

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Meeting #15 – Oct. 1, 2010
Fife Community Center

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	Sylvia Miller, Councilmember Rory LaDucer, Director of Public Safety
City of Tacoma	Charlie Solverson, Planning Manager	Ryan Mello, Councilmember
City of Fife	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	
City of Auburn	Chris Andersen, Environmental Protection Manager	
King County	Jeanne Stypula, Supervising Engineer	
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)		Tom Clingman, 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	

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Other Attendees:

Katy Vanderpool, King County Department of Natural Resources
Steve Bleifuhs, King County Department of Natural Resources
Carl Durham, City of Fife, Community Development Director
Harold Smelt, Pierce County Water Programs Manager
Lorin Reinelt, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Melissa Paulson, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Brian Ziegler, Pierce County Public Works and Utilities
Debby Hyde, Pierce County Public Works and Utilities
Steve Bailey, Pierce County Emergency Management
Chris Schutz, Pierce County Government Relations
Brynn Brady, Pierce County Government Relations
George Walk, Pierce County Government Relations
Jody Woodcock, Pierce County Emergency Management
Doug Levy, City of Puyallup
Sean Murphy, Office of Senator Patty Murray
Tom Young, Office of Congressman Dave Reichert
Linda Danforth, Office of Representative Adam Smith
Sara Crumb, Office of Representative Norm Dicks
Keely Domville, USACE Assistant Planner
Lori Morris, USACE GI Manager
Karen Pease, community member
Sally Bailey, community member
Penny Mabie, facilitator
Kristina Walker, note taker

Meeting Purpose and Overview

Pierce County convened the fourteenth meeting of the Puyallup River Executive Task Force (ETF) in Fife, Washington on Oct. 1, 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 39 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 May 7, 2010 meeting notes

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

Corps GI Study Update

CJ Klocow, US Army Corp of Engineers, said that as of Sept. 23, 2010 the Corps has a signed agreement and is moving forward with the project. He said that there is \$400,000 from the Corps to get started. The fiscal year starts Oct. 1 and the Corps has to set up an escrow account to get the money. The first step is to develop an existing conditions report. The process will take a year and CJ will be reaching out to local jurisdictions to gather existing data that has already been done.

CJ noted that jurisdictions can provide cash through the inter-local agreement, but that they are also allowed to provide in-kind work. To be considered as part of the in-kind contribution, work has to be identified up front and done after the initial design. Jurisdictions are always welcome to contribute but if it is not identified and approved up front it cannot be 'in-kind'.

CJ overviewed the process and told cities that they must submit a proposal to the Corps and the County with their scope of work, costs and how the work contributes to the study. It must be approved by the Corps and the County. CJ provided a handout that detailed the review and approval process. Once a proposal is submitted, the Corps has 90 days to approve or disapprove. If the proposal is not approved, jurisdictions then have 60 days to submit additional information. The Corps then has 30 days for their final decision. The Corps will do their own internal estimate to determine the allowable in-kind work amount credited to the jurisdiction. CJ added

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

that all of the Corps work is subject to stringent review so the Corps needs to be careful about how the work fits in to the project and ensure that it is of high quality.

CJ reviewed the restrictions and mentioned that projects that are funded by another federal source cannot be used as in-kind work for the Corps. Work not identified in the project management plan (PMP) will be denied. The Corps cannot accept work that is the inherent duty of the government, such as value engineering. Some of the things accepted by the Corps are:

- Public outreach, as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process
- Hydrologic studies
- Economic studies
- Sedimentation studies
- Real estate
- Rights of entry

CJ noted that documentation is very important because the Corps is audited regularly. CJ handed out a sample letter from Seattle City Light as a good example. He noted that the request letter, scope of work, budgets and invoices all need to be kept for three years after the work has been done.

