

**Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9)
Implementation Technical Committee
January 19, 2022 | 9:30 am – 11:00 am**

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89069145463?pwd=SUhLOHhTVEs2VlhleTFML0x4V3J2UT09>

Meeting ID: 890 6914 5463

Passcode: salmon

- | | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| 9:30 | Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Agenda review | Iris Kemp, WRIA 9 |
| 9:40 | ITC Review: Lower Green River Corridor Plan Comment Letter <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Before meeting:</i> participants review draft comment letter and provide feedback to mgoehring@kingcounty.gov.• <i>During meeting:</i> ITC members review/discuss feedback on draft letter, and develop a recommendation regarding a revised draft for consideration by the Management Committee. Please note: A revised draft needs to be submitted to the Management Committee by the end of the day on 1/19. | Matt Goehring,
WRIA 9 |
| 10:15 | Brief presentation: Green River redd surveys
<i>Rescheduled</i> | Nik Novotny, City of
Tacoma |
| 10:30 | Round Robin Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project recruitment/updates• New topic requests for future ITC meetings• Bring your update to share! If you're unable to attend, you can share updates in advance at this link or by emailing Iris (ikemp@kingcounty.gov). | All |
| 11:00 | Adjourn | |

WRIA 9 ITC web page: <http://www.govlink.org/watersheds/9/committees/ImpleTechCmte.aspx>

Participant list:

Alexandra Doty, Brandon Parsons, Cleo Neculae, Heidi Watters, Iris Kemp, Katherine Lynch, Katie Beaver, Martha Neuman, Matt Goehring, Mike Mactutis, Mike Perfetti, Nikolas Novotny

Round-table Updates and Reminders

- If you have a new project for adoption into the Salmon Habitat Plan or you have a project with significant updates from original project design/footprint for re-tiering in the plan, please submit a Proposed Project Form. Visit our [“Funding Opportunities” webpage](#) and scroll down to “Updating and Adding Salmon Habitat Projects” for more information. **Submission deadline is January 28.**
- Re-Green the Green and Monitoring and Research grant opportunities are open! Visit our [“Funding Opportunities” webpage](#) for more information and please distribute widely throughout your network. **Proposals are due March 4.**
- Give us some feedback! What would you like to see for the WRIA 9 ITC in 2022? Write your thoughts on the second slide at this link: <https://tinyurl.com/Jan2022ITC>. Slide will remain editable until **Monday, January 31.**
- Ecology management has approved restarting the Soos TMDL temperature and dissolved oxygen studies.
- Check out some photos from Lowman Beach on the first slide at this link: <https://tinyurl.com/Jan2022ITC>

ITC Review: Lower Green River Corridor Plan Comment Letter

A preliminary draft WRIA 9 comment letter on the Lower Green River Corridor Plan PEIS (www.lowergreensepa.org) was developed from December 2021 ITC meeting discussions. At this meeting, the ITC collectively reviewed proposed edits to the preliminary draft. The reviewed draft was approved for Management Committee consideration and is attached as a separate pdf.

Summarized discussions and recommendations on proposed edits

This letter is an opportunity for WRIA 9 to bring a salmon and habitat lens to the Lower Green River Corridor Plan process and encourage a multi-benefit approach that provides flood protection and supports climate resiliency, habitat restoration/creation, salmon recovery, economic development, recreational value, and improved quality of life for residents.

Proposed edits: minor copy-edits and clarifications/word choices

- All accepted without discussion.

Proposed edit: comments on tribal treaty rights and Chinook ESA-listing

- Mike M. proposed edits from the city’s perspective: cautious of potential repercussions around singling out flood risk reduction approaches as a driver of Chinook population decline and legal issues associated with tribal fishing. In the technical comments, remove comment on the larger watershed and Puget Sound as outside the scope of the Lower Green Corridor Plan.
- Brandon suggested encouraging comments from the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

- Cleo and Heidi commented that the paragraph in question describes Chinook conditions in general; the next paragraph acknowledges that while issues in the Lower Green contribute to these conditions, there are other contributing factors.
- Katie and Mike P. commented that the WRIA's primary goal is Chinook salmon recovery.
- *Resolution:* altered language in letter to "Escapement of Chinook salmon remains significantly below recovery goals which can negatively impact treaty-reserved tribal fishing opportunities. Our region's approach to flood risk reduction is inherently linked to historic habitat loss and contributed to the ESA-listing of Chinook salmon."
- *Resolution:* altered language in technical comments to "The PEIS should analyze potential impacts to tribal and treaty reserved rights."

