

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Meeting #14 – May 7, 2010

Port of Tacoma Business Center, Fabulich Building

Task Force Members

Organization	Representatives in Attendance	Unable to Attend
Pierce County Executive Office	Pat McCarthy, Pierce County Executive	
Pierce County Council	Joyce McDonald, Councilmember	
Pierce County Chamber of Commerce		David Graybill, CEO
Puyallup Tribe of Indians	Bill Sullivan, Director of Natural Resources Lisa Brautigam, Attorney Rory LaDucer, Director of Public Safety	Sylvia Miller, Councilmember
City of Tacoma	Ryan Mello, Councilmember	
City of Fife	Rob Cerqui, Mayor Pro Tem Carl Durham, Community Development Director	Barry Johnson, Mayor Steve Worthington, City Manager
City of Puyallup	Ralph Dannenberg, Interim City Manager John Knutsen, Councilmember	Kathy Turner, Mayor
City of Orting	Ken Wolfe, Building Official	
City of Buckley	Pat Johnson, Mayor	
City of Sumner	Dave Enslow, Mayor Bill Pugh, Director of Public Works	
Port of Tacoma	Robert Brenner, Port Staff	Clare Petrich, Port Commissioner
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)	JoAnn Schueler, Project Development Engineer	
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA NMFS)		Dan Guy, Branch Chief
Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)	Dan Sokol, Floodplain Manager	
Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WSDNR)		Derrick Toba, South Puget Sound Shoreline District
US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)	CJ Klocow, Project Manager Kristen Kerns, Plan Formulator	

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Other Attendees:

Chris Andersen, City of Auburn Environmental Protection Manager
Katy Vanderpool, King County Department of Natural Resources
Jim Morrow, City of Puyallup Department of Public Works Director
Mark Palmer, City of Puyallup Engineer
Randy Harrison, Pierce County Executive's Office
Harold Smelt, Pierce County Water Programs Manager
Lorin Reinelt, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Martha Huebner, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Melissa Paulson, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Debby Hyde, Pierce County Public Works and Utilities
Jeff Cox, Pierce County Council Attorney
Chris Schutz, Pierce County Government Relations
Brynn Brady, Pierce County Government Relations
George Walk, Pierce County Government Relations
Jody Woodcock, Pierce County Emergency Management
Sean Eagan, Port of Tacoma
Russ Ladley, Puyallup Tribe of Indians
Sean Murphy, Office of Senator Patty Murray
Tom Young, Office of Congressman Dave Reichert
Gil Hulsmann, Abbey Road Group
Dave Seabrook, Puyallup River Watershed Council
Doug Levy, City of Puyallup
Ann Coon, Friends of Clarks Creek
Mary Lou Codge, community member
Penny Mabie, facilitator
Rachel Patterson, note taker

Meeting Purpose and Overview

Pierce County convened the fourteenth meeting of the Puyallup River Executive Task Force (ETF) in Tacoma, Washington on May 7, 2010. The meeting included an update from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a discussion of local cost sharing for long-term flood protection, an update on the Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan (FHMP) process, and an update on the flood control zone district planning process. Approximately 43 people attended the meeting, held at the Fabulich Building in the Port of Tacoma Business Center.

Meeting Summary

Welcome

The meeting started at 9:05 a.m. with Penny Mabie, meeting facilitator, welcoming the group.

Brief introductions

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Penny Mabie asked Executive Task Force (ETF) members to introduce themselves. She reminded participants that there would be a period for public comment at the conclusion of the meeting.

Review meeting agenda and ground rules

Penny Mabie reviewed agenda items, which included an update from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a discussion of local cost sharing for long-term flood protection, an update on the Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan (FHMP) process, and an update on the flood control zone district planning process.

Penny Mabie reviewed the ETF ground rules established at the first meeting, which are as follows:

- Start / end on time
- Silence cell phones
- Come prepared
- Listen respectfully
- Speak from interests, not positions
- Participate in the process

Review Jan. 22, 2010 meeting notes

Penny Mabie asked whether there were any changes to the draft notes from the previous meeting. The notes were approved.

