

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

**Meeting #16 – Dec. 3, 2010
Evergreen State College – Tacoma Campus**

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 Rory LaDucer, Director of Public Safety	Lisa Brautigam, Attorney Sylvia Miller, Councilmember
City of Tacoma		Ryan Mello, Councilmember Charlie Solverson, Planning Manager
City of Fife	Steve Worthington, City Manager Dick Godwin, Councilmember	Barry Johnson, Mayor
City of Puyallup	John Knutsen, Councilmember	
City of Orting	Ken Wolfe, Building Official	
City of Auburn	Chris Andersen, Environmental Protection Manager	
City of Buckley	Pat Johnson, Mayor	
City of Sumner	Dave Enslow, Mayor Bill Pugh, Director of Public Works	
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	
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	

Other Attendees:

Harold Smelt, Pierce County Water Programs Manager
Lorin Reinelt, Pierce County Surface Water Management
Dennis Dixon, Pierce County Surface Water Management

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Brynn Brady, Pierce County Government Relations
George Walk, Pierce County Government Relations
Keri Rooney, Pierce County
Tom Young, Office of Congressman Dave Reichert
Matt Perry, Office of Representative Adam Smith
Gil Hulsman, Abbey Road Group
Greg Laird, Otak
Penny Mabie, facilitator
Kristina Walker, note taker

Meeting Purpose and Overview

Pierce County convened the sixteenth meeting of the Puyallup River Executive Task Force (ETF) in Tacoma, Washington on Dec. 3, 2010. The meeting included updates from the Pierce County Flood Control Zone District, Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers General Investigation Study and inter-local funding agreements, and a discussion about regulatory and land use strategies. Approximately 30 people attended the meeting, held at the Evergreen State College – Tacoma Campus.

Meeting Summary

Welcome

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

Brief introductions

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 updates from the Pierce County Flood Control Zone District, Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers General Investigation Study and inter-local funding agreements, and a discussion about regulatory and land use strategies.

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 Oct. 1, 2010 meeting notes

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

Flood Control Zone District update

Harold reported that the Boundary Review Board met this week and signed a formal decision of support of the definition for the County-wide district, which allows for the collection of fees County-wide. The City of Lakewood has filed an appeal. The Board of Supervisors (Pierce County Council) rescheduled their first meeting for Dec. 13, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the council chambers. This meeting will include the

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

election of officers, adoption of the 2011 budget, and identifying the level of funding for 2011. Their intent is to put in place a \$5 flat fee per parcel, which would raise \$1.5 million. That would allow them to open their doors, hire an executive director, adopt a capital plan, and implement some standard operating procedures. They will contract with Pierce County for some services, including \$1 million for increased maintenance along the river system.

Questions and comments:

