

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Channel Migration Zone Citizen Advisory Committee**  
**Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008**  
**6:30 – 8:30 p.m.**  
**Pierce County Central Maintenance Facility**  
**4812 196<sup>th</sup> St. E., Spanaway**

CAC Members Present

Thomas Magnan	Jerry Harnish
Karen Willard	Valerie Wilson
Hal Michael	Ted Hill
Jeff Barney	Betty Zenkner
Don Hawkins	Mike Fenimore
Kathy Hatcher	

Staff and Speakers

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

Excused:

Shelly Butterfield

**Roles and Responsibilities**

The Roles and Responsibilities matrix distributed by Melissa outlined three potential options for distributing leadership work amongst 1) Chair and facilitator; 2) Chair only; and 3) facilitator only, all inclusive of support from Pierce County staff. The primary difference between the models lied in the responsibilities for managing monthly meetings, with some additional differences in the development of materials between meetings. After some discussion about the potential value of adding a dedicated “public relations” person, the CAC opted for the Chair and facilitator model (option #1), while reserving the right to be flexible on specific duties and responsibilities as the process goes forward. Melissa will continue as facilitator. CAC members interested in serving as Chair were asked to submit short bios and statements of interest via email to Melissa by October 15<sup>th</sup>, who will compile them and distribute to the group. A Chair will be elected at the next meeting.

**Building Our Final Product**

Because the CAC is charged with a specific task by the Pierce County Council (“evaluation and development of recommendations on mapping, development standards, notification and other related issues”) on a specific timeline (by 8/31/09), it’s important to begin thinking about the final outcome of the group’s process. Responses to brainstorming on the question, “How will we know when we are finished with our work?” included reference to the sunset date, level of satisfaction with our efforts and readiness to report to the Council. Responses to the question, “What will our final product look like?” included descriptions of content items (e.g., the four topics assigned by Council, specific analysis items, priorities, etc.), suggestions for format (i.e., readability) and connectivity with related planning efforts and agencies (e.g., basin plans, PALS, etc.). The CAC’s final report will take shape over the next several months. All responses to brainstorming questions are included on page 4 of these notes.



## Review Draft Workplan

The draft workplan is intended as a high-level roadmap for guiding the CAC's work between now and August 31<sup>st</sup>. Although changes may need to be made as we move ahead, the workplan outlines the "big picture" discussion items and will serve as the basis for further developing our meeting agenda. In developing the workplan, Pierce County staff made a number of assumptions, including:

- 1) The general structure is consistent with the four topics outlined by the Council.
- 2) "Other related issues" will be fleshed out as the process moves ahead over time.
- 3) The CAC's final product will include both evaluation of current CMZ management (within the four areas) and recommendations for changes.
- 4) The final product will be written iteratively in topic unit chunks, rather than all at once at the end of the process.
- 5) Every topic unit will follow the same general format: Presentation, Clarification, Analysis/Evaluation, Alternatives Generation.
- 6) Meetings will be held monthly.

Discussion comments included questions about the impact of "sideboards" on the workplan, the appropriateness of the order of the four topic units, and requests to explicitly include mapping- and regulation-related assumptions on future agendas for discussion. Melissa requested that any "deal breaker" comments be emailed to her by 10/15. The CAC agreed to use the workplan if no one expresses any major concerns by that time.

## "Bookends" for CMZ Management and CAC Process

Hans provided a handout on the constraints (or "bookends") that require consideration during the CAC's process. These include consistency across geographic areas; consideration of potential fiscal impacts and corollary recommendations for funding; and linking of CAC recommendations to existing policies. Hans also briefly outlined some of the factors that Pierce County takes into consideration when developing CMZ management policy, including: structural vs. non-structural solutions; feasibility of constructing "CMZ-proof" levees; cost of broad acquisition strategies; and management of public expectations. In addition, Hans reminded the CAC to avoid the tendency to rely too heavily upon only a structural (levee) solution, as it is widely known by floodplain managers that all levees *will* fail at some point in time. While it's not a formal requirement that the CAC adhere to these constraints, consideration of these factors will strengthen the quality and impact of the final product.

## Assignments

All Members: Email short bios/statements of interest in Chair position and "deal breaker" comments on the draft workplan to Melissa by 10/15; continue to review materials and ask questions as needed; respond to online scheduler request



Future Chair: Decision on extent of public involvement at future meetings

PC Staff: Compile and distribute bios and statements of interest for Chair position; provide address list of all CMZ property owners (sorted by zone) at the next meeting; publicize future meetings more widely (including Lewis County if possible); create flowchart showing relationship of CAC effort to other CMZ/planning efforts; send online scheduler to finalize future meeting schedule

### **Next Meeting**

Wednesday, November 5<sup>th</sup>, 6:30-8:30 p.m. at the CMF

DRAFT



## Responses to Brainstorming Activity re: Final Product

*How will we know when we are finished with our work?*

- Reach the sunset date of August 31, 2009
- Requirements in the resolution will be fulfilled
- Achieve consensus that we have satisfied the public (full involvement, etc.)
- Complete a majority and minority report
- CAC members are totally satisfied
- Might not include full agreement, but we will provide good information
- Confidence that we've made our best effort
- Readiness to report results to Council

*What will our final product look like? What will it contain?*

- Four topics: mapping, development standards, notification, related issues
- Range of alternative solutions (may be outside of current budgetary constraints)
- Defined suggestions for public education and disclosure, proposal to create flood control districts (including identification of flood, lahar and CMZ hazard areas), funding mechanisms, clear connection with basin plans, prioritized measures to protect
- Readable report with clearly described alternatives
- Perhaps funding information is not appropriate?
- Information/recommendations on use of acquisition tool and assessment/valuation process
- Range of alternatives with clear justification
- Implications of proposed CMZ management actions for areas outside of the mapped CMZ (may also include impacts on areas outside of Pierce County, as well as impacts of actions outside of CMZs on those inside CMZs)
- Recommendations for needed next steps (including funding, etc.)
- Distinction between management of new development and existing development
- Product informed by reactions from PALS and other agencies
- Identification, analysis, special treatment of existing infrastructure and recommendations for changes
- Overview of existing CMZ plans
- Cost-benefit analysis, especially for impacts on businesses
- Connection with (and communication to) community plans
- Definition of affected population and measured value of CMZ management