Penny Mabie welcomed new participants to the ETF. CJ Klocow will serve as the new project manager from the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), who will be involved for the duration of the General Investigation (GI) study. Sean Murphy is the new ETF representative from Senator Patty Murray's office. Sean noted that Senator Murray had requested \$600,000 to be appropriated for the Corps' portion of the General Investigation study. Ralph Dannenberg is the interim City Manager for Puyallup. Harold Smelt, Pierce County Surface Water Management, also welcomed Chris Andersen, City of Auburn, to the table.

Corps GI Study Update

CJ Klocow, Corps, provided a brief overview of the recently developed project management plan (PMP) for the feasibility stage of the Corps GI study. He noted the following key details from the PMP:

- The PMP is a road map for the feasibility phase of the GI study.
- The feasibility phase of the project is scheduled to last about six years, and will cost a little more than \$6 million.
- The PMP is not set in stone, and will be updated moving forward.
- The most important sections are the scope, schedule, and budget, which lay out the project's framework.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Main sections of the PMP include the following:
 - **Introduction** – explains the document’s purpose and how it will be used.
 - **Requirements section** – lays out the requirements of the project. It must be technically feasible as well as economically, environmentally and socially sustainable.
 - **Project delivery team** describes the team working on the project.
 - **Work breakdown structure** – details what the plan will look like, lists specific tasks, and outlines general problems and opportunities, and inventory and forecast conditions. This section will be fleshed out with scopes of work and associated costs. The Corps is required to ensure the process is as transparent as possible, and that tasks are broken down as much as possible.
 - **Schedule** – long-term but flexible, as there is some uncertainty when forecasting for six years. Lays out major milestones. Specific tasks will be broken down to meet major milestones.
 - **Budget** – for 2010 only; the Corps looks at the current fiscal year and will update annually. Funding will be split 50/50 with the exception of the independent external peer review, which the Corps fully funds. The Corps is currently developing the 2011 budget, which will be released in fall 2010.
 - **Study management coordination** – details monitoring and control measures, and walks through processes needed to manage the plan and ensure that communication lines are established in advance and all are in agreement.
 - **Acquisition plan** – lays out contracts the Corps will be pursuing, for example a geotechnical inventory analysis.
 - **Closeout plan and after action report** – establishes what happens at the end of the project.

Questions / Comments:

Harold Smelt mentioned that the current version of the PMP incorporates Pierce County’s comments. Pierce County met with Corps staff to discuss the document. Harold noted that as data becomes available and alternatives and assumptions shift, the PMP will also shift. There will be an annual review of the plan where Pierce County and other stakeholders will review the document.

- Lisa Brautigam asked about the independent peer review process mentioned in the PMP. Kristen Kerns said the independent review process requirement was initiated in January 2010. The plan will undergo an in-district and out-of district Corps review, followed by an independent external peer review. The peer review

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

generally happens following the alternatives analysis. A panel of technical experts from outside the Corps looks at the plan for technical accuracy and safety assurance. The cost for a study of this size is generally around \$500,000, which is 100 percent covered by the Corps.

- Pat McCarthy asked whether the independent review takes long. Kristen said it takes about six months. It is a new process, which has not been expedited but may run more quickly once it is applied to this project. CJ Klocow noted the final reviewed plan will be appended to the PMP and will become a public document that can be referenced.
- Dave Enslow commented that in Sumner people have ongoing concerns about flooding, and it was important to note the long timeline puts a lot of people at risk. CJ acknowledged the long process for Corps work. The process is lengthy to ensure a sound, sustainable plan that will work to fix the problem. The project will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and will affect a large group.
- Bill Sullivan asked whether the ETF could receive updates before the independent review. Kristen Kerns said there would be an alternative formulation briefing and the independent external review will run concurrently with the Corps headquarters review.
- Harold Smelt commented that Pierce County has taken note of the urgency from the ETF. The Corps has trimmed about 18 months from the process to make it run more smoothly.
- George Walk commented the senate is looking at the re-authorization of the Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) bill. Funding applications were due the previous week and there was an opportunity to update the bill's wording. Pierce County submitted a request for a waiver of the credit requirement for local match. The county asked congress to look at providing more flexibility for the Corps and the community to initiate projects before the full study is done and get credit later. The City of Fife is also currently meeting with the Congressional delegation and will address this issue. Harold noted that as it is currently worded, projects can only receive credit after the preferred alternative has been selected and an agreement to costshare is signed. The idea would be to receive credit following approval of the 905B report and signing of the alternatives cost sharing agreement. There would need to be selection criteria to ensure credit is given only for legitimate projects. Lisa Brautigam suggested jurisdictions contact representatives to support this request, and asked for circulation of Pierce County's submittal to ETF participants.
- **Action Item:** Pierce County and City of Fife will circulate the congressional request for revised wording in the WRDA bill.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- John Knutsen commented that Puyallup River flooding will result in a catastrophe in the next six years, and asked what municipalities can do in the interim. Ken Wolfe noted that Orting budgeted funds to install a levee and replace a conveyance system.
- John Knutsen expressed concern about Clarks Creek backing up and concern that there will not be an agreement from the ETF that the study will be accepted. Kristen Kerns noted the Corps cannot build a project that induces damages without mitigation or compensation. She emphasized the importance of communicating potential issues early and often.

Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement

Kristen Kerns explained that the Corps and Pierce County would enter into a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) by September 2010. This agreement formalizes the 50-50 cost share between the Corps and Pierce County for the feasibility phase of the GI study, and must be in place in order for the Corps to spend money. Currently, the project is in the reconnaissance phase, and funding is federal only. Although inter-local agreements may be in place with Pierce County, the Corps looks at this as an agreement with Pierce County. There will be a periodic check-in to ensure equal cost sharing. The FCSA can be terminated at any time. Pierce County can step away at any time. The FCSA is supported by the PMP, and the PMP must be approved prior to the signing of the FCSA. The document will also pass through a legal review process.

CJ Klocow noted the Corps' work on the project conditions report would move more efficiently if the Corps could access data from cities and the county. Data could be GIS or inventory / survey data. He noted the Corps would provide information on data needs to Harold Smelt with Pierce County.

Questions / Comments:

- Ken Wolfe asked whether a GI study had been done previously. Kristen Kerns noted a Reconnaissance study was completed in 2002 which looked primarily at ecosystem restoration. The initial 905b study was completed only for the lower eight miles of the Puyallup. No FCSA has been executed prior to the current one.
- Ken Wolfe asked whether the approach would be to work from the mouth up, or from the upper reaches down. Kristen Kerns noted it would be a holistic approach. The study will look at all portions of the basin, including the Carbon and White rivers. After the FCSA is executed, the Corps will inventory economic and environmental resources in the basin as well as existing flood control resources. The alternatives will be built upon this information.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Randy Harrison asked whether the schedule could be accelerated if the county provides data. Kristen Kerns agreed that the more resources the Corps can draw upon, the faster the process will be.
- Randy Harrison noted it appears that 60 percent of the study will be taking place this year, but the FCSA will not be signed until September. He asked how this would work. Kristen Kerns commented that as long as contracts are secured, funds can carry over into future fiscal years.
- Pat McCarthy asked whether the county would need to send payment to the Corps as soon as the FCSA is executed. Kristen Kerns noted prompt payment would move the process forward more quickly. The county needs to deliver a minimum payment of \$200,000 on Aug. 1, 2010.
- Pat McCarthy reiterated the importance of data sharing between the county and the Corps to expedite the schedule.
- **Action Item:** The Corps will provide a specific list of data needs to Pierce County, and Pierce County will provide a list of county GIS data to the Corps.
- Harold Smelt noted that a draft of the FCSA could be sent out for review by the ETF. The group agreed this would be a good idea.
- **Action Item:** Pierce County will send out the draft FCSA for review by the group.
- Chris Andersen noted that existing Corps data comes primarily from Pierce County. He asked whether there would be coordination with King County particularly with regard to the White River. Kristen Kerns said the Corps has done some coordination work with King County, and will not overlook any documentation provided by King County. Katy Vanderpool added that King County has been sharing data with the Corps and will continue to do so. Harold Smelt said that Pierce County will be meeting with King County. Kristen Kern said there are some current studies on the White River regarding channel capacity that the Corps will reference.
- Kristen Kern noted that the Corps will need stakeholder and Pierce County input on whether there is interest in any structural or operational modifications to Mud Mountain Dam. If there is a strong interest, the Corps will need to consider additional expenditures for dam modifications.
- Dave Enslow commented about the White River flood and the damage caused to the City of Pacific, which occurred after too much water was released from Mud Mountain Dam. Kristen Kerns noted the Corps, USGS and others are researching White River channel capacity.
- Pat McCarthy asked whether a different Corps team is working in Pierce County and King County. Kristen Kerns said many of the same team members are

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

working on both the White River channel capacity study and the Puyallup River study. The Puyallup River study will pull information from the White River study.