- Pat McCarthy asked if the district would create an advisory board. Harold said that the district is working with a consultant (Kjristine Lund), who will be giving the report and recommendations to the group. Her recommendations will likely include an advisory committee of major stakeholders. The King County Advisory Committee meets quarterly with an executive committee (a subset of the County Council) that meets monthly. The full board of advisors only meets twice a year.
- Pat McCarthy said that she is concerned that there are so many bodies working on similar issues and the same staff working on them. The Puyallup River ETF, the County Council, and the Board of Supervisors of the Flood Control District are all depleting staff energy. She noted that the ETF would be a good group from which to solicit representatives for the Flood Control Advisory Committee. She also asked if the County engineer would be the executive administrator (per state law). Harold said that King County has an executive administrator (the County engineer) and also has an executive director who works more directly for their council. He felt that Pierce County is leaning this direction.
- Dave Enslow said that he appreciated Pat's comments and felt that we had too many advisory groups and not enough people doing the work. He said that he'd like to see the flood district come together with the least amount of overhead possible and also have a robust advisory committee that allows us to speak.
- John Knutsen agreed and added that he would like to see more elected officials on these groups to create a better balance. He agreed that the creation of another committee wouldn't be beneficial.
- Clare Petrich asked what the specific purpose and goals are of the two groups. Harold replied that the Flood Control Zone District is a revenue source and that the advisory committee will direct capital expenditures and will prioritize what projects that revenue would be used for. There is an overlap with the ETF as we start the GI Study process and it might make sense to combine them.
- Clare asked what it would take to make that happen. Harold noted that there is a limit to number of members (15) on the Flood Control District Advisory Committee according to the RCW. Harold said that the group would need to have a formal selection of members and that that group would schedule the ETF and make sure that the broader group is still involved in the discussions.
- Pat McCarthy asked for people to express their opinions so that we could report to the board at the Dec. 13 meeting. Harold can compile comments and provide it to the council.
- Steve Worthington noted that the two boards have a similar purpose but that there might not be as much overlap as first thought. The Puyallup River ETF is working on the GI Study and has a unified local governmental presence and presents a common voice about what the group is doing. If that can be achieved with a different group, he felt it would be worthwhile to combine the groups. He noted that the Flood Control District is in need of some mending of fences and that it needs to be more inclusive than this group. (There should be County-wide representation.)
- Pat Johnson said that she sees a potential turf war between County Council districts with County funds within the Flood Control District. She reminded everyone that flooding is not confined just to the lowlands; Wilkeson and Eatonville have had major flooding that most people don't think of. She added that there needs to be an outreach and education effort so that people are educated about what flooding is, upstream and down, and that other cities should be at the table.
- Harold noted that the Flood Control District Advisory Committee is supposed to be all-inclusive and that cities like Steilacoom, DuPont, and Gig Harbor, for example, will likely take up some of

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

the 15 seats on the committee. Since some of the funds will likely be turned back to the cities to address their flooding issues, it will be important to have everyone at the table.

- Pat Johnson noted that her city council was sold on the Flood Control District based on the fact that money could be coming back to the city.
- Harold noted that Kjrystine Lund is the executive director for the King County Flood Control District so the recommendations will likely be in line with what King County is doing.
- JoAnn noted that she didn't think it would be appropriate for WSDOT to be a part of the Flood Control District Advisory Committee, as a group that allocates funds.
- Pat McCarthy asked if WSDOT sits on the King County Advisory Committee. Harold said that they do not and that King County actually exempts WSDOT properties from paying the Flood Control District fee.
- Clare Petrich noted that she likes the idea of collaboration between the two groups.
- David Graybill said that he appreciated what he has heard. He noted that he is retiring and will try to make sure that there is some consistent representation from the chamber.
- Steve Worthington added that he will be leaving the City of Fife near the end of the year and that they will be hiring a new city manager.
- Clare asked to see the list of participating organizations on the King County Advisory Committee.

ACTION ITEM: Kristina will send out the list of positions on the King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee.

- Pat McCarthy noted that she is in support of the Flood Control District but recognizes that the County could have done it differently. King County did more due diligence ahead of time and Pierce County could have done that. She said she is hopeful that the board of supervisors will address the concerns and the missteps that have happened. She also noted that she doesn't want to duplicate efforts and would support dismantling the ETF if the Flood Control Zone District has wide enough representation.
- CJ Klocow noted that the Corps would be a passive participant of a Flood Control District Advisory Group since a lot of the County-wide work would fall outside of their scope of work on the GI Study.

Flood Hazard Management Plan

Harold said that this regular update is at the request of the group, and encouraged the group to speak up if they would like to remove this from future agendas. The group indicated a desire to continue to receive FHMP updates.

Lorin Reinelt reported that the economic analysis and US Geologic Survey (USGS) study that he reported on at the last meeting are complete and have been posted to the website. He noted that the Tacoma News Tribune did a report on the economic analysis – a study based on socio-economic conditions within the floodplain, how many people live there, properties, wastewater treatment, recreation, transportation, and property damage.

