

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Channel Migration Zone Citizen Advisory Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008**  
**6:30 – 8:30 p.m.**  
**Ohop Grange**  
**41608 Mountain Hwy. E., Eatonville**

CAC Members Present

Thomas Magnan  
Karen Willard  
Hal Michael  
Jeff Barney  
Don Hawkins  
Kathy Hatcher

Jerry Harnish  
Valerie Wilson  
Shelly Butterfield  
Ted Hill  
Betty Zenkner

Staff and Speakers

Harold Smelt, PC SWM  
Hans Hunger, PC SWM  
Melissa Paulson, PC SWM

Excused:

Mike Fenimore

**Introduction to Channel Migration Zones in Pierce County**

Hans Hunger very briefly overviewed the Pierce County regulations (Title 18E.70) pertaining to flood hazard areas County-wide. Channel migration zones (CMZs) are either mapped or required to be mapped along seven waterways: the Carbon, Puyallup and lower White rivers (adopted 2005); South Prairie Creek and the upper Nisqually River (completed, not yet adopted); and the Greenwater, Mashel, upper White, and lower and middle Nisqually rivers (not completed). CMZs in Pierce County are managed as floodways to protect human life and health, minimize expenditure of public funds and protect ecological functions, among other goals.

Passages of Title 18E.70 directly related to CMZs have been highlighted in yellow. Shelly raised a concern that additional relevant information may be contained elsewhere in Pierce County Code related to Critical Areas. She will work with Melissa to get that information out to the CAC.

**Role of the Citizen Advisory Committee**

The role of the Channel Migration Zone Citizen Advisory Committee (CMZ CAC) is defined by the Pierce County Council in R2008-125, Section 1: “The ad hoc advisory committee is requested to evaluate and provide recommendations regarding the regulation of Channel Migration Zones including, but not limited to, the process for mapping such areas, development standards that should apply to such areas, process for notifying property owners of potential natural hazards associated with such areas, and related matters.” These four categories – mapping, development standards, notification and other related matters – will be the basis for approaching the CAC’s work, which must be completed by August 31, 2009.



## Introductions

Every member of the CAC was invited to share their thoughts on the following question: *What kind of information do you feel you need in order to develop recommendations on the management of Pierce County's channel migration zones?* Responses included information on the current regulations and restrictions, understanding of the management tools available for use in CMZ areas, details on the mapping process, cost-benefit analyses and other information. The responses given by each CAC member are outlined separately.

## Work Planning Activity

In the interest of time, this agenda item is tabled until the next meeting. Pierce County staff will further develop the draft product for review and modification by the CAC.

## Housekeeping Items

Schedule and Location: Meetings will be held monthly, although increased meeting frequency may be required as the CAC nears the August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009, sunset date. The group's first preference for meeting dates is the second Wednesday of every month, although Melissa has an existing meeting that conflicts with that schedule. Based on how the October schedule plays out, we may revise the schedule to first Wednesdays. All future meetings will be held in the Graham area, as it is centrally located within the County.

Standard Operating Procedures: Draft operating procedures were distributed for review. The document provides a basic framework for the CAC's operations, including information on roles and responsibilities, decision making, board participation and other expectations. Initial feedback on the document was positive and it will be approved as final after any necessary revisions are made (see discussion of Chair, below). These standard operating procedures are modeled after those adopted by the Pierce County Surface Water Management Advisory Board (SWAB).

Discussion of Chair and Other Roles: Pierce County strongly encouraged the group to consider selecting a Chair and Vice Chair from within the ranks of the committee. The potential responsibilities of a Chair are outlined in the draft operating procedures and include working with Pierce County staff to develop and approve agendas, representing the CAC to the general public and facilitating meetings/decision-making. Selection of a Chair is perceived as important for establishing a sense of legitimacy of the CMZ CAC as a citizen-led effort, as well as for establishing a single point of contact for communication with Pierce County staff. A Vice Chair would be selected to perform the duties of the Chair in his/her absence.

In general, the members of the group expressed interest in moving forward on selecting a Chair, although there was some uncertainty as to what exactly the role of that person would be with respect to the role of a facilitator. Many members expressed interest in having the continued support of Melissa as facilitator. However, others were concerned that her involvement (as a



Pierce County employee) may not be in the best interest of the process over the long-term because of potential real or perceived conflicts of interest.

To address concerns and help move toward a decision, Melissa will develop a list of potential roles and responsibilities under three possible scenarios: 1) Chair and Facilitator; 2) Chair only; and 3) Facilitator only. This list will serve as the basis for future discussion, as well as for nomination of potential Chairs. Members of the CAC will be invited to submit short statements of interest, which will be compiled and distributed for decision at a future meeting.

Discussion on Citizen Input: In addition to the members of the CAC, approximately 10 members of the general public were in attendance. Although this agenda did not include a public comment period, citizen input was encouraged by way of written comments that would be compiled and distributed to the CAC monthly or as necessary. One attendee stated that the public would feel most involved (and thus, would be most likely to continue to attend meetings) if the agenda included time set aside explicitly for public comment. Reaction from the CAC was mixed, with some members supporting the idea of including a comment period in all future meetings and others expressing concern that too much input from citizens might interfere with the ability of the CAC to do its job in a timely fashion. The issue will be resolved at a future meeting.

### **Assignments**

All Members: Provide feedback on draft documents via email as desired; Review South Prairie Creek and Upper Nisqually River Channel Migration Zone studies

Shelly: Work with PC staff to provide additional regulations related to CMZs and Critical Areas

PC Staff: Draft meeting notes; draft workplan; develop list of potential Chair/facilitator roles and responsibilities; work with Shelly to provide additional regulations related to CMZs and Critical Areas

### **Next Meeting**

Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 6:30-8:30 p.m. in the Graham area (location TBD)



## CAC Responses to Introductory Question:

*What kind of information do you feel you need in order to develop recommendations on the management of Pierce County's channel migration zones?*

Thomas: Contact information for affected property owners; impact on property owners of

Ted: What are my limitations as CMZ property owner?

Karen: Where is the flexibility in mapping?

Hal: How to maintain/protect structures in CMZ; how activities outside of CMZ impact areas within CMZ; impact of increased base flow on CMZs (future scenarios)

Jeff: Better understanding of tools; implications and use for mitigating floods; interested in a holistic approach; economic impacts (i.e., on property owners, towns, etc.)

Don: Loss of value of property aerial photos from 2006 (prior/after); scoping documents for CMZ (study); overview of regulations.

Betty: Compensation for devalued property; both side of story.

Kathy: Understand both sides; "one size may not fit all"

Jerry: Cost benefit analysis; (specifically with respect to levees)

Valerie: How can this work for both County and property owners? What are other counties doing? What are Pierce County's long-term flood management plans?

Shelly: Style of acquisition of CMZs; Federal, State and local funding use and appraising/valuation processes; resolution of codes/County being more proactive; "Substantial Damage" evaluation (i.e., what are the Assessor/Treasurers roles); impacts on new construction; outcome of management for this group.