- Randy Harrison asked whether the Corps thought storage capacity modifications to Mud Mountain Dam would be a good solution. Kristen Kerns said operational changes to dams tend to be supported economically, but structural changes do not. Because of its high potential cost, this measure may result in increased overall project costs. For other GI studies with dam modifications costs have run in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Penny Mabie reminded the group that at the Oct. 17, 2008 meeting the ETF recommended against pursuing changes to Mud Mountain Dam.
- John Knutsen asked whether the Corps would notify communities of existing problems, such as vegetation growth on levees, and how jurisdictions would find out what to do about these problems. Kristen Kerns said the Corps will inventory existing levee conditions and publicize technically reviewed analyses. She noted that vegetation management is a complex issue. If there is a life-threatening emergency, the Corps will notify jurisdictions. Harold Smelt added that there is an agreement with the Puyallup Tribe of Indians about how vegetation can be removed. He asked jurisdictions to notify the county of any concerns about a specific tree on a levee.
- **Action Item:** ETF participants will submit feedback and comments on the PMP to Pierce County by May 21.

Cost Sharing Agreement Update

Harold Smelt noted the near-term funding spreadsheet showing distribution local match for the Puyallup River GI study has been updated to include a new status column. The county is making good progress with cost sharing agreements. County staff have produced customized agreements for each community. Any actual costs billed to the county will be distributed in a comparable ratio. Less than the full \$500,000 will be spent this year.

Harold thanked WSDOT for fully executing their agreement. He also thanked several cities that are currently working on agreements. He noted inter-local agreements to be executed require Pierce County Council approval. The county is determining the best way to introduce the agreements to the council.

Questions / Comments:

- Ken Wolfe asked what the figures on the spreadsheet represent, and noted that the City of Orting's share had increased since previous iterations of the spreadsheet. Harold Smelt said this is a not to exceed number.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Lorin Reinelt commented that page 26 of the PMP in the budget for annual expenditures, FY 2013 shows \$800,000. There may be an exception for one year where more funds are required.
- Harold Smelt reiterated that the county does not intend to execute the FCSA with the Corps until inter-local agreements are in place for match.
- Dave Enslow asked how the flood control zone district (FCZD) would interact with the inter-local agreement. Harold Smelt noted this would be discussed later in the meeting.
- CJ Klocow asked how the weighting factors for the near-term funding spreadsheet were determined. Harold Smelt said they represented a specific risk factor.
- Penny Mabie offered to send a meeting summary with this information.
- Pat McCarthy noted the ETF agreed a year ago to step up and participate. She encouraged jurisdictional representatives to work with their councils to resolve inter-local agreements by the end of July.
- Joyce McDonald reiterated there is a long road ahead before any funds are available for the FCZD. The county needs to move forward quickly to get the Corps investigation started.
- Ken Wolfe noted the City of Orting will need to see an invoice from the county. County finance staff will follow up with Orting.

Flood Hazard Management Plan Advisory Process

Harold Smelt informed the ETF that the county is currently revising its comprehensive flood hazard management plan (FHMP). The county is working extensively with stakeholders and providing a briefing at each ETF meeting. There has been a good deal of progress since the Jan. 22 ETF meeting.

Lorin Reinelt gave an overview of the planning process. The geographic scope of the flood plan is county-wide, focused on four major rivers (the Puyallup, Carbon, White, and Nisqually) and three minor tributaries (the Greenwater River, South Prairie Creek, and Mashel River).

Lorin went over recent FHMP advisory committee meeting discussions and public input. He highlighted technical work including a USGS joint agreement and economic analysis. Copies of Lorin's presentations are available on the ETF website, and additional information can be found on the FHMP website. Lorin will continue to provide regular updates at future ETF meetings.