Lorin reported that the analysis of 250 problems, and the feasibility of solutions, has led the advisory committee to develop policies that will guide the solutions. The policies are categorized as: General, Projects, Regulatory, Flood Warning and Emergency Response, and Funding Policies. The policies were then divided into two groups. Group A policies were agreed upon and Group B policies are still under discussion. He noted that he is working with his policy team and steering committee and that it will then be sent to the County Council for consideration. Lorin provided a handout with the detailed information.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force

Summary Notes

Questions and comments:

- Steve Worthington asked if there are any other certified levees in the County. Lorin confirmed that there are not any presently, but that they are working to certify levees at Soldiers Home and in the City of Orting.
- Dave Enslow asked if the newly-formed Flood Control Zone District would cover a lot of this. Lorin said that these are draft policies that have been agreed upon by staff and the advisory committee. He added that it is policy language that would go into a draft plan to be considered by the County Council. Lorin said that the plan should be completed in April of next year and then go to the County Council.
- Dave Enslow noted that this will have to be another conversation with the Flood Control Zone District about whether they want to use these policies.
- Pat McCarthy said that this is a great body of work and it would be to their disadvantage if the council and the district did not use this. She noted that Lorin and his staff did a great job.
- Lorin clarified that the FHMP is a County-wide plan but focuses on the major rivers. He added that the representation on the plan's stakeholder committee is County-wide. Harold added that there are senior-level technical staff on that advisory group.
- Penny clarified that the three advisory groups being referred are:
 - Pierce County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee: would have county-wide representation if formed
 - The Puyallup River ETF: focus on the Puyallup River
 - Pierce County Rivers Flood Hazard Management Plan Advisory Committee: county-wide focus, but short-term
- Harold added that the ETF was formed in response to the decertification of the Puyallup River levee. Lorin's group was formed as part of a County effort to update the Flood Hazard Management Plan. And the Flood Control Zone District may have an advisory committee as well. It is our hope that the Flood Hazard Management Plan will be adopted by the flood control district.
- Harold said the plan will go to the County Council for their review and then also to the Flood Control Zone District's Board of Supervisors.
- Ken Wolfe said that he is on the FHMP advisory committee and he complimented Lorin and his staff on their great work. He said that they've reached out to every community in Pierce County and received feedback to complete these policy recommendations.
- CJ Klocow noted that the Corps is monitoring the plan closely and will use information from the FHMP in the GI study to avoid duplication of effort.

GI Update

CJ Klocow reported that work is underway on the General Investigation (GI) Study. The Corps has received \$500,000 in Federal funding and expects another \$350,000 when congress passes their budget. CJ is working closely with Harold and Pierce County to finalize the local match. CJ is working on the existing and future conditions report and monitoring to look ahead 50 years. The study is looking at economic damages based on specific events, environmental impact, endangered species, water quality, cultural resources, hazardous and toxic waste, geotechnical studies of the levees, and soil studies. It will be a very comprehensive report; it will be an appendix to the larger Corps document.

This process should take a year but could be shorter depending on what existing data the Corps can work with. CJ will be working with Pierce County and ETF members to gather existing data. CJ added that the timeline of a year also depends on the Corps' stringent review policy.

CJ reported that the Corps is aiming to conduct a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping meeting in August. He said that the purpose of this step is to get input from stakeholders and the

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

community. There will be a court reporter at the meeting and a formal comment period will accompany the meeting. CJ said that he would be contacting the ETF to help get the word out about the meeting and the process to ensure that the Corps has a good representation and has all the correct agencies there.

Questions and comments:

- Steve Worthington suggested that the Corps aim for May for the scoping meeting to get more involvement since August is not usually a good month for public participation. CJ said that they would definitely look into that. He added that the meeting takes a little bit of preparation time and requires a federal registry notification for the project.
- Harold noted that he will be meeting with the Corps and other County staff next week to talk about data gaps. He said the next meeting will be to follow up with other stakeholders and he hopes that many of the ETF members will be able to participate. The Corps will be using information from the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) tool, a habitat assessment tool the County has invested in.
- CJ added that they have started developing preliminary measures. He added that Lorin's plan is a good start, but that we need to start identifying projects and potential problem areas so that we can look at what can be done to address them. He said that, ideally there should be some ideas by the time the Corps holds the NEPA scoping meeting. He said that he will be reaching out to get input from the ETF representatives to make sure we have the right ideas, the right measures, the right problem areas.

