

**Duwamish-Green (WRIA 9)
Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee
Meeting Summary**

Committee website:

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias_1962/37322/watershed_restoration_and_enhancement_-_wria_9.aspx

Next Meeting: December 2018, Date and Location TBD

Meeting Information

Monday, October 29, 2018

1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Tukwila Community Center

Agenda

	Topic	Time	Action	Handouts	Lead
1.	Welcome	1:00 pm	None	- Agenda	Chair
2.	Introductions	1:10	None		All
3.	Overview of Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) and Committee Purpose	1:30	Presentation and discussion	- Streamflow Restoration Act (ESSB 6091) Overview - ESSB 6091 map - WRIA 9 map	Chair
4.	Break	2:30			
5.	Breakout session: share expectations for Committee and Plan	2:35	Activity and discussion		All
6.	Next steps	3:30 pm	None	Documents distributed following meeting	Chair
7.	Public comment	3:45	None		

**all handouts are available on the Committee website*

Committee Representatives and Alternates in Attendance

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Lisa Tobin	Auburn	Chris Searcy (alternate)	Enumclaw
Mayor Dana Ralph	Kent	Mike Mactutis (alternate)	Kent
Mark Hoppen	Normandy Park	Councilmember Rick Forschler	SeaTac
Don Robinett (alternate)	SeaTac	Kathy Minsch	Seattle
Ryan Larson (alternate)	Tukwila	Josh Kahan	King County
Joan Lee	King County	Matt Everett	Highline Water District

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Rick Reinlasoder	King County Agriculture Program	Jennifer Anderson	Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
Trish Rolfe	Center for Environmental Law and Policy	Stewart Reinbold	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Larry Fisher (alternate)	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	Stephanie Potts	WA Department of Ecology

Committee Members not in attendance: Muckleshoot Tribe

Other Attendees

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Matt Goehring	WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Megan Kernan	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Andrew Graham	HDR	Greg Volkhardt	Tacoma Water
Stacy Vynne	WA Department of Ecology	Ria Berns	WA Department of Ecology
Ingria Jones	WA Department of Ecology	Mary Verner	WA Department of Ecology
Will Stelle	Washington Water Trust		

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
Those who attend the meeting download meeting info to future attendees/ reps	Membership/attendance/involvement drops over time
King County will share permit-exempt well data	Lack of voting authority of those who attend meetings
We will consider potential economic impact on small developments (i.e. 5 packs)	Unincorporated areas are not well represented
Where are areas that expect growth without city or PUD water?	Need a better understanding of how the Howard Hanson Dam will impact Green River flows (Tacoma Water and Army Corps)
Define level of outreach to public and interests not represented on the cmte – how often, format, etc.	What if cmte “fails” and can’t find projects to offset use
What is public comment period on the plan (and entire process)	How much time to review? how much influence on products
Look at water quality as well	Feasibility for top priority projects

Expectations	Concerns
Limit scope to requirements of legislation	Narrow scope of planning process and not accounting for cumulative impact on water resources
Define level of resource commitment	Inconsistency with other WRIA-wide planning processes (i.e. salmon recovery)
Close coordination with other committees/efforts	What happens after “20 years”?
Use sound science to identify project areas/offsets	Getting to consensus
Consistency re: policy for rural hook-ups (exempt well vs public water)	Funding availability for non-water projects
Promote projects that have multiple benefits	Adequate representation of rural interests
Mitigation is possible	Place at the table for large municipal water suppliers
Group decisions require compromise	Long term monitoring of plans – adaptive management
Focus on water quantity and water for water projects	Workload of monthly meetings
non-water projects included to benefit salmon	Is there much consumptive use to offset in WRIA 9? Magnitude of issue
Share information between WRIA Committees	Wells are not metered. How do we know how accurate our projections for consumptive water use are?
Can get population projection info from King Co.	How can we quantify benefits from given projects? Do we have existing data/analysis? Is funding available for this?
Understanding the magnitude of potential development. What does the past look like?	How will this affect larger water providers?
Keep providing water to customers	What are the opportunities for getting credit for decommissioning wells? For preventing development through land acquisition
Projects in plan are implemented	Climate change considerations
Understand existing water resources constraints	Preserve existing municipal water rights
Understanding habitat conservation plan (HCP) nexus. Maybe separate accounting process (e.g. credit/offset where project also required under HCP)	
Understanding instream flows	
Storage management and habitat	

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 WRIAs.

