

WRIA 9 Implementation Technical Committee
Meeting Summary – July 18th, 9:00 am –12:00 am
King Street Center, 6th Floor- King/Chinook Rooms

Attendees: Ashley Bagley, King County; Katie Beaver, King County; Larry Fisher, WDFW; Matt Goehring, WRIA 9; Chris Gregersen, King County; Kollin Higgins, King County; Antonia Jindrich, Midsound Fisheries; Josh Kahan, King County; Kathy Minsch, City of Seattle; Amber Moore, PSP; Jessica Olmstead, WADNR; Doug Osterman, WRIA 9; Mike Perfetti, City of Tukwila; Dennis Robertson, City of Tukwila; Ron Straka, City of Renton;

Habitat Plan Update Workshop Summary – Matt Goehring

Building off our last meeting, we'd like to get back into policies and programs. Matt gave a summary to update people on how the workshop went and the key takeaways. The following are takeaways and topics of concern identified in the workshop broken down by subbasin:

- Marine Nearshore- much of the discussion from the workshop was focused on compliance, with a lot of room for improvement with regulations, enforcement, incentives, education, and outreach.
 - 1) Shoreline Management Act Compliance. Some of the jurisdictions wanted more of a model about shorelines and programs with how the WRIA could support them in meeting objectives, as well as potential opportunities for synergies among the jurisdictions.
 - 2) Homeowner Education and Outreach. An example of this is the Kitsap County Shore Friendly Program. Something like this could be coordinated and implemented across WRIA 9 jurisdictions.
 - 3) Riparian and Bluff Restoration. Including buy-outs of properties, education of landowners, and incentives for following rules and permitting.
 - 4) Information Sharing with Partner Jurisdictions. This includes technical support, recovery priorities, and climate change issues.
 - 5) Research needs. We don't have a good understanding of non-natal estuary rearing and how important they are to Green river Chinook. Kollin- this has been done by the Tulalip and Skagit Coop up north, looking at non natal streams and characteristics of those streams. We could implement this for WRIA 9, as well as incorporating some of what the Puyallup tribe has done. Also increase research related to soft shore armoring effectiveness as well as citizen science initiatives.

- Duwamish
 - 1) NRDA/Superfund Coordination. Was a lot of interest in moving forward with NRDA lead restoration and how the WRIA can become more engaged in the process as well as the superfund coordination. Also discussion revisiting MS-1, which directs 40% of funds to Duwamish restoration- do we want to shift this? Dennis- if we're losing fry in the Duwamish, wouldn't it be worth spending money to find out why?

- 2) Off-Site Mitigation. This won't be counted toward our recovery goals, but there is really an opportunity for this mitigation to provide a net lift to the subwatersheds especially given the costs associated with restoration in places like the Duwamish.
 - 3) Land Acquisition. If restoration isn't the priority in the Duwamish as far as WRIA funding, how do we maintain flexibility in acquiring properties if they become available?
 - 4) Riparian Revegetation. Continue developing public private partnerships, long term maintenance of revegetation, and incentives for these programs
 - 5) Stormwater Management and Source Control. Discussion of ongoing ecology PLA, in terms of cleanup and restoration we need to make sure we're not contaminating our restoration.
 - 6) Research Needs- as mentioned, fry survival and contamination are an issue that we will need to look at.
- Lower Green
 - 1) Coordinate Revegetation Efforts. A lot of interest in the Re-Green the Green program. How do we continue to coordinate this, develop synergy, and outreach. Also discussion on BMP's, public safety, and how do we manage these sites (for example, public safety, homeless camps).
 - 2) Tributary Juvenile Salmon Rearing Habitat- Based on preliminary findings from Chris's work, we know fish are using these. Barrier removal and restoration is something we should look at for these.
 - 3) Corridor Planning and Levee Setbacks- Ensure the WRIA is engaged in the process, including levee setback policies, maximizing project footprints, and open space development that benefits salmon recovery. Katie has been tracking this process. Dennis- will be participating in this representing the city of Tukwila.
 - 4) Education and Outreach. This includes elected officials, school programs, and businesses.
 - 5) Research Needs- Sedimentation, effectiveness monitoring of projects that have been done and how this can inform restoration design moving forward, tributary research.
 - Middle Green
 - 1) Coordination Between Ag and Salmon Interests- How do we coordinate these interests at the intersection of ADP/FPP and restoration potential? Primarily middle Green with some application to the Lower Green. Kollin- caution that the lower green is different in that it has more FPP and it's primarily owned by one landowner who has purchased a large amount of Ag land in the lower Green recently.
 - 2) Rearing Habitat Drives Chinook Productivity- Protect the rearing habitat the currently exists, explore flow issues that influence availability of rearing habitat.
 - 3) Protect/Restore Coldwater Sources- This includes tributary health and restoring wetlands.
 - 4) Acquisition Strategy for Levee Setbacks- Align flood control and habitat restoration.
 - 5) Education and Outreach- This included a large discussion of school programs. Ongoing pilot program called storm fest to get kids out and teach them about stormwater, could be something useful for other jurisdictions as well.
 - Upper Green- The 2005 plan drafted under the belief that we would have fish passage soon, not the case for the foreseeable future.

