

**Cedar-Sammamish (WRIA 8)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee
Meeting Summary**

Committee website:

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias_1962/37321/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_8.aspx

Next Meeting: December 2018, Date and Location TBD

Meeting Information

Wednesday, October 24, 2018

9:30 am to 12:30 pm

Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village

Agenda

	Topic	Time	Action	Handouts*	Lead
1.	Welcome	9:30 am	None	- Agenda	Chair
2.	Introductions	9:40	None		All
3.	Overview of Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) and Committee Purpose	10:00	Presentation and discussion	- Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) Overview - ESSB 6091 map - WRIA 8 map	Chair
4.	Break	11:00			
5.	Breakout session: share expectations for Committee and Plan	11:05	Activity and discussion		All
6.	Next steps	12:00 pm	None	Documents distributed following meeting	Chair
7.	Public comment	12:15	None		

**all handouts are available on the Committee website*

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Councilmember John Stokes	Bellevue	Brian Landau (alternate)	Bellevue
Chris Hall (alternate)	Bothell	Bob York	Issaquah
Richard Sawyer	Kenmore	Matt Knox (alternate)	Kent
Andy Rheume	Redmond	Ronald Straka	Renton
Danika Globokar	Sammamish	Michele Koehler	Seattle
Tom Beavers	King County	Jacqueline Reid	Snohomish County
Carla Carlson	Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	Matt Baerwalde	Snoqualmie Indian Tribe

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Julie Lewis	Snoqualmie Indian Tribe	Kurt Nelson	Tulalip Tribes
John McClellan	Alderwood Water & Wastewater District	Melissa Borsting	King County Agriculture Program
Gina Clark	Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties	Dan Von Seggern	Center for Environmental Law and Policy
Stewart Reinbold	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	Stephanie Potts	Washington Department of Ecology

Other Attendees

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Jason Hatch	Washington Water Trust	Megan Kernan	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
David Hartley	Northwest Hydraulic Consultants	Jason Wilkinson	WRIA Salmon Recovery Council
Stacy Vynne	WA Department of Ecology	Ria Berns	WA Department of Ecology
Ingria Jones	WA Department of Ecology	Tom Buroker	WA Department of Ecology

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
Listening, understanding, compromise. Balancing goals	Understanding the scale of the impact – number and location of wells
Showing assumptions and methodology behind the water use estimates and project impact estimates	Operation and maintenance of projects. Long term effectiveness. Who monitors the projects after 5 years, 10 years, 20 years?
Sharing lessons learned and resources/tools from early planning Committees (WRIAs 1 and 11)	Gallons per day – do we need to offset the maximum allowed amount? (950 gpd)
Plan meets the goal of “streamflow restoration” – plan results in improvement to instream flows	Estimating consumptive use and the assumptions behind that estimate
Definition of scope of work. Keeping the committee within scope. Have a permanent “parking lot” for issues outside the scope.	Ensuring the plan is implementable
Nexus to county comprehensive planning	Time commitment, especially for those engaging in multiple committees

Expectations	Concerns
Ecology will provide good/clear definitions of plans and process and timeline/timescale	Groundwater boundaries vs. project and use boundaries
Plan is implemented and monitored (ongoing)	Unfunded (local) mandates
What is the projected consumptive water use in WRIA 8? Process could be simple in WRIA 8	Uncertainty around funding for projects and types of projects
Ecology as process facilitator	Outside political influence
No Ecology director override used (because plan approved by consensus)	Committee cannot reach consensus and plan goes to Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Projects are “in-place”	What is the role of cities? Since citizens within the UGA get municipal water
Projects benefit salmon	Out of kind mitigation being seen as replacement for consumptive use offset
Reduce duplicate efforts with Salmon Recovery. Use existing info from other planning efforts. Don't reinvent the wheel	Funding – will it be enough? What happens after the \$300 million, 15 year grant program ends?
Address the water quantity data gaps in the Salmon Recovery Plan	Relative project cost. Location differences will impact costs (e.g. urban vs rural)
No double dipping. Offsets not considered mitigation	Consumptive use of water beyond the 20 year plan. Extension of sewer could change consumptive use estimates.
Define nexus between domestic wells and stormwater management, related to consumptive use	Impact to municipal water rights from new exempt wells
Understand role of local jurisdictions	Accounting for impacts back to January 2018
Water conservation opportunities	Using EAGL for grants
More regional water to reduce impact to local streams	Diverse interests coming to consensus agreement
Evaluate streams without instream flows and determine whether they need them	Technical aspects – seasonality, hydrogeology, impacts on species
Funding opportunity for jurisdictions to continue restoration work, including land acquisition	
Understand priority; maintain watershed focus	
Relationships are maintained	

Discussion Summary

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 WRIs.

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. Basins undergoing planning and basins with endangered fish species are prioritized for funding.

Committee membership is based on the roster identified in the legislation. The legislation calls for all cities in the watershed to be invited to join the Committee. Ecology believes there is a role for cities, but a city may choose not to participate if they do not see a role for themselves. Cities may choose to caucus if that is a more appropriate approach given capacity limitations. The legislation is focused on permit-exempt wells constructed after January 19, 2018 and does not affect older wells or water right permitting for municipal water.