Questions / Comments:

- Charlie Solverson asked about the two levels of approval and whether the flow diagram shows the County approval or just the Corps? CJ said that applicants should submit two proposals, one to the Corps and one to Harold at the County. CJ and Harold will meet to go through details and both will sign off. Harold added that the County will be handling the financial impacts to the Corps.
- Steve Worthington asked if this approval process is specific to Phase 1 only. CJ said that this applies to all phases. What the Corps accepts would be different under construction but the basic approval process will be the same.
- Steve Worthington mentioned that each jurisdiction knows how to reach our own citizens to do public outreach work but maybe there is a way to work together with some kind of agreement for this work.
- Brian Zeigler mentioned that there was some funding for public outreach in the PMP. CJ added that the Corps identified some work in-kind costs up front in 2011 for general management and public outreach. The details still need to be worked out but jurisdictions are eligible for funds for those services.
- Harold noted that right now the credit is only for work that supports the planning process. Right of way and easement or purchasing a property would not be credited towards the study.
- CJ noted that the Corps can amend the PMP but that only every fiscal year. If you come to the Corps with a request for something specific CJ can discuss amended it.
- CJ added that this is a six-year study but there are opportunities to make it quicker if we get technical data from local jurisdictions. He noted that they can't construct the project until the study is finished. That does not stop jurisdictions from taking one of

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- the projects and running with it. The Corps will create a menu of options for these projects and jurisdictions can talk with CJ about getting started on those.
- Harold added that the first step is data collection and that jurisdictions will be getting requests from the Corps to help with that process. Harold said that the jurisdictions have done some great work to date and we want to make that available to the Corps, if possible. Harold asked ETF members to respond to the Corps requests because even if there isn't a match credit, it will speed up the process.
 - Lori Morris, GI Manager with the Corps, noted that, to be counted as a match, the project must be relevant to the project but be something that you would not be doing already. Lori encouraged jurisdictions to strategize about how they are going to get credit for work. She also noted that the request letter must come from the chief financial officer.
 - Jeff Cox asked if the list of projects is through the advisory committee or is it more formal. Lori said that everything the Corps does is public information so all documents will be available on the Corps website. Notify the Corp if you are going to do a project and we will take it out of the general investigation study and it will be part of the existing conditions report.
 - Barry Johnson asked if land purchases might be credited. He asked if it is worth purchasing things now (since jurisdictions may be able to purchase land at a lower price than the federal government) but wondered if it will be credited. Lori said that land purchases are not part of the planning process. You may get credit for the cost of the land if it is used for a project later but you will not be credited until the project happens. If it is not used for the project, it cannot be credited.

CJ encouraged all jurisdictions to contact him to work with the Corps to make sure that the process is smooth and that jurisdictions get credit for their work.

Discussion

John Knutsen noted that the next rainy season is coming and there is a real possibility of going under water. He said that focusing on this long-term study is discouraging immediate actions. He said that the ETF needs to demand action. He said that if somebody doesn't start fighting for immediate action, no one will.

Harold Smelt said that many immediate actions have happened. For example, Pacific has sandbags, Pierce County is piloting gravel removal and is reinforcing levies. He noted that jurisdictions are continuing to work on immediate actions while we keep things moving with this planning process.

Penny Mabie added that everyone is cognizant of the immediate risk and are working on fixing things in the near-term while committing to the Corps study.

Joyce McDonald said that she understood the concern. This is a long process. The Pierce County Council knows this is about public safety and has taken steps to fix things short-term. The flood control district has started. Pierce County is doing a lot of work throughout the basin.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Dave Enslow noted that the ETF has made a lot of progress here in the last couple of years and are finding ways to solve the problem. He said that he would like to thank County Executive Pat McCarthy and Councilmember Joyce McDonald for putting their necks out to make things happen.

