committee to offsetting permit-exempt well consumptive use in place, and in time. It was expressed that the Committee should go beyond that limited scope with its plan and ensure that projects could consider all water uses and ecosystem function. This will be a topic that the group will consider further, and determine how the WRIA 14 plan will meet Net Ecological Benefit within the scope of RCW 90.94.

A concern was expressed that the Ecology well log database is not accurate, and that the group should consider looking into ways to get a more accurate count of wells. Ecology’s database is not 100% accurate for several reasons, including the fact that there was not historically a requirement to report or record wells, however Ecology views it as a valuable tool. It was suggested that other efforts to inventory wells in WRIA 14 may be needed to supplement Ecology’s database.

A question was raised regarding the timing of the plan development, and how to account for the impacts of wells which are currently being installed given that offsets will not occur until later. As the group develops its priority project list, we will consider the issue of timing for offsets.

Some challenges may arise due to the nature of WRIA 14 and the large number of sub-basins. This is something the group will keep in mind as we move forward, and further discuss offsetting within sub-basins. Sub-basins are unique and we will continue to discuss ways to meet the needs of the watershed.

The group will need to discuss what constitutes consensus in terms of decision-making within the Committee. We will be getting more in detail on this, as well as the structure of the group, in the next couple of months as we discuss the group Operating Principles and Charter.

Ecology accepted comments on two actions related to the Streamflow Restoration Law: The Streamflow Restoration Funding Program Interim Guidance was open for comments through October 28, 2018. This guidance will be developed into rule proposal which will be used for future grant periods after the 2018 Streamflow Restoration Grant funding cycle. Additionally, comments were accepted on the Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) Interim Guidance through November 9, 2018. The final NEB guidance is anticipated to be published in early 2019.

Plans are adopted if the Committee approves them and Ecology determines that they meet Net Ecological Benefit by June 30, 2021. Rulemaking would be triggered by the following: the Committee recommends a change to the \$500 building permit fee or a change to the 950 gallons per day maximum annual average limit; or if the Committee does not approve the plan by June 30, 2021. The Committee can make recommendations to Ecology to change the instream flow rule, but this will require more discussion within the Committee. It is possible that new information may be available in some areas with better data collection and modelling, and this would be a good topic for discussion at a future meeting.

Concerns were expressed regarding duplicating efforts of existing committees. At the December meeting, we will talk more about coordination with Salmon Recovery Lead Entities (LE), Local Integrating Organizations (LIO), and other existing efforts. In the meantime, Ecology staff will continue discussions with LE and LIO staff. Ecology staff chairing the various Committees will coordinate when there is an issue that overlaps multiple WRIAs.

There was no public comment.

Parking Lot

Parking lot items will carry over to future meetings until the Committee agrees they have been addressed.

- How do permit-exempt wells impact/interact with instream flow rules, and how are they governed by them?

Action Items

- Ecology will send out a doodle poll to 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. Ecology will send out an additional Doodle Poll to select the standing meeting date.
- Ecology will continue conversations with Salmon Recovery Lead Entities and Local Integrating Organizations to discuss opportunities and concerns regarding formal/informal engagement in the planning process.
- The next meeting will focus on operating principles. Ecology 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?
 - Should we come up with a new name for the Committee?
 - What are some trainings the Committee would like to see?

Flipcharts from breakout sessions

Hopes / Expectations	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set 3-6 months to achieve progress - Be able to use existing not approved plan - Provide WRIA committee on funding/NEP policy does & expect presentations - Set up data collection procedures & adaptive mgmt into the fact - Tech coord amongst parties - stay within scope of land - Keep the "parking lot" even if turn not answered "parts" of parking lot items - get a handle on existing and then in the future - get historical perspective - data consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can't come to agreement - no progress - understanding done before data collection to ensure adequate info - clarifying who "sits" @ table - who's & how - clarification on decision making process - how decisions should

Expectations and HOPES	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hope to stick to timeline - clearly understood & communicated guideline for operating - use science & not emotion in decision-making - Projects identified in plans are implemented - Done so in a way that unfunded mandates aren't put upon local jurisdictions - Consensus is a primary role of the group - water quality, quantity & salmon habitat will be protected - note dissent along the way - Field trips - Teleview each committee meeting (web) - Public input on every agenda meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough time for ^{funding} data gathering - measuring success - one group can prevent consensus - legal concerns about going too far out of the scope of RCW 90.94

Hopes / Expectations	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GIVE ^{Land use} Permit Applications Realistic Assessment REGULATORY CERTAINTY AVAILABLE SCIENCE + DATA FUND HYDRO STUDIES LONG TERM Monitoring & Enforcement EFFECTIVE MEASURES OF SUCCESS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOT ENOUGH TIME FOR DATA GATHERING EXCESS (BEDLOADING) (AGGREGATE) ^{historical} LACK OF Habitat ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR ALL WATERSHED (PROJECTS + DATA) Representation of RURAL HOMEOWNERS