

**Meeting Notes from the CAC/TAG Meeting**  
February 7, 2008, 4:00 to 6:00pm  
Pierce County Environmental Services Building,  
Cascade Conference Room

**1. Introductions – those present included:** Eli Asher, Hans Berge, Scott Hansen, Tom Kantz, Ron Larson, Tyler Patterson, Melissa Paulson, Lorin Reinelt, Dave Seabrook, Keith Underwood, Kristin Williamson

**2. Updates and Information Sharing**

- a. Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) Update – Lorin distributed a handout, showing a schedule for completion of the PSP Action Agenda. Tasks and activities include gathering existing information, topic forums and workshops, action area workshops and leadership meetings. The South Sound Action Area workshop will be on March 7. The date of the South Central workshop is unknown.
- b. Watershed Leads Update – The updated 3-year project list is due in mid-April to the PSP Salmon program. We will be working with the PSP to develop a list of salmon habitat projects for inclusion in the 2009-11 biennial budget request.
- c. South Puget Sound Action Area Core Group – The core group is meeting regularly to work on issues in the South Sound Action Area. An Ecosystem Health Issues workshop will be held Feb. 27 to examine issues affecting South Puget Sound health and location of hot spots. They will be developing a spatially explicit list of issues and problems.
- d. South Sound Science Symposium – A symposium is schedule for March 26 to focus on ecosystem issues and questions unique to south Sound. There will be numerous technical presentations on water quality, forage fish, salmon, marine birds and mammals, and other topics.

**3. WRIA 12 Allocation or Potential Lead Entity**

Keith led the discussion focused on deciding which of three options to pursue on this topic: (1) maintain status quo, (2) internal allocation to WRIA 12, or (3) pursuing a separate WRIA 12 lead entity. Scott expressed support for option 3 as the only way to bring reliable funding to WRIA 12. Dave favors option 2 because of concern that option 3 would not be successful and it would draw funding from other watersheds. Tom K. favors option 3 if it can be successful. He's concerned about waning interest in WRIA 12 because projects are not receiving any funding. He favors option 2 as a fallback. Ron is concerned about option 2, noting that we shouldn't set up a scoring system and then not follow it by allocating funding to a lower scored project in WRIA 12. Tyler asked whether there is value in being equitable with a watershed that doesn't merit it.

Dave noted the importance of maintaining public support from WRIA 12 to support overall salmon recovery efforts. Scott supported Dave's comments and also noted the importance of WRIA 12 steelhead and coho populations. Melissa noted that we can handle it locally using option 2; option 3 would make WRIA 12 equitable with other like WRIs in Puget Sound, but noted it's not a guarantee. Keith questioned the timing and noted there is a risk. We should try to take care of this in our own watershed first, and

not leave WRIA 12 behind. Hans suggested that updating the strategy to address steelhead might give more weight to WRIA 12 projects. **Dave made a motion to support option 2 (internal allocation) as an interim and begin pursuit of option 3 (separate WRIA 12 lead entity). After brief discussion, this approach was approved by consensus.** A decision on percent allocation to WRIA 12 will be decided at the next meeting.

#### **4. WRIA 10/12 CAC/TAG Scoring System**

A committee consisting of Keith, Dave, Ron, Lorin and Melissa met on January 29 to develop recommendations for updating the CAC/TAG scoring system. Dave gave a brief overview of the history of the CAC/TAG scoring system and strategy development. In about 2002, the TAG developed the technical/science scoring based on benefit to salmon, certainty of success, and fit to strategy. That year, the SRFB recognized the strategy as the “most improved.” He noted that there was concern in the past few rounds about the 0-10 score for the CAC criteria, noting that it is too broad. There was also an interest in revising the CAC criteria. Melissa presented an overview of the scoring and evaluation criteria used by WRIAs 7 and 11, referring to a summary handout. She highlighted the scoring system of WRIA 7, with scoring from 0-5, and guidance that helps enhance consistency between evaluators. She also highlighted some of the community support questions included in the WRIA 11 scoring.

Keith summarized the proposed changes recommended by the committee. This includes changing the weighting of scores from the CAC (30%) and TAG (70%). This represents a 5% change from the previous 25/75. This is proposed due to the change of the landowner willingness criterion from the TAG to the CAC and to slightly increase the importance of citizen and community support. The committee also updated the CAC criteria (changing the format to questions) and proposed following the 0-5 scoring used in the WRIA 7 example. The changes were previously distributed by email to all CAC and TAG members. Tyler asked for a clarification of the sustainability criteria. Hans questioned whether we might use a 1, 3, 5 scoring system. Keith noted that we are trying to allow for greater variance and to have more discrimination between values. Hans asked about the reasoning for the change from the 25/75 rating. Keith noted that the landowner willingness was changed to the CAC and we were trying to have slightly stronger emphasis on the citizen component. **Tom K. moved that we accept the new CAC criteria as proposed by the committee. This was approved by unanimous consensus.**

Scott moved that we change the weighting to 30/70. Hans was opposed. Tom noted that this is the continuing erosion of the technical merit of projects. Dave noted that this recognizes that there are other important elements, particularly public support. This is one way to have project sponsors take public support more seriously. The legislation that created this process anticipated broad community support as important. Hans agreed, but noted he still had some reluctance. **However, with that explanation, the revised weighting (30/70) was approved by consensus.**

The final discussion focused on the TAG scoring. It was noted that there is a need for more transparency. The CAC asked the TAG to provide more detail on the scores for benefit to salmon and certainty of success. The TAG was asked to respond at the March 7 meeting. **It was also decided that preliminary CAC member scores must be turned in to the Lead Entity Coordinator in advance of the meeting for CAC scores to be counted.**

Regional projects proposal – please review proposal and send any comments to Tom Kantz.

Marine shoreline and nearshore assessment – Kristin presented preliminary results from the WRIA 11/12 nearshore assessment. As part of this project, they will be developing 30% plans for 2-3 projects. Kristin distributed a powerpoint summary of the project, including information about habitat, beach, forage fish, eelgrass, creek mouth estuary, beach seining and modification surveys. Possible nearshore restoration projects include estuarine reconnection, habitat enhancement, riparian plantings, beach nourishment, retrofits to the railway, soft armoring, bluff/sediment reconnection and stormwater treatment. Several projects from this assessment will be developed for inclusion in the strategy update or the 3-year project list.

**5. Membership on the CAC/TAG for 2008 Funding Round** - We discussed the need to expand the CAC in advance of the next funding round. We will need to advertise for additional members, so that they can be in place by April 2008.

**Meeting was adjourned at 6:10pm**

**Next meeting** will be March 6, 2008 at Pierce County ESB.