- 1) Innovative Stand Management- how can changing stand management using hydrology modeling (e.g. FELMA model) and climate change. Most of upper Green is privately owned, so long term having the forest land in a 40 year rotation would lead to less water so something to consider in the future with climate change.
 - 2) Road Abandonment and Closure- high density of roads, challenge with checkerboard ownership. Need some method of landscape scale land acquisition and prioritization.
 - 3) Land Acquisition and Checkerboard Land Ownership- decided how to prioritize and accomplish this on a landscape scale.
 - 4) Fish Passage- Need to assure fish passage happens in a timely matter and provide opportunity for access and cold water refugia.
- Takeaways for all watersheds- we will be organizing subwatershed rosters and finalizing individual subwatershed working groups. These groups will be meeting once or twice to refine the subwatershed specific policies. Working now on identifying groups providing representation for the subwatersheds.

Habitat Plan Update – Watershed Wide Policies and Programs – Matt Goehring

The current 2005 plan has many policies and programs scattered out through several chapters (found in chapters 3 5 and 8), and as part of the habitat plan update we would like to find a better way to organize and present these in a useful way to salmon recovery.

- Purpose

The purpose of the policies and programs are to guide salmon recovery funding, these are used for guiding grant applications and funding, project support and rationale, model policies, and enhancing awareness.

- Plan Structure

Moving forward, in terms of policies, how often have local governments looked at salmon recovery policies and policies that they would adopt? Do we want to spend time to produce these policies with the intent that jurisdictions adopt, or do we want to use them to guide salmon recovery efforts for the WRIA. Ron- it would be good to have them to help justify their policies and programs. Dennis- having some overall guidance would be useful. Any guidance would be useful, especially if you don't have the staff input from the smaller jurisdictions that may not have the technical background. Doug- we need to have the projects list, but need to have more in the plan to help describe how to make these happen- something more targeted that each of the jurisdictions in the watershed can take into account. Kathy- there is an opportunity for input with the flood hazard management plan, so all is not lost on the multiple benefit side of things. Dennis- how would this work when this effort primarily works at the staff level, being an elected official? Ron- haven't been directly involved in these efforts, primarily planning department- but there is a lot to balance as far as property rights and economics. Staff will make the recommendation but ultimately the elected officials make the decision. Dennis- What if WRIA 9 focused on elected officials? Ron- this is happening to some amount, also the shoreline master plan has to be approved by ecology. Doug-

should we be specific in the plan to target specific issues (the group discussed the example of water withdrawals for the golf course). Matt clarified that this is a program in the plan but may need clarified. Dennis- budgets are tight, need to decide if this is where we want to spend the money if it's worth the cost? Doug- committee should talk about pros and cons of not implementing or including specific issues in the plan and how it could influence our effectiveness with the salmon habitat plan. Matt mentioned that this was meant to frame the discussion, comments are welcome and some comments were provided.

There was continued discussions regarding the example of the golf course water withdrawals. Kollin- not a policy of consumptive use of water in general. If there was a policy saying reduce consumptive use of water for things like irrigation, it could promote better use such as with reclaimed water. If we had something like this we could use it as a statement to help reduce consumption it would be helpful, such as on the water management conference calls. If we had something like this, could it help transition things like agriculture to better use of water? Also, should the WRIA buy water rights? Aside from Tacoma's use, there's still 30-40 cfs in the system that's designated to water rights. WRIA could also step in for outreach and education of water as just one of the tools, or help with improvements in water systems if a policy existed. Matt- some of these policies might not even be useful to local government, may not be enough specificity.