Key points from Lorin's presentation included the following:

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- The Advisory Committee agreed to a set of guiding principles in Feb. 2010, which will be used for development of actions within the plan. Together with the goals and objectives, the principles will form the foundation for actions and recommendations within the plan.
- Ultimately the County Council will adopt the guiding principles.
- The county created a series of study sessions on flooding issues, some of which will soon be available on DVD, streaming online and possibly on Channel 22.
- The Advisory Committee recently developed problem prioritization criteria, which will be finalized at the May 13 meeting. More than 298 problems (e.g. flooding, channel migration) have been identified through one-on-one interviews, public meetings, and the advisory committee process. The list of problems will soon be available in a spreadsheet format indicating which group(s) identified each problem.
- Pierce County completed a study with USGS to look at flood carrying capacity of river channels, analysis of sedimentation trends, and evaluation of river management scenarios. Study results show varied changes in sediment levels over the past 25 years. The study also indicates that setback levees are an effective river management strategy for reducing water-surface elevation.
- Pierce County analyzed existing regulations and legal agreements, including federal, state and local regulations, the Puyallup Land Settlement, and the vegetation management agreement adopted in 1990 between the Puyallup Tribe of Indians and the U.S. government, the county, the Port of Tacoma, railroads, landowners and jurisdictions. This information strongly affects what can be done within the plan. The county also looked at the Mud Mountain Dam Operating Agreement, which mandates protection of the lower river.
- The county is developing a flood management strategies “tool box,” which includes flood hazard and channel migration zone mapping, management of land use, river channel management, structural flood management strategies, flood hazard education, preparedness and emergency response.
- The county held meetings in Orting, Eatonville, Puyallup and Sumner and received good input on problem identification and areas of concern. A second set of meetings is planned for fall 2010 to look at the range of alternatives, and a third set will occur in early 2011.
- Economic analysis looked at potential financial effects on economic activities in the floodplain, including business, private property, agriculture, the Port of Tacoma, transportation, recreation and wastewater treatment plants. Lorin noted that recently in Rhode Island, wastewater treatment plants were offline for some time as a result of flooding, resulting in raw sewage discharges and tens of millions of dollars of costs per plant. Lorin referenced information from the

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Pierce County Cooperative Extension indicating agricultural crops are sensitive to flooding. For the Port of Tacoma, flooding could affect the process of moving goods from truck to rail and damage perception of the Port as a place to do business. Pierce County used a Puget Sound Regional Council model to look at transportation effects of flooding.

- Next steps for planning and process include developing an Environmental Impact Statement for both the plan and for about a half dozen early action projects, and continued meetings of the advisory committee.

Questions / Comments:

- Ryan Mello asked if the analysis included direct and indirect impacts of Mount Rainier National Park losses. Lorin Reinelt noted the analysis does include indirect effects, but will be studied further for the draft report.
- John Knutsen asked whether wastewater treatment plant effects considered surrounding communities and businesses. Lorin acknowledged there would be additional effects on every business that uses the plant.
- Ann Coon noted there are people living in the valley concerned about a new chemical storage plant in Sumner and asked what effect this plant could have. Lorin noted this plant was not included in the study.
- Pat Johnson noted that although Buckley doesn't have direct flooding concerns, Buckley's economy depends on Crystal Mountain. When the pass is not open, the town notices the economic impacts. The landslide that happened on SR 410 stopped everything.
- John Knutsen asked whether sediment measurements included the entire river cross-section. Lorin affirmed that measurements extended across the bed from levee to levee.
- Randy Harrison noted that without Mud Mountain Dam there would have been larger floods in 2006 and 1996. Data from the USGS study confirms the Corps study about releases from Mud Mountain Dam in 2009 which caused the City of Pacific flood.
- Katy Vanderpool asked if the study assumed gravel removal would be a one-time action. Lorin Reinelt affirmed the assumption was that it would occur once. Dave Enslow asked whether gravel removal would actually happen multiple times. He also asked whether setback levees would fill up with sediment over time and become less effective. Lorin noted the county will look at a gravel removal scenario that is focused on sediment removal from existing setback levees. Bill Sullivan noted that setback levee maintenance (gravel or sediment removal) is easier to permit since it is out of water. There would be fewer Endangered Species Act issues and it would be less expensive.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Dan Sokol commented that he has been involved in about 50 FHMP efforts, and this effort is the best organized effort he has seen.
- Randy Harrison asked why there is such a large amount of sediment but small flow of water in the Puyallup River. Lorin Reinelt said there are a few reasons. First, the mountain's volume is immense. Second, sediment transport has become more extensive since 1984 due to rapid retreat of glaciers – 0.5 to 2 percent of glacier volume is currently receding each year, and lateral moraines are caving. Rainfall patterns are changing, with more precipitation falling as rain than snow, and higher volumes falling on Mount Rainier. This results in less ability to transport material downstream. Previous lahars and mudflows often end up being transported downstream.
- Penny Mabie recommended that this group look at the study group “101” presentations to be posted on the website.
- Lorin Reinelt asked anyone not currently on the distribution list to notify himself or Melissa Paulson.

