

Kittitas County Water Quantity Citizen Advisory Committee

February 17, 2015

Facilitator: Dan Haller, Aspect Consulting

Committee Members: Roger Weaver, Anne Johansen, Carey Gazis, Lance Ballew, Mark Nelson, David Bowen, Jeremy Bach, Marc Kirkpatrick, Rory Savage, John Eaton, Sage Park, Ben Serr, Winston Norrish, Mark Larson

Staff: Robin Read, Erin Moore, Kaitlyn Reddick, Holly Myers, Holly Duncan, Paul Jewell, Lindsay Ozbolt

What we are aiming for this meeting? To hopefully come to a consensus on what the committee's recommendation will be to the Board of County Commissioners.

Review of draft memo/recommendation to BOCC:

- What form should the committee's recommendation take? Dan drafted a proposed memo that outlines what the recommendation might look like.
 - Package A: Indoor package with X gallons/day/house
 - Package B: Indoor and Outdoor package including 500 square feet of lawn
 - Terms of packages (who can purchase which package)
 - Assumptions being used to develop recommendations
 - Minority opinion with additional options/recommendations
- Comments: What about stock water? Should we be clear in our recommendation that this doesn't include stock water? Stock water is not the issue of this committee, but adding wording to indicate so would make it clearer.
- Are committee members OK with the memo coming from Dan, representing the committee? General consensus was yes.
- There is about a 12% difference in outdoor evapotranspiration rate between upper/lower county compared to the county average. This recommendation currently indicates that one number will be used for the entire county. This will avoid more administration costs, but leaves a certain amount of inequity between customers. Upper County residents would end up paying a bit more than what they need; lower county residents would end up paying a bit less. There would be one standard for water even though upper county residents wouldn't need to use as much and lower county residents would need to use a bit more due to climate and environmental differences. The committee reached consensus that using one number is preferable versus having a number for upper county and lower county. Discussion: Ecology recommended that the group consider that using one number could result in inappropriate mitigation for water usage, resulting in potential impairment if senior water users feel it isn't appropriately mitigated for. Dan pointed out that mitigation will be likely monitored at the bank level to ensure senior water rights aren't impaired. The county will be responsible for making sure of this.
- Discussion of terms of packages: Currently, the recommendation states that people can't purchase package B if they have access to outdoor irrigation. If someone doesn't have irrigation available, they must purchase package B. The minority opinion still exists that someone should be able to purchase package B even if they have outdoor irrigation, if they are willing to pay for it. In addition, additional outdoor water usage should be available for purchase. The committee

reached consensus to leave the majority and minority opinions as they are in the recommendation (with minor wordsmithing.)

de minimis outdoor usage quantity

- We can add language to the recommendation that allows for minimal outdoor use such as washing windows, washing cars, etc.
- An average of 60 minutes per week of this type of usage would be 77 gallons per day according to the water usage calculator
- Average of 15 minutes per day would be 19 gallons per day
- Average of 10 minutes per day would be 13 gallons per day
- Average of 3 minutes per day would be 4 gallons per day
- For a reference point: 500 square feet of lawn would result in an average of 61 gallons per day
- This usage needs to be considered when developing the final recommendation of indoor use plus outdoor *de minimis* use.

Where are folks at with the recommendation (vote #1)? What range? (Indoor use and outdoor dominimus use only, outdoor use would be an additional 61 gpd per 500 square feet of lawn)

- 150-200 gpd: 0 people
- 200-250 gpd: 2 people
- 250-300 gpd: 6 people
- 300-350 gpd: 5 people

Review estimates of water system usage data (includes indoor and outdoor usage)

- Numbers vary from 200 (DOH design manual) to 381 gpd (eastern Washington systems). Average was 272 gpd.

Re-Vote #2:

- 150-200 gpd: 0 people
- 200-250 gpd: 3 people (Reasons: Big families will be balanced out by smaller families if monitoring is done at the bank level, we shouldn't be encouraging people to overuse water when water resources are scarce, looking at usage data for Kittitas County we don't need more than 200 gpd)
- 250-300 gpd: 7 people (Reasons: cautious of protecting water resources [Ecology])
- 300-350 gpd: 3 people (Reasons: better to err on the higher side, less enforcement/complexity for county, encompasses more diversity in family size, too low of a number might discourage people from purchasing property in the county)

Re-Vote #3:

- 150-200 gpd: 0 people
- 200-250 gpd: 1 people
- 250-300 gpd: 11 people
- 300-325 gpd: 1 people

Recommendation should include:

- County needs to do clear messaging both about how the bank works and making it as simple as possible; and the importance of water conservation.

Re-Vote #4 (via paper, exact number):

- Average of all votes: 274 gpd

Recommendation: Report the data as is instead of coming to consensus on an exact number.

Since there was additional time in this meeting after completion of the chartered work tasks, we used it to discuss some items that were of interest to the group on price.

Discussion on price: We discussed whether indoor and outdoor use should be charged, given that outdoor use has the biggest consumptive use and the most impact on bank longevity.

- Should there be price difference between packages that charges proportionally more for outdoor use compared to indoor use? Consensus reached that outdoor water should be valued higher than indoor usage.
- How much more should be charged? Most agree that should be around 50% more.
- Incentives for xeriscaping could be provided by the County to assist in compliance and help make bank supplies stretch further.

Discussion on administration of bank: We discussed how the County should charge for water when it may acquire cheaper or more expensive water in certain areas or in the future (e.g. lump all charges together for a single bank price, or keep charges unique to each purchase).

- Administer different locations differently, depending on how water was acquired and at what cost?
- Or do we just use averages that we continually adjust as the county acquires more water?
- Most agree that people shouldn't be charged different prices unless the differential is great.