For the three interest areas (environmental, agricultural and residential construction), Ecology solicited nominations broadly for groups representing those interests and conducted a survey with the representative governments. Based on the survey results, Ecology invited representatives from organizations that had both the capacity to fill the seats and committed to representing the broader interest. For the WRIA 8 Committee these organizations include: King County Agriculture Program, representing agriculture interests; Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, representing residential construction interests; and the Center for Environmental Law and Policy, representing environmental interests. The Committee may choose to invite other groups that are not called out in the legislation as non-voting, ex officio members. The Committee may consider a subcommittee or workgroup structure to support development of draft products.

What is the scope of the problem? Since the watershed is very urban, the number of new projected wells could be small for WRIA 8.

Rulemaking would be triggered by the following: the Committee, by consensus, 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 consensus. The Committee can make recommendations to Ecology to change the instream flow rule, but Ecology is not required to engage in instream flow rulemaking and will consider this on a case-by-case basis.

Plans are adopted if the Committee approves them by full consensus and Ecology determines that they meet Net Ecological Benefit by June 30, 2021.

Suggestion for Ecology to create a map showing the water district boundaries and UGAs.

We received a question about including projects in the plan that are implemented after January 18, 2018 (when the bill was passed) but before plan approval. The Ecology Policy team provided the following response: Projects included in the plans should meet the intent of the ESSB 6091 to develop new projects that benefit instream resources to offset the consumptive impact of permit-exempt domestic wells. Thus, Ecology interprets that if the Planning Unit or Committee agrees, projects or phases of a project that sign a funding contract or agreement after January 18, 2018 can be included in the plan and can count toward the offset. We interpret that projects completed before January 19, 2018 should not be included in the plan and would not count toward achieving NEB or the offset of the consumptive impact of new domestic permit-exempt wells in the basin.

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 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? So the acronym isn't WREC!

Flip charts from breakout sessions

WRIA 8 Expectations Hopes	Concerns
Part of a group - compromises can help whole group ✓	SRFB/BRP ✓ (mitigation?)
Maintain + improve instream flows. ✓	Cities need to supply w/in USA → What's their role? ✓
In place projects	Out of kind being seen as replacement for cons. use offset
Projects that benefit salmon	Funding - enough and after \$300m + 15yrs. ✓
Reduce duplicate efforts w/ Salmon Recovery - use existing info. → Don't reinvent the wheel. ✓	Relative project cost (location differences) (veg, urban v. rural \$)
Address W Quantity data gap in Salmon Recovery Plan ✓	Consumptive use beyond 20 yrs. Sewer changing consumptive use portion. ✓
type-Offsets won't be considered mitigation (no double dipping) ✓	Groundwater boundaries v. project + use boundaries ✓
- Define nexus btwn. domestic wells + stormwater mgmt (re: cons. use)	

Expectations	Concerns
Use existing planning work products ✓	time commitment ✓
Report-out from existing collaborative efforts ✓	not working together across similar efforts ✓
Nexus to county comprehensive planning ✓	Definition of scope of work + product/plan
Definition of scope of work ✓	strategy? tactical
Ecology provides good/ clear definition of plan + process + time-line/time scale ✓	unfunded (local) mandates ✓
Plan is implemented + monitored (ongoing) ✓	process for calculating consumptive use ✓
Process could be simple! (in WRIA 8) ✓	uncertainty around funding projects + types of projects ✓
Ecology as process facilitator ✓	outside political influence ✓
No director ever used ✓	

Expectations	WRIA 8 Concerns
understand role of local jurisdictions water conservation apps. ✓	impact to muni water right from new exempt wells
more regional water to ↓ impact on local streams ✓	accounting for impacts back to Jan 2018
What is projected impact? Not too much work? ✓	"Double Dipping" of Projects (Salmon recovery + well offset) ✓
Evaluate streams up instream flow \$ do they need? How align this work? Need discussion ✓	time commitment + engagement on multiple committees (how align, efficiency) ✓
\$ opportunity → jurisdictions continue restoration ✓	another \$ program! EAGL! ✓
Land acquisition apps ✓	diverse interests, getting to agreement ✓
understand priority, maintain watershed focus ✓	Techn aspects, seasonality, hydro + impacts on species ✓
Relationships maintained ✓	

Expectations	Concerns
listening, understanding, compromise - balancing goals ✓	understanding scale of impact (# of wells) ✓
Show assumptions, methodology behind projects + estimates ✓	O & M of projects - long term effectiveness - who maintains projects 5yrs, 10yrs, 20yrs ✓
lessons learned from early planning WRIA 8 ✓	implementability of plan ✓
permanent parking lot for issues outside cmk scope ✓	gpt- do we need to offset higher amount if allowed (i.e. full 450 gal) ✓
plan meets "streamflow restoration" goal ✓	how cmk estimates consumptive use - the assumption behind it ✓