Inter-local Agreement:

Harold reported that a resolution authorizing the County Executive to sign for funding is headed for Council Tuesday and ETF members should get signed documents in the next couple of weeks. He also reported that the ETF raised \$290,000 (the goal was \$250,000). He noted that the City of Tacoma has approved it to be put in their budget but has not signed the paperwork yet. He asked the ETF members if they would like to save money or accelerate the process. This may depend on whether or not we have the federal match from the Corps.

Questions and comments:

- Steve Worthington said he liked the idea of speeding up the process.
- Dave Enslow asked if the process would actually go faster. He noted it would be nice to know that if we're spending the money, we're getting something for it.
- CJ said that it depends on how soon the federal budget comes out since the Corps is currently operating under a continuing resolution. The Puyallup River is not the only project the Corps is working on, so the Corps needs to make sure the resources will be available to accelerate. Harold added that it also depends on the federal match amount.
- Ken asked if the federal funding is an annual appropriation. Harold said that it was.
- Harold noted that his understanding is that there is a minimum fifty percent local match. Harold asked if the Corps would be able to utilize additional local match even if federal matching doesn't come in at \$500,000. CJ said that he'd look into it.
- CJ noted that there will be an executive-level meeting in late January with Pierce County and the Corp to discuss these issues.
- Pat McCarthy asked CJ to get that meeting setup and noted that if it is possible to accelerate the process, that's where the extra money should go. She asked if the issue needs to be finalized for the inter-local agreement to go through the County Council. Harold said that the agreement included not-to-exceed amounts for cities, so no adjustment to the agreement is needed. He added that the group needs to recognize that there may be less federal match.
- John Knutsen asked why more money would mean it could go faster. Harold said that the Corps could allocate more staff time to the project.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Penny noted that the group agreed that if the additional funds mean that the process should go faster, then the fund should go to accelerate the process.

ACTION ITEM: CJ will check with the Corps to make sure they have the staff to accelerate the process and will set up a January meeting to discuss the GI Study.

Regulatory/land use strategies

Penny introduced the draft regulation matrix handout that shows the land use policies regarding flooding from each of the jurisdictions along the Puyallup River. She noted this will be an extensive discussion and will be continued in subsequent ETF meetings.

Harold introduced the matrix and reminded the group that they had expressed a desire to talk about regulations at the last meeting. He said that this matrix is a good way to look at the level of service across the County to start the conversation about consistency and predictability. He added that making consistent policies will level the playing field in terms of development and homeowners. He said that this regional system would allow the County to be proactive, not reactive about flooding issues. He told the group that Dennis Dixon would highlight the technical issues and the differences in regulations between jurisdictions and agencies, and then open it up to a discussion about what consistency looks like and what the group wants to do to support it. Harold asked if the group was supportive of consistent floodplain regulations.

Questions, comments and discussion:

- Pat McCarthy said that consistency sounds like a good idea in theory but that she has concerns about existing homeowners. She said it's not clear what consistency will mean for folks who already live on the river bank. It's one thing to say that we don't want new development on the river and another to talk about the impact to existing homeowners. Harold agreed that redevelopment is a huge issue for the cities with existing development in flood hazard areas.
- Ken Wolfe said that the floodplain is only going to get bigger and that this is going to be a tough call for cities. He said that with the glacial melt, his entire city will soon be in the floodplain. He also noted the impacts to property owners. For example, the national flood insurance program asks property owners to raise their houses.
- Bill Sullivan noted that the Tribe is in a unique situation because they don't own a lot of land that *is not* in a floodplain so he's not sure what the tribal council will be willing to adopt.
- Dave Enslow said that there is value in consistency, but is worried about what consistency is.

Penny noted that this is the conversation we'd like the group to have. Harold said that we know that some cities have stricter regulations but we're interested in setting a minimum.

Dennis Dixon presented the first segment of the spreadsheet, 'floodplain mapping.' Currently, jurisdictions with flood insurance are all using the 1980 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain map as a minimum. We know that the best available data is much different and that the new draft FEMA map is closer to the actual situation. He noted that the draft FEMA map will be open to comments in January 2011 and may be adopted next year.