Inter-local agreement update

Harold provided an update on the inter-local agreement status. He said that the last agreements are trickling in. He said that the agreement with the Puyallup Tribe is close to being finalized at \$50,000 a year. He mentioned that the City of Auburn has signed an agreement which has added additional funds to the pool. The inter-local agreement partners have two options: 1) to keep spending the same amount and the community's match amount is lowered because of the extra, unplanned money, 2) to do more work with the additional funds and raise our total. He thanked Auburn for joining the group. He said that Chris Schutz, Pierce County, is working to finalize all the agreements and the County will sign those very soon. The City of Tacoma is the last jurisdiction to sign the agreement and Charlie Solverson, City of Tacoma said that the agreement is on the Oct. 27, 2010 city council agenda.

- **Action Item:** Harold will update the cost-sharing matrix to reflect the agreements and funding contributions.

Flood Control Zone District Update

Harold noted that the Flood Control Zone District concept has been challenged by twelve cities who have filed an appeal with the boundary review board. The hearing to change the boundary and be removed from the district is scheduled for Oct. 12, 2010. Harold mentioned that he met with the Flood Control Zone District on Sept. 29, 2010 and noted that the group has a need for funding. He said that the flood control district should fund both the local match for the GI and ongoing maintenance and repair of levy system.

Harold encouraged attendees to pick up leftover packets from the previous night's Elected Officials Workshop on the Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan and requested that attendees inform others about this work. The presentation will be posted on their website, www.piercecountywa/floodplan.

Brian Zeigler, Director of Public Works and Utilities, Pierce County, said that Pierce County has hired a consultant to develop the operating guidelines and a work plan. Brian thanked the jurisdictions that had sent letters of support and welcomed attendees to send additional support letters.

Questions / comments:

- Steve Bleifuhs asked if King County had the same types of issues when they formed their flood control district.
- Jeanne Stypula, King County, said that there was a lot of discussion with cities before the zone was introduced to council but that there were still minority opinions that were expressed when the concept was introduced.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Joyce McDonald, Pierce County councilmember, noted that the council has heard concerns that Pierce County did it backwards by not having those conversations before forming the district. She said that they would have liked to go to cities first but since the council makeup would be changing after elections, they knew they needed to get it on the books. She added that the county wants to work with the cities now to help them understand the district.
- Charlie Solverson asked if King County's board of supervisors includes their county council. Jeanne said that it did. Brian Zeigler added that they also have an advisory committee of 15 people.

Flood Hazard Management Plan Update

Lorin Reinelt, Pierce County, gave an overview of the progress to date on the flood hazard management plan. Lorin gave an update on the work done on problem identification and prioritization, the Phase 2 USGS study and work with the advisory committee and the public.

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).

Working with cities, tribes, agencies (including WSDOT), an advisory committee and using feedback from public meetings, the group has identified 250 problems related to flooding and levee construction. They also developed four problem prioritization criteria to determine level of effort in developing solutions:

- Existing Land Use of Affected Area (consequences) (20 pts)
Top 2 land uses (e.g., critical facilities, road, commercial, residential, agriculture, resource lands, recreational)
- Severity of Flood/Channel Migration Impact (10 pts)
Public safety; minor, moderate or severe infrastructure/property damage
- Area of Impact (regional, severe, moderate, local) (10 pts)
- Frequency of Flood or Channel Migration (10 pts)
0, 1, 2, or >3 occurrences in last 20 years

The problems have been analyzed using the criteria and broken into three tiers. Pierce County will focus on Tier 1 first, doing a solution analysis which includes an evaluation of alternatives, feasibility, select preferred alternative, conceptual design and a cost estimate.

Lorin noted that Pierce County has, in the past, tried to give the same level of protection everywhere (e.g., 100-year design and three-foot freeboard) but now funding is incompatible with the desired level of service. The 2010 proposed approach will target protection based on land uses, presence of facilities, river conditions, resources, etc. The following criteria will be used to decide which projects to focus on:

- More intensive and valuable land uses warrant higher protection

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Existence of river management facilities (e.g., levees, revetments)
- Conditions relative to river channel gradient and width
- Presence of salmon spawning and rearing habitat
- Sediment transport condition (e.g., deposition, incision)

The results of the analysis were similar for the project team and the advisory committee. The advisory committee met in September and reviewed 11 proposals. They will make a decision about the path forward at the next meeting. Public meetings will be held in November.