Proposed edit: comments on stakeholder engagement process

- Mike M. proposed removal of language around interdisciplinary workgroups as it was outside the scope of what was previously studied and was not clearly defined. Workgroups are part of the existing process; is this comment recommending a different process?
- Katie, Mike P., and Cleo commented on the value of putting ideas in writing at this stage; this is a chance to redefine the multi-benefit approach. From the WRIA perspective with a salmon focus, engaging stakeholders and developing process early is critical to project design. Designing projects that are truly multi-benefit is not possible without stakeholder engagement.
- Brandon and Heidi commented that the paragraph in question supports the adaptive management approach described in alternatives 2 and 3 and adds a recommendation on *when/timing* of the approach. Emphasize early and sustained engagement.
- *Resolution:* altered language to "Multi-benefit outcomes require challenging conversations and difficult tradeoffs. The Corridor Plan should clearly define a stakeholder engagement process to identify interests, opportunities, and tradeoffs associated with potential projects during early conceptual design and at key milestones throughout the process. An interdisciplinary look beyond individual project sites to include a larger reach scale is needed to support compromise and tradeoffs based on reach-specific opportunities and constraints. An interdisciplinary workgroup charged with integrating multiple objectives can help facilitate broad stakeholder support and access to diverse funding sources to build resilient projects that promote vibrant communities and healthy salmon runs."

Proposed edits: recommend alignment of the Lower Green Corridor Plan and the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan update and broaden the description of regionally significant efforts to be more inclusive of ongoing investments

- Martha and Heidi suggested including Duwamish restoration as well as clean-up efforts and commented on the connectedness of the watershed: the "line" defining Lower Green vs. Duwamish is artificial and their connection is increasingly relevant with sea level rise.
- Heidi and Mike P. suggested acknowledging investments by private landowners in the list of efforts.
- *Resolution:* altered the last two paragraphs of the letter to adopt the proposed edits.

Proposed edit: restructure technical comment to focus on function and goals for recreation rather than committing to maintaining existing facilities

- Matt commented that all alternatives would maintain the current alignment of existing recreation facilities to the extent practicable, which sets a predetermined constraint on conceptual designs and could potentially result in prioritization of recreation above other benefits.

- Mike M. commented that the caveat “to the extent practicable” creates potential to move recreational spaces for habitat while keeping the recreational spaces functional. There is precedent for this.
- Katie, Brandon, Heidi, Mike M., and Mike P. identified that the “maintaining current alignment” piece is the issue. This would prioritize existing facilities over habitat opportunities. What is needed is maintaining recreational value not necessarily the current alignment of facilities. Being too prescriptive could limit future design options, including creative designs that could improve both habitat and recreation benefits.
- *Resolution:* altered language to “The inclusion of an objective to maintain the current alignment of existing recreation facilities to the “extent practicable” could unnecessarily constrain achieving multi-benefit outcomes. Recreational goals and objectives are integral to project design but should focus on enhancing recreational function and experience rather than strictly alignment. Presupposing the current alignment as most desirable unnecessarily may limit creativity in the design process and seemingly elevates recreation among other identified benefits. Suggest modifying this objective in all alternatives to highlight a holistic, inclusive, and collaborative approach to integrated floodplain planning that balances all multi-benefits.”

Proposed edits: modify Alternative 3 technical comment to clarify FCD intent on acquisition and recommend FCD define “protect” in their statements around protecting housing

- Mike M. and Katie commented that acquisition is included in all alternatives; the difference between alternatives 2 and 3 is the use of condemnation for flood protection vs. multi-benefit outcomes. In the FCD’s alternatives chart, alternative 3 bolds acquisition which implies it’s not an option in alternative 2 even though acquisition is already used in the current process.
- Brandon suggested clarification/definition on the use of “protect” with regards to housing and whether this would limit acquisition even in the case of, e.g., low-income housing that experiences continual flooding issues. Does “protect” include options beyond protecting housing in-place? Revisit alternatives and motion and comment if not clear there.
- *Resolution:* altered language to “The applicability of voluntary acquisition of businesses and residential dwellings within the three alternatives should be clarified. The current description of Alternative 3 highlights that businesses and residential dwellings may be acquired to facilitate levee setbacks. This is not mentioned in Alternatives 1 and 2. We suggest that the distinction between alternatives with respect to voluntary acquisition be revised to emphasize differences in the potential magnitude of acquisitions as opposed to differences in eligibility of specific land uses.”