Flood Control Zone District Update

Debby Hyde, Pierce County Special Project Coordinator, updated participants on the Pierce County Council's May 4 adoption of an ordinance to form a county-wide flood control zone district (FCZD). The FCZD will be codified in the county code, and will be governed by the Pierce County Council. Timeframe and funding mechanisms for the FCZD remain to be determined. The council and executive branch will now start working on recommendations for implementing the ordinance. Debby noted the FCZD must have a plan in place, and will likely adopt the FHMP plan currently in process.

Questions / Comments:

- Pat McCarthy recognized Councilmembers Joyce McDonald and Sean Bunney, and council staff member Jeff Cox, for their hard work on the FCZD. She noted that although there is a lot of work ahead, moving forward with flood management is the right thing to do.
- Dave Enslow said he was concerned that the Pierce County Council would not make information readily available. Joyce McDonald reiterated the process would be open. The framework is all that is currently in place. The next step is a boundary review board. The council plans to take it one step at a time and see how it goes. Debby Hyde reiterated the council expressed an intention not to create another bureaucracy. The county chose to use county staff to do most of the work since they have experience.

Near-Term Activities Update

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Penny Mabie asked whether there were any updates from the group to the list of near-term actions.

- **Pierce County** submitted a WRDA request to receive advance credit from the Corps for early project work.
- Ken Wolfe noted that the **City of Orting** has been working with Lorin Reinelt on the FHMP, and came up with five potential activities. Orting is also working on a bar removal study. Orting budgeted \$200,000 for a new outfall along the Carbon River for the wastewater treatment plant. Orting is purchasing properties for the Calistoga Setback levee project. They applied for \$6.5 million in WRDA grants, and met with Rep. Reichert. They also applied for a \$10 million loan for the setback levee. Letters of support from other jurisdictions would be helpful.
- Dave Enslow said he was glad to see the process going forward with tangible results. The **City of Sumner** is looking at a potential sizable wetland mitigation project. Joyce McDonald asked whether Lorin Reinelt's presentation helped Dave better understand river levels and how setback levees work, and Dave affirmed that it was quite useful.
- Rory LaDucer noted the **Puyallup Tribe of Indians** is working on emergency housing for evacuations, applying for grants to cover equipment and command posts, and pulling together a citizen response team.
- Harold Smelt noted that **Pierce County** has applied for grants from the State Department of Emergency Management (DEM) for three separate projects. Letters of intent are due May 15. For more information contact Mark Stuart at State DEM or Lou Dooley at Pierce Co DEM.
- **Pierce County and King County** are working on a new association for floodplain management for Washington State. The goal of the association is to bring together professionals from organizations for educational opportunities, trainings with FEMA and a legislative outreach group to address changes to state law. The county intends to circulate a letter through the Washington Association of Counties or the Washington Association of Cities.
- Dan Sokol noted grants were submitted to the **Department of Ecology** from **Orting** for a stormwater outfall system, and from the Town of **Wilkeson** for protecting water and sewer lines.
- Chris Andersen noted that the **City of Auburn** had amended their floodplain regulations to incorporate the new FEMA regulations, which allowed for removal of some floodplain restrictions.

Future meeting topics

The next ETF meeting will focus on non-structural flood control solutions.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Next meeting

The group will schedule another meeting within the next two to three months. Rachel Patterson will circulate a Doodle poll to determine the next meeting date.

Public comment

Members of the public were encouraged to share their comments with the Task Force. No public comments were heard.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.