

Meeting Notes from the CAC/TAG Meeting
March 27, 2008, 3:00 to 6:00pm
Pierce County Environmental Services Building,
Cascade Conference Room

1. Introductions – those present included: Eli Asher, Hans Berge, Bob Burkle, Karen Chang, Tom Kantz, Russ Ladley, Ron Larson, Bart Madison, Tyler Patterson, Lorin Reinelt, Dave Seabrook, Harold Smelt, Keith Underwood, Carl Ward, Dan Wrye

2. Updates and Information Sharing

- a. TAG field trip to Puyallup River at Electron Dam and Acclimation Ponds – The TAG had a field trip to the Electron Dam on March 11 to view the fish passage issues (adult ladder and juvenile downstream migration). The TAG also visited one of the Puyallup Tribe's acclimation ponds on Rushing water Creek.
- b. 2008 SRFB Funding and 3-year list – The updated 3-year project list is due April 18 to the Puget Sound Partnership. The expected SRFB allocation in 2008 for the WRIA 10/12 lead entity is \$624,463.

3. Proposed Scope Modification – Puyallup River Setback Levee Project

Dan Wrye gave an overview of Pierce County's request to revise the scope of its design grant for the Puyallup River Setback levee at Fennel Creek. Pierce County proposes to extend the project to include the South Fork levee setback site just upstream on the Puyallup (RM 17.8-18.4). Because of land ownership and willing seller issues, the proposal is to complete a 100% design for the South Fork site and a 30% design for the Fennel Creek site. Pierce County will be closing on property (encompassing 2/3 of the South Fork site) in the next few weeks, with partial funding by a WWRP grant. The South Fork site construction could occur by 2011, whereas construction at the Fennel Creek site is dependent on one remaining property owner, who is not yet ready to sell.

Ron asked whether the TAG has reviewed the South Fork site. The WRIA 10/12 TAG has not reviewed the site, but it is one of the top three priorities in the levee setback feasibility study. Tom K. noted that the TAG for the levee setback study is supportive of the South Fork site. Several members of the WRIA 10/12 TAG serve on study TAG, including Russ, Hans, Tom N., and Martin Fox. Russ noted that the South Fork levee setback project is also included in the Tribal catalogue, but it also recommends channel excavation at the site. Bart noted that in the end, we would get two projects moving forward, one with full design and the other with 30% design. Lorin noted that this change has also been discussed with Joe Ryan and Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz at the Puget Sound Partnership, and Brian Abbott and Barb McIntosh at the RCO. They are waiting for a recommendation from the WRIA 10/12 CAC on this proposed change.

Keith noted that the proposed change and the South Fork site seem to meet the technical criteria, but he expressed some concern about the process and funding. Tom K. moved to support the shift in funds to the South Fork site. Bart seconded. Russ asked about whether there was a need for more funds at the White River county-line project. Lorin explained more details about the funding of the six projects in the past

round, noting that all had been funded in full (as per original request) and the County-line project was fully funded with the \$1.24 million in SRPF/PSAR funds and \$500,000 project partner funds from Pierce County. **The CAC approved the proposed revisions to the scope, which includes 100% design for the South Fork site in the project.** Lorin will send an email to the PSP and RCO informing them of this decision.

4. Update of the Lead Entity Strategy

Lorin summarized the changes to the lead entity strategy that have occurred over the past three months. A “track changes” version of the strategy was sent to all CAC/TAG members. Key updates follow: (1) Chapter 1 - additions related to steelhead and passing Chinook into lower 4 miles of Chambers Creek; (2) Chapter 2 - Addition of H-integration paragraph and reference to appendix; (3) Chapter 4 - (a) addition of steelhead priority restoration recommendations, (b) Important areas to emphasize for protection and restoration in WRIA 10, (c) natural Chinook and steelhead focus in lower 4 miles of Chambers Creek, and (d) preliminary priorities for WRIA 12 shoreline; (4) Chapter 5 - addition of levee setback and Puyallup estuary projects and section on regional projects; (5) Chapter 6 - Updates to reflect changes in CAC scoring criteria; (6) Chapter 7 - Addition of priority data gaps; (7) Chapter 8 – Updated CAC/TAG scoring, rating guidance and criteria; and (8) Appendix A - New H-integration appendix.