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.

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. During the December meeting discussion on Operating Principles, the Committee will discuss whether to allow cities to opt-in to joining the Committee later in the planning process.

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 9 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 9.

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.

Department of Ecology includes Vashon Island in the Kitsap watershed (WRIA 15), however Vashon is included in WRIA 9 for salmon recovery planning. During the December meeting, the WRIA 15 Committee will discuss whether to include Vashon in their plan or recommend for inclusion in the plan for WRIA 9. The hydrogeology of Vashon is similar to the Kitsap watershed, so it could make sense for them to remain in WRIA 15.

In WRIA 9, in-time and in-place mitigation could be challenging. Many of the jurisdictions participating on the Committee that have potential projects are downstream from where rural development will occur. The legislation states that the plan must meet two standards: (1) offsetting the quantity of water from new permit-exempt domestic wells and (2) an overall net ecological benefit for the watershed. Offsets that are in-time and in-place is the goal, but the legislation allows flexibility for offset projects that are in a different time or place than the impact. Non-water/habitat restoration projects are important to reach the net ecological benefit standard when in-time, in-place mitigation cannot occur.

The Committee will decide in early 2019 whether to delineate sub-basins within the Duwamish-Green watershed.

We will talk more about the Howard Hanson Dam and impact on instream flows at a future meeting


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!

Flipcharts from breakout sessions

WRIA 9 Expectations	Concerns
<p>Understanding magnitude of potential development? → What does the past look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep providing water to customers. - Plan projects are actually implemented. ✓ - Understand existing WR constraints - Understanding HCP NEXUS. - maybe separate accounting process - Understanding Instream Flows. - Storage mgmt. = habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How can we quantify benefits from given projects? Do we have the existing data/analyses? ✓ ↳ Funding - Magnitude of issue ✓✓ - How will this affect larger water providers? ✓✓ - What are the opportunities for credit for decommissioning? ↳ for preventing development through land acquisitions - Climate change considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserve existing rights. - muni water rights. <p>e.g. credit offsets where projects are required under HCP</p>

WRIA 9 Expectations	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - group decisions require compromise ✓ focus on % quantity / water-for-water - Some non-water projects for salmon recovery → sharing info between Committees - Can get pop info from King County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ reaching consensus - finding for non-water projects ✓ adequate representation of rural interests - large municipal water supplies - involvement ✓ long term monitoring of plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adaptive mgmt ✓ workload of monthly meeting - representation for rural land owners ✓ is there much consumptive use to offset? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wells are not metered, how do we know how accurate we are?

WRIA 9 EXPECTATIONS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Use sound science to id project areas/offsets Consistency re: policy for rural hook-ups (exempt w/ public utility) Projects have multiple benefits. ✓ Mitigation is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> feasibility for projects priority project narrow scope of planning process + not accounting for cumulative impacts on the resource ✓ Inconsistency w/ other WRIA-wide planning process (salmon recovery) ✓ What happens after "20 years" Consensus 

WRIA 9 EXPECTATIONS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ for recycled water projects o those who attend download to future attendees/ reps o King Co share permit-exempt will date o potential economic impact on small developments?? o King Co delivery of recycled water to more users o Where are areas that expect growth w/o city or PuD water o define level of outreach + to public (those not here) - how often, format, etc. o what is public comment period on plan (+ entire process) o Look at Water Quality as well o Limit scope to requirements or list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o membership/drop over time involvement o lack of voting authority of those attendee mtgs o Union incorporated areas not well represented o Green R. Streamflow + ACOE requirements w/ Howard Hansen Dam → tribs → Coord, quests about relationship o what if "fail" and can't find projects to offset use o how much time to review how much influence on products o define level of resource commitment o close coord w/ other committees/ plans