Penny asked the group if they would like to use the 1980 data, which are the most current FEMA maps as a minimum and if they would like to suggest that all jurisdictions should use the same data set to regulate.

Harold said that there are two choices for regulation: 1. Use the formally issued maps by FEMA (20 years old) or 2. Use the best available data, which at the moment, is the draft FEMA maps.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

- Steve Worthington said that the City of Fife has been using best available data since 2001 and had adopted it as a regulation tool. If they hadn't, he believes they would have lost thousands of homes. He noted that if you want development to occur where it shouldn't, use the old maps.
- Jim Morrow noted that there is case law that says we have to use best available data. Cities have been sued because they used old data, knowing that there was new data available. Harold replied that Pierce County has gotten pushback from people for using a map for development restrictions that is still a draft.
- Jim Morrow said that with that argument, as development occurs, the areas that are prone to flood are going to change. We need to constantly be changing our best available data. Just because it's not on a map, doesn't mean we don't know it's true.
- Harold agreed and noted that the draft FEMA maps that will soon be adopted are already 10 years old and that Pierce County is already aware of areas where flooding is different than as shown on the maps.

Penny noted that it sounds like there is a consensus that the group should use the approved FEMA map plus the best available data. Harold noted that currently, the best available data is the draft FEMA maps.

Dennis noted that the schedule for approving the new FEMA map is to be posted on the federal registry in January, followed by a three-month comment period and, if FEMA keeps their original map, the earliest letter of determination would be in May or June. Then, there is a six-month period for cities to adopt the map, and the earliest it could be adopted by FEMA would be December 2011.

- Pat McCarthy asked what the ramifications are if the ETF supports the suggested minimum for mapping. Dennis said that we would be asking people to raise their houses to the minimum specifications and that it would have a dramatic effect on development along the river (up to 10 feet above the previous level). He added that FEMA will give jurisdictions the option to adopt the map and remain in the national insurance plan, or not.
- Harold noted that if the ETF comes to a consensus, it will be asking our community to change their regulations; but noted that it is not clear what weight this group brings.
- Pat McCarthy noted that, in the past, the County Council has retreated on this topic because it affected the people who live on the river who wanted to update their houses and could not. Harold noted that the council did loosen regulations on agricultural land.
- Pat McCarthy agreed that for future development, this minimum is fine but wants to look very closely at how it affects current residents before this group recommends anything. She added that cities might have economic development concerns. Harold noted that those issues will come up later on the matrix and suggested that once the group agrees on a common map, those issues can be discussed.
- Dave Enslow said that he is concerned about the implications of the maps and cited an example in Sumner that would be affected by the new maps. Harold said that changes between the 1980 maps and the draft maps are dramatic.
- Pat Johnson said that at some point the property owner needs to take responsibility for where they build. Taxpayers are tired of paying to buy property owners out.
- Dave Enslow said that rivers are filling up and that people are making investments based on one regulation and to ask them to make changes based on the new regulations is going to be tough.

Penny asked what the group thinks about saying that, for now, the draft FEMA map is the level that everyone would seek for consistency.

- Jim Morrow said that if jurisdictions have best available data, they would be remiss in not using them as the regulations used to build in that area. FEMA is coming out and saying that

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

jurisdictions have two choices: adopt the map or opt out of national flood insurance. It is then the city's decision how to deal with property owners. These are policy decisions that we can address and make recommendations, but the cities have to make the decisions. This group can't usurp what the cities decide to do.

- Steve Worthington noted that this group can provide recommendations; not impose rules. It can set the ideal set of policies and guidelines--a model that communities should look to, rather than suggest that this is the absolute. It is easier to say that "ideally" this is what should happen, without imposing it on jurisdictions.

Penny asked attendees to think about looking at policies for an "ideal world."

- Dave said that he likes the discussion but needs to take time with the matrix to really know what's out there.
- Harold suggested that Dennis introduce the technical aspects and then have the policy discussion at the next meeting.