Pierce County is conducting an environmental impact statement on the three alternatives in the plan. Five early action projects will be ready to go for 2012 if funding is available.

Pierce County is currently working on a USGS study through a joint agreement. The Phase 1 study will be completed in October and the Phase 2 study will be completed in February 2011.

The next steps for the Flood Hazard Management Plan is to develop policies. The county will take information to the public in November, prioritize projects and then make programmatic recommendations.

Questions / Comments:

- Brian Zeigler asked if Alternate 3 is adopted and forms the basis for the Flood Control Zone, what the price tag would be for that plan. Harold said that it is probably \$400 to 500 million.
- Brian noted that if the district can raise \$30 million in revenue this will still take 10 years to accomplish. Harold said that King county raises about \$32 million based on property taxes and that Pierce County will probably raise around \$9 to 10 million because of the lower property values.
- Debby Hyde asked who is on the advisory committee. Harold said that there are 27 people on the committee including cities, valley cities, county, resource agencies, businesses, agriculture, Master Builders, Citizens for a Healthy Bay, the Port of Tacoma, the Puyallup Tribe, and five citizens.
- Dave Enslow said that he is glad that the group is studying sediment removal because it is the cheapest thing you can do. He noted that across from Rainier Manor in Sumner is a high value warehouse and hopes that we can do something there before the flooding affects the warehouse.
- Lisa Brautigam added that she'd like to stress the importance of development regulations so that jurisdictions don't build on the river in the first place.
- CJ Klocow added that the Corps is planning on doing a lot of the things in the plan and that there will be opportunities for overlap with the GI study and the potential for federal funding.

Non-structural risk strategies

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Harold Smelt said that when the ETF first started, the group had identified that they wanted to talk about non-structural risk reduction. Now that the GI Study is underway, it's time to return to the topic. Harold walked through the five risk strategies that Lorin mentioned in his presentation.

Improve Flood Hazard Management and Channel Migration Zone Information: Most communities rely on FEMA maps. Pierce County has gone above and beyond this work by improving or expanding existing FEMA maps. However, there is still more that can be done. Future conditions mapping, including climate change and development, is another option for communities. Pierce County has done channel migration zone mapping by looking at 1931 maps to see where the river used to be and then looking at 2005 to see where the river is now and where development is. This shows where the river wants to go. Pierce County has hired consultants to chart potential river migration and identified levels of hazard. Studies have mapped and adopted Puyallup, Carbon and White Rivers; have mapped but not adopted the Upper Nisqually and South Prairie Rivers; and would like to map the Middle Nisqually, Greenwater, and Mashel Rivers.

Management of Land Uses: This is another way to prevent flooding including home elevations, relocations and acquisitions; managing development; creating levee setbacks; and working more closely with FEMA on flood hazard identification.

River Channel Management: These are things that we associate with maintenance, not capital projects. Landslides fall into this category. This category is dedicated to preventing, anticipating and managing these events.

Flood Hazard Education, Flood Preparedness, Flood Warning and Emergency Response: This includes a lot of activities that communities get credit for in FEMA's community response program. Pierce County sent out 17,000 copies of its Flood Bulletin to educate communities about flood preparedness. Fife has partnered to distribute this in their community and others are welcome to join the county in that educational effort. This includes a lot of services that Pierce County already provides including the alert system and reverse 9-1-1.

- **Action Item:** Let Harold know if your jurisdiction would like flood brochures to distribute to your community.

