

Meeting Notes from the CAC/TAG Meeting
March 6, 2008, 4:00 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, Tom Nelson, Melissa Paulson, Lorin Reinelt, Keith Underwood

2. Updates and Information Sharing

- a. 2008 SRFB Round and Funding – The estimated amount of 2008 SRFB funding statewide is \$20 million. This translates to approximately \$600,000 for the Pierce County (WRIA 10/12) lead entity. New for this round: (1) design only projects are eligible with a \$200,000 maximum and no match required; (2) lead entities can submit 2-3 project alternates that may be funded up to 180 days after SRFB funding decisions; (3) combination projects (e.g., acquisition/design and construction) requires phase 1 work to be completed within 18 months; (4) the landowner willingness form has been renamed “landowner acknowledgment form.”
- b. Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) Update – Action Area workshops were held for South Central Puget Sound on Feb. 25/26; the South Puget Sound workshop will be held on March 7. The focus was on Sound-wide and local status and threats, and discussions focusing on the six PSP goals: (1) water quality, (2) water quantity, (3) species/biodiversity, (4) habitat/land use, (5) quality of life, and (6) human health.
- 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 was held Feb. 27 to examine issues affecting South Puget Sound health and location of hot spots. Next Core Group meeting is March 21.
- d. Habitat Work Schedule Training – Training for project sponsors on the HWS is scheduled for March 31 in Tacoma and April 2 in Poulsbo. Every potential project sponsor is encouraged to send at least one person to the training.

3. WRIA 10/12 Strategy Update

Mission statement in strategy - Tom N. raised some issues about the mission of the WRIA 10/12 CAC noting the words “recovery,” “self-sustaining” and the geographic focus on WRIAs 10 and 12. With respect to recovery, he asked whether this implies a focus on only listed species. Tom K. noted that we were thinking more broadly than just the recovery of listed species. Bob noted that with the CAC in particular, there is a broader interest in multiple species of salmonids. With respect to self-sustaining, the question is whether this focuses primarily on wild stocks. Bob suggested the focus is on locally adapted fish. Finally, the focus on WRIA 10 and 12 habitat would seem to limit the funding of regional projects. This should be considered in updating the strategy.

Regional projects proposal – Tom K. presented a proposal to address funding of regional projects. He gave a brief summary of the funding of the Nisqually River (dike setback) project in the past round. If we are to consider future funding of regional

projects, we need a WRIA 10/12 position to take forward to the South Sound group. Over the course of the discussion, the following options were discussed:

- (1) No participation in regional project funding;
- (2) Regional projects – nearshore projects only in South Sound (south of the narrows bridge);
- (3) Regional projects – nearshore projects in all areas of WRIA 10/12, WRIA 11, 13, 14 and 15;
- (4) Regional projects – nearshore projects throughout the ESU (Puget Sound wide);
- (5) Regional projects – nearshore projects or freshwater projects that focused on primary Chinook populations of regional significance to south and south central Puget Sound (White River spring Chinook or Nisqually River fall Chinook);
- (6) General statement of support of ESU-wide regional projects that are regionally significant and “ready to go” → make the decision on a case-by-case basis.

Russ questioned why we should limit this to WRIA 10-15. We should consider funding regional projects that benefit our salmon populations. Tom N. and Eli concurred that maybe we should consider funding ESU-wide priorities. Keith expressed concern that we are not even funding enough locally in WRIA 12. He noted that we need to focus on diversity and Chambers Bay as an important nearshore area. Russ noted that at some point we will be held accountable for what we’ve done; we have to focus on areas that can produce fish and use the funding wisely. Eli questioned the need for the regional projects write-up in the strategy. Tom noted that if we’re not looking for reciprocity, we may not need a write-up or agreement. Keith thinks that regional projects should be in line with the priorities of WRIA 10/12; benefits should be measured in terms of the benefit to our populations. Tom N. noted that if an outside lead entity needs funding for a very good project, we should be willing to contribute funding to it. He doesn’t think we need to worry about reciprocity; there won’t be that many projects that come along.

Tom K. said he would complete a draft write-up on the general case noted in option 6 above. Keith summarized that we should consider projects of regional significance that address de-listing of Chinook ESU-wide, in freshwater or nearshore areas. Hans concurred, noting that we need consensus on the projects to fund them. **Tom K. will write-up a summary regional project statement by March 13 (for inclusion in the strategy).**

H-integration – Tom K. presented his summary write-up about H-integration in the watershed, with a focus on the Puyallup River fall Chinook and the White River spring Chinook. Tom asked how we want to treat H-integration in the strategy. He suggested putting the write-up in an appendix. Keith noted that this is treading into the management side of salmon. Tom K. noted that natural productivity is low. Lorin noted that it would be helpful to know how the information from the H-integration and AHA analysis can inform the types of projects that should be a priority in the watershed. Keith noted that we can only control habitat capacity; we cannot control productivity. Keith asked if we are focusing more on the habitat element or fish management aspects in this analysis. Russ noted that White River spring Chinook is probably the best example of recovery success in the state. Tom K. said that the preliminary

recommendation is to focus on actions that improve productivity. **Tom K. will update and modify the H-integration write-up by March 13. It will be included in the appendix with a reference paragraph in the main body of the text.**

Marine nearshore assessment in WRIA 11/12 – Eli gave a short update on the nearshore assessment, referring to a recent summary completed by SPSSEG. The final two pages of the summary provide a list of restoration opportunities by action type: primary estuarine system, barrier lagoon system, secondary-tributary estuarine system, riparian treatment, beach creation/augmentation, removal or softening of shoreline and removal or retrofitting of overwater and intertidal structures, and protection. Eli suggested some preliminary priorities; SPSSEG will recommend projects for inclusion in the updated 3-year project list.

Steelhead and Priority Data Gaps – Tom N. summarized proposed updates to the strategy relative to steelhead and priority data gaps. This is a condensed and prioritized version of information presented at the January 17 CAC meeting. It includes important project types for steelhead and important areas to emphasize in WRIA 10/12 for Steelhead. It also summarizes three key priority data gaps: (1) smolt trapping to help understand the migration timing and production in various rivers and streams for multiple species; (2) EDT modeling for steelhead; and (3) salmon productivity upstream of the Electron dam. Melissa asked why we don't include the entire 4-page write-up in the strategy update. Tom N. noted that it has to do with relative priorities and the level of confidence in the broader list. This is our chance to direct possible funding to those things that are most important. Hans recommended adding "comprehensive habitat surveys" to the priority data gaps.

Tom N., Tom K. and Lorin will make proposed changes in the strategy in knockout language in time to review in advance of the March 27 meeting. This should be available to send out to the CAC/TAG by March 21.

4. WRIA 12 Allocation for 2008 and Future Rounds

The CAC deferred discussion on a possible WRIA 12 allocation percentage to the next CAC meeting.

5. Schedule for Strategy and 3-year Project List Update

Lorin distributed a draft schedule and timeline for completing the strategy update in March, completing the 3-year list update by April 18 and initiating the 2008 SRFB funding round in May. It also summarized progress on the strategy update during the past several CAC meetings. In order to meet the April 18 deadline to the Puget Sound Partnership for the updated 3-year list, it will be necessary to schedule two CAC meetings between now and April 18. **The CAC agreed on a 3-hour meeting on March 27 (3-6pm) to finalize the strategy update and initiate the 3-year project list update and a regular 2-hour meeting on April 10 to finalize the 3-year project list for 2008.**

Meeting was adjourned at 6:20pm

Next meeting will be March 27, 2008 at the Pierce County ESB.