Dennis described the 'plan review – data requirements' section of the matrix. He said that when reviewing development plans near the floodway plain, it is difficult to determine where the boundary line is. The choice is to look at the boundary on the FEMA map, or ask the applicant to identify what the ground is in relation to the elevation of the project. (If it's lower than what the map shows, it could be in danger of flooding.) Jurisdictions have the option to require developers to change the project based on that information.

Note: Communities identified in yellow on the matrix in this section are communities that are asking for additional plans and ground elevations from developers.

- Jim Morrow said that cities need to identify if they have additional knowledge of the floodplain and the elevations not on the maps. If they do, they should ask the developer to assure the city that they are outside of the floodplain elevation or adapt their project.
- Ryan Dicks noted that we're assuming that people want to build everywhere. He said that if developers had more information and knew where they shouldn't build, they would actually appreciate it. They don't want to build in the floodplain so they have to change their project every five or ten years. He noted that more information would help developers.

Dennis described the 'FEMA Floodway' section on the matrix. He noted that most people meet the FEMA minimum: no buildings in the floodway. He noted that there are some agricultural exemptions.

Dennis described the 'channel migration' section. Channel migration describes the movement of the river, rather than just the rising and falling of the water. The regulatory decision is what to do if there is a known risk. The Endangered Species Act, FEMA Model Ordinance, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are all asking for channel migration to be considered. Lorin noted that the County has done some work on mapping channel migration. Dennis said that the Department of Ecology has guidance for channel migration mapping but that mapping where a river is likely to move is still a young area of study. The lower Puyallup is not mapped for this because it's been contained by levees for so long.

- Pat McCarthy brought up the question of liability: Is it the responsibility of the County or the federal government to bail out a property that needs to be rebuilt because of flooding, if the risk is known? This is especially difficult for existing property owners. Dennis noted that it is not as much about compensating the existing structures, but whether or not we issue a permit to build

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

there in the future, knowing that it is in the floodplain. Then, the question is: *Once a jurisdiction issues the permit, who is responsible if it floods?*

- Harold noted that this questions has been discussed in public workshops for more than a year. The questions are: 1. *Should we map it?* and *How do we map it?* Then, 2. *How do we regulate it?* In Pierce County, we decided that we should map. We designated the Channel Migration Zone (CMZ) as floodways so that building cannot occur there. The alternative is to map in a less severe way. This could be an entire meeting topic for this group.

Dennis gave a brief overview about the ‘deep and fast flowing floodway’ section. He noted that most jurisdictions have a policy for structures in fast-moving water, but not about people [in fast-moving water]. The choice is whether to upgrade the regulation to include the risk for a person. Harold added that the question is, again, if we should map it, and then, how we should map it? While a developer may only see these regulations as three different lines on a map, Pierce County knows that if the levees fail on the Puyallup River, we may have up to eight feet of water. This area may not be a FEMA floodway, but it doesn’t sound like a smart place to build.

Penny and Harold suggested that the ETF continue to talk about these issues at future meetings and will provide some additional framing questions to guide the discussion.

Near-Term Activities Update

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

- Ken Wolfe with the **City of Orting** said that they are working on another appraisal for Calistoga Levee Setback project (Dec. 17), which will take us to 100 percent ownership. He is also doing a presentation about the cycle of water in January to a 4th grade class. Orting is also signing a \$1.2 million agreement with the Salmon Recovery Board for the setback project and working on the design, which should be complete in June. Currently, they’re looking for grants for construction. Orting just completed the first review on cost of service for these capital service projects (including the Calistoga project). Their Utilities Committee is working on that calculation and what it is going to take to build with no more than 50 percent grants.
- Chris Andersen said that the **City of Auburn** is still awaiting the results of their Community Rating System (CRS) visit and they anticipate earning a score of five. The City has opened sand bag stations in the community which are open seven days a week. They have not seen the same level of activity as they saw last year. Auburn has also begun the process for long-term planning for flood control.
- Jim Morrow reported that the **City of Puyallup** is working with USGS to establish two real-time elevation gauges on the Puyallup River and one on Clarks Creek. Mark Palmer is working on a storm modeling system as part of the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan. The City is using grant money to turn existing gravel alleyways into porous pavement. They are working in conjunction with Washington State University to get real-life data on how well things are working. They are also working on buying the 14th Street property, a property that traditionally floods.
- Clare Petrich said that the **Port of Tacoma** is working on a mitigation project on Hylebos Creek that should be completed this summer. She invited the group to come and celebrate with the Port when it is completed.
- Bill Pugh said that the **City of Sumner** is working on funding for the treatment plant wall and proceeding ahead with design. They are also working on the 24th Street Setback Feasibility Study. He also noted that the City is starting to look at how to deal with the realities of a large amount of industrial development, while protecting investments, and dealing with flooding.
- Pat McCarthy noted that the Local Actions Report was really helpful. She added that education is very important and encouraged the local jurisdictions to be educating their communities by the