Harold showed the five risk reduction strategies again and asked the group to raise their hands if they were interested in discussing the following topics at future meetings:

1. Improve flood hazard management and channel migration zone information (poll: 5)
2. Management of land uses (poll: all)
3. River channel management (e.g., sediment, debris) (poll: 12)
4. Flood hazard education, flood preparedness, flood warning and emergency response (poll: 7)
5. Flood protection facilities (e.g., levees, revetments, flood walls, flood gates) (poll: not polled)

Puyallup River Executive Task Force

Summary Notes

Floodplain Regulations

Dennis Dixon, Pierce County, gave a presentation on existing floodplain regulations. He reiterated that Pierce County is doing more than the national standards (FEMA). FEMA's standards include: 1. Build at or above base flood elevation (BFE) 2. Substantial improvement/damage threshold of 50% (must come up to current code) and 3. No encroachment, fill or structures in floodway unless zero flood rise shown. FEMA encourages communities to do better through their Community Rating System (CRS) that gives communities credits for implementing higher standards. Dennis added that FEMA does not meet standard endangered species act (ESA) requirements.

Generally, most communities are doing things to protect structures but no one is doing anything to protect people. There are certain standards that might be adopted:

- Don't subdivide upland/lowland. Create a regulation that says you can only build on high ground.
- Access/egress: elevate driveways so that flooded residents have a way to leave and emergency vehicles have a place to access flooded areas.
- Zero rise requirements/compensatory storage
- Elevating structures (Pierce County requires 2' freeboard, King County, a 3' freeboard)

Dennis presented a matrix of regional floodplain regulations, showing what each community is doing. They have compared local standards to federal and state standards and highlighted the ones that are above the minimum. Dennis added that training and consistency in enforcement are critical and that the public is aware of the fact that there are different standards but doesn't necessarily know how to navigate them.

- **Action Item:** Let Dennis know if you have changes to the flood plain regulations matrix.

The public is aware there are different standards but they need one set of rules. If we can standardize these things, it will be a huge savings to the public in home damage, public infrastructure damage, emergency response and discount on flood insurance.

Questions / comments:

- A committee member asked what the recommended elevation is for developing in the flood plain. Dennis said that he would recommend going as high as you can since flooding is different every year.
- Doug Levy said that he appreciated the presentation for new development but wanted to know more about existing buildings. He said that there are areas that are developed with industrial buildings and offices and that it is cost prohibitive to retrofit them. Dennis said that you have to look at cost benefit. He suggested thinking about other locations for buildings after they flood. He added that most commercial buildings are being redeveloped on a 10- to 30-year cycle and it is during that redevelopment that retrofitting may be possible. Retrofitting is not always feasible but we need to take advantage of the opportunities.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Harold noted that if we think about strategies or level of service, like those that Lorin presented, we can adapt our protection strategies accordingly. Pierce County is trying to be consistent in these strategies and trying to strive for consistent land use regulations which will aid in that effort tremendously.
- Lisa Brautigam asked how many of these communities on the matrix are complying with the FEMA regulations. Dennis said that everyone is going to have to relook at the endangered species act (ESA) requirements and compliance because there are places that are not meeting the model ordinance. We may be meeting the requirements under ESA but not under the model ordinance. Each community is still going to have to talk to FEMA and NOAA because no community will look just like the model ordinance.
- Lisa said that she is concerned that the requirements will need to impose consistency across the board so that developers don't shop around to develop in the least stringent areas. If those communities are upstream from those who are going above and beyond, it will defeat the purpose. Harold said that there have been discussions in professional circles about changing minimum Washington State regulations so that communities would comply with that, which would enforce consistency.
- Katy Vanderpool said that the fundamental problem is that the growth management act (GMA) is a disincentive to communities. We need to encourage development standards in land use planning and growth management. Dennis said that yes, you cannot incorporate or annex within the floodplain and that it brings up a good discussion about how to tie the GMA to floodplain management.
- Katy added that local jurisdictions have an economic incentive to not set levees back and asked how we incentivize them to set levees back. Dennis said that we have to focus on the overall risk. There are plenty of reasons for the community as a whole to require levee setbacks.
- Dave Enslow said that he was worried about people's property rights and hopes that we can have cooperation between property owners and the city. He said that Sumner would love to be a part of uniform standards across the county but that they do not want someone to arrive and tell them what to do. He said that he would like to be part of the group that makes these decisions and that they are standard for everyone so that people don't "shop around."
- Chris Andersen said that Auburn adopted amendments for the model ordinance and transmitted them to FEMA in May but have not heard back from FEMA.
- Debby Hyde said that part of the problem is that the biological opinion and FEMA's response is out there but it's not finalized so it's causing confusion for a lot of jurisdictions.