Josh mentioned that 13 of the policies reference an action by a local jurisdiction or entity. 11 don't. Seems like there hasn't been enough work to actually implement these programs/policies. If you want to implement these to be successful you need to reach out and make sure that they happen. Matt- may not be how the WRIA addresses these though, as Kollin said we can use these as a reference when discussing an issue with another group. Mike- need to have WRIA participation in the shoreline planning processed for each jurisdiction. Kathy mentioned that it would be helpful to have names since it's hard to remember the numbers, might want to organize them into categories. Kollin mentioned that some of these are also spread out.

- Watershed Wide Policies

Policies are scattered throughout the plan (Ch 3, 5, and 8), also different categories that aren't especially called out. Antonia- how can we categorize the policies so that we can better track them, is miradi being used? Kollin- some exercises of this were useful, but is it actually useful to do day to day tracking of these processes? Not really.

Looking at some of the current policies, things have changed and current situations might call for re-wording of some of the policies to make them more effective. Such as fish passage (culverts), which now has been determined to be a legal obligation. We can update it also based on what we know about juvenile fish use and passage of juvenile use, so we can support Chinook recovery based on this new information. Also, we need to determine the most important policies that need to be addressed.

Kollin gave an example of the watershed outreach policies/programs, when at the most recent forum meeting staff from Federal Way mentioned that they were not included in some aspects of the previous plan, though they didn't realize that previous Federal Way staff removed the city from WRIA salmon habitat plan projects/programs. This is just an example that there is a need to do consistent outreach to jurisdictions about the plan and programs. Antonia- while we don't have the

enforcement ability for jurisdictions, the WRIA has the support of a big group of jurisdictions and elected so that we have some sway and pressure that we can use.

- Policy Gaps

This includes redevelopment of open space, infrastructure maintenance, equity and social justice, mitigation policy, h integration. Some other ideas- reorganize these policies and try to remove redundancies. So we would like the group to try to work on this.

- 2005 plan structure

As mentioned earlier, there is some duplication that we can clean up and expand on examples that have been implemented. For example increased volunteers and stewardship. Opportunities to clean this up and consolidate some things and updating those programs and data gaps.

- Watershed-Wide Program Evaluation

Matt briefly presented some of the survey results, recommendations for the SHP update, gaps, and other ideas for update. Within the survey, some of the programs are pretty highly implemented throughout the watershed. Things like car wash practices have been fully implemented and are part of everyday practices-maybe this could be pulled out. Development and porous concrete, these have been adopted so maybe programs could be adapted to things like retrofits. To keep these relevant, could move from program to policy. The group mentioned that to keep things relevant or in cases where implementation could change, we may want to keep them.

Overall, the overarching conclusion was that the plan update should more specifically correlate program recommendations to the responsible entities and service providers, and indicate where the programs are most needed. Moreover, the update should estimate the resources needed to adequately implement programs and identify existing model programs that are applicable to apply in WRIA 9.

Round Robin Updates – All

Katie and Kollin- Brief update on the status of the Lower Green Corridor Plan that the FCD is doing this year. The resolution was passed on April 20th, and some printed copies of alternative 3 from the resolution were distributed. We weren't getting a clear timeline on when the scoping period would be for this, but we recently got some clarity that it would start in early September. Currently, the 3 alternatives include the following: No action- which is implementing what's in the 6 year CIP and SWIF, alternative 2 is up to 15 miles of new facilities, and alternative 3 is up to 30 miles of new facilities. This alternative 3 includes things like levee setbacks and bigger footprints. Also, language is included that states that they are not consider setbacks anywhere there is ag, buildings, parking lots, roadways. Muckleshoots will not be participating in this directly. Invitations for participation haven't come out yet. Kathy- how does alternative 3 relate to the SWIF maps, what happened to those? They should be used, might be helpful to send them out again to help inform comments on the corridor plan. We should make sure this effort is used. Doug- need to ask if the goals from SWIF 1 are guiding the current goals.