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

River. She noted that Pierce County's Emergency Management Division (EMD) and the work Harold and the Surface Water Division are doing is great.

- Bill Pugh added that he really appreciates the EMD and the collaboration with the cities in Pierce County.
- CJ Klocow said that the **Corps** has emergency management teams on the Puyallup and White Rivers doing testing so that they are ready to go. In addition, the Corps is conducting the White River study. The study will be done this spring and the results will be tied into the GI Study.
- Harold Smelt reported on behalf of **WSDOT** that mitigation for the HOV lanes off of Pioneer Way is almost complete. It is in the Clarks Creek watershed, and adds about 30 acres of storage to that watershed. Harold also noted that Pierce County is working with WSDOT on preventing flooding on the Puyallup River with the Puyallup Bridge Replacement and HOV project.
- Pat Johnson reported that the **City of Buckley's** City Council adopted a stormwater plan to meet the 100-year flood event regulations. They've since thought about backing off to the 50-year event because of the costs of the 100-year level being nearly impossible for a small city. She added that they are trying to do everything they can in Buckley so it doesn't affect the rest of the jurisdictions in Pierce County.
- Bill Sullivan reported the **Puyallup Tribe of Indians** is working with the City of Puyallup, WSU and Pierce County on Clarks Creek for a long-term solution. They are partners with WSDOT because they own the river banks, and want to ensure that the discharge is clean. The Tribe set up an emergency housing program to assist tribal members if they are evacuated in a flood. They are adding that information to their website.
- Steve Worthington reported that the **City of Fife** is conducting routine maintenance, including replacing a pump that failed early. They are permitting projects to require compensatory storage. One area that Fife used for compensatory storage for an industrial development project doubles as a community park, which opened last week. They worked with Port security on a joint exercise with the Port security program so they know what the protocols are and where the emergency ordinance is located. He noted it is important to work through those things so that we're ready to go when we do need it.
- Harold reported that **Pierce County** received a \$2 million Hazard Mitigation Program grant for the acquisition of flooded structures. The grant is applied to specific projects and the money is designated to buy out people who are desperate to get out of the floodplain. Harold also reminded attendees to look for an article in the Tacoma News Tribune this Sunday about flood changes and how glacial changes are affecting communities.

Public Comment

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

Future meeting topics

The next meeting will include updates from the Flood Control Hazard Management Plan, the Corps and the GI Study, the Flood Control Zone district. The next meeting will also include a continued discussion of the regulation / land use strategies, with additional framing questions. A future meeting will include a report on the NEPA scoping process.

Pat McCarthy encouraged people to attend the Dec. 13, 2010 Flood Control Zone District Board of Supervisor's meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Harold and Kristina will send the Flood Control Zone District meeting notice to the group.

Puyallup River Executive Task Force Summary Notes

Harold noted that the inter-local agreement was supposed to start in 2010 but jurisdictions will not be invoiced until 2011 since there has been no significant work by the Corps in 2010.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Action Items

- **ACTION ITEM:** Kristina will send out the list the King County Flood Control District Advisory group.

- **ACTION ITEM:** CJ will check with the Corps to make sure that they have the staff to accelerate the process.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Harold and Kristina will send the Flood Control Zone District meeting notice to the group.