

Meeting Notes from WRIA 10/12 CAC/TAG Meeting

August 14, 2008, 4:00 to 6:00pm

Tacoma Mall Office Bldg., 4th Floor Conference Room

1. Introductions – those present included: Hans Berge, Bob Burkle, Karen Chang, Scott Hansen, Tom Kantz, Russ Ladley, Ron Larson, Bart Madison, Tom Nelson, Lorin Reinelt, Mike Rhubright, Al Schmauder, Dave Seabrook, David Swindale, Keith Underwood

2. Updates and Information Sharing

- a. Request to Puget Sound Recovery Council for WRIA 12 Allocation – At the July 16 meeting of the Recovery Council, we requested consideration of an allocation of PSAR funds to the WRIA 12 watershed as part of the 2009-2011 biennium budget. We requested a WRIA 12 allocation of between 0.95 and 1.9% of the Puget Sound allocation. Unfortunately, the request was denied by the Recovery Council, largely because they didn't want to re-open the allocation discussion that had taken so long to agree upon in 2005-6.
- b. Development of Biennium Budget Project List for WRIA 10/12 – WRIA 10/12 needs to develop a biennium budget list (for both \$2.9 and \$5.1 million options) for inclusion in the Puget Sound Partnership budget request to the governor. The proposed list is due September 15. Lorin asked for volunteers to help him develop a list; Tom K., Dave and