Bob proposed several edits and additions, including (1) references to Chambers Bay and the marine shoreline as priorities in WRIA 12; (2) noting how protection and restoration for Chinook and steelhead will generally address the needs of bull trout; and (3) addition of WRIA 10 and 12 steelhead (under priority stock status). Bob’s proposed changes were approved. Keith asked whether we should consider including an appendix on what we have accomplished in the watershed. He also noted that there is no measure of population response in the strategy. Dave noted that we should keep a track record of progress. Bart suggested a specific reference to acquisitions as a priority for protection. Dave noted that the strategy is protection, but we don’t necessarily want to emphasize acquisition. There was no consensus to make this change. Eli suggested several minor changes (language, capitalization of Chinook) that were approved.

Keith noted that we don’t have actual adult numbers for Chinook, coho, steelhead, etc. Everything is based on EDT modeling; he suggested a future update to reflect actual fish numbers. Keith suggested several changes, including: (1) noting a lower priority for WRIA 12 streams instead of “not considered a priority,” (2) including the reference for Ladley, rather than noting “personal communication,” (3) addition of Chambers Bay as a high priority in WRIA 12 (Chapter 7), and (4) moving references before the appendixes. These changes were approved. The tables in Chapter 7 will also be updated to add bull trout to all rows under “species” (long-term priorities), and to add bull trout and coho to the bottom five rows of the near-term priorities table. Keith asked a question about Appendix B (“policy recommendations”). Tom K. noted that this was a compromise in the last update to address sticky issues involving fish management. **With the additional changes noted above, the updated WRIA 10/12 lead entity strategy was approved by consensus.**

5. WRIA 12 Allocation for 2008 and Future Rounds

Lorin gave some background from past meetings where we have discussed three options to address WRIA 12 funding, including (1) status quo, (2) internal allocation, or (3) separate WRIA 12 lead entity status. At the February 7 meeting, the CAC approved option 2 as an interim and requested that we pursue option 3, if feasible. We deferred a decision on the allocation to the March meeting. Historically, WRIA 12 has received about 10% of the total funding. Dave proposed 15% for WRIA 12. Eli proposed less than 10%. The idea of a 5-year rolling average was also suggested. Tyler noted that we need to ensure that the projects exceed the “project of concern” threshold that the Science Review Panel applies. The language we choose is important. Keith moved to **support a planning target of 10% of the SRFB allocation to WRIA 10/12, based on a 5-year rolling average.** The 5-year rolling average means that there is no commitment to allocation funds in individual years. Dave seconded. Tom K. expressed a concern about potential projects that don’t meet a certain “quality test.” **The CAC approved the above proposal as a planning target.**

6. Update of 3-year Workplan and Narrative

Lorin distributed a draft of the process and schedule for updating the 3-year watershed implementation priorities for WRIA 10/12. Key steps are:

1. Delete projects that were funded in 8th round that are not asking for additional funding (White River Countyline, Greenwater LWD, White River Acquisition, Puyallup Setback at Fennel Creek)
2. Solicit new projects that meet the following criteria: (1) project can be completed or initiated in the next 3 years; (2) project fits the lead entity strategy; and (3) project has a ready sponsor.
3. Fill out new 3-year project list template from PSP (see spreadsheet) with up-to-date project and budget information (due to Lorin by April 4). The CAC approved 3-year project list must be submitted to PSP by April 18.
4. Approve the 3-year project list update at April 10 meeting.

Project sponsors were asked to send information on potential new projects to Lorin by April 4. Lorin and Tom K. will lead update of the narrative. Tom K. noted the importance of adding priority data gaps to the 3-year list.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:50pm

Next meeting will be April 10, 2008 at the Pierce County ESB.