City of Auburn

Penny reported that the City of Auburn is providing funding and would like to be a member of the executive task force. Penny asked for input from the group. Brian Zeigler commented that since Auburn has already met the minimum financial requirement, he didn't see any reason why they shouldn't be at the table. No other comment was made. Penny welcomed Auburn to the table.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- **Action Item:** EnviroIssues will add Auburn to the list of executive task force members.

Near-Term Activities Update

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

- **Pierce County** is doing levy maintenance and required repairs. Currently, their crews are working in the Nisqually area on the entrance to Mount Rainier.
- **City of Fife** is enhancing their 9-1-1 alert system and using Facebook and Twitter. They are restricting trucks on Levee Road to keep the levee in place. They are doing a new overlay on Levee Road to improve its structural integrity. Through door-to-door outreach, they have distributed a “What does it mean to live behind a levee?” brochure, which includes development regulations. Their CRS rating was raised to a 5 for 25 percent reduction of flood insurance. In preparation for flooding this year, Fife has tested their Fife-specific emergency system.
- **City of Orting** is in the final design of the Calistoga Setback levee project. The project is a total of \$700,000. They are working on salmon recovery and doing presentations to get additional funding. They are doing four public outreach events this fall. They utilized Buckley prisoners to add sandbags to the levee. They are hoping to hit a 4 on their recent CRS submittal. They are replacing flood control structures along the river, working on bar removal and working with Pierce County to identify projects that will help the community.
- In addition to the CRS work with FEMA (mentioned earlier), the **City of Auburn** is conducting an annual survey of miles 6 & 7 of the White River.
- **Port of Tacoma** is analyzing current elevations on Hylebos Creek.
- **City of Tacoma** is in permitting for their flood control plan.
- In addition to working on the Puyallup River GI study, the **US Army Corps of Engineers** is conducting a White River channel capacity study.
- **City of Sumner** is working on finding funding for their wastewater treatment facility. They are working on the 24th street setback. They are working to improve their emergency preparedness by working with Pierce County Emergency Management.
- **King County** is working on a study on the White River and doing geomorphic and sediment work with the Corps. They launched a USGS study on habitat effects and completed a sediment trends report. They are working on a capital project in Auburn on the county line. Construction on the left bank will begin in 2012 with construction on the right bank in 2014. They are working on a feasibility study for the Trans-Canada project in Auburn. They updated their temporary hazardous waste facility in the spring. They’ve partnered with the city of Pacific to reach out to low income residents to keep their public use open during the project. They are putting pumps in place for a stormwater system and continue to monitor their flood warning center.

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 before the end of 2010. Kristina 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.

- **Sally Bailey, Sumner:** I would like to encourage you to do gravel sediment removal in front of the Rainer Manor apartments. Someone must have some power somewhere. Wouldn't it be nice if it could be removed before flood season starts? Thank you for anything you can do.

Action Items:

- **Action Item:** Harold will update the cost-sharing matrix to reflect the agreements and funding contributions.
- **Action Item:** Let Harold know if your jurisdiction would like flood brochures to distribute to your community.
- **Action Item:** Let Dennis know if you have changes to the flood plain regulations matrix.
- **Action Item:** EnviroIssues will add Auburn to the list of executive task force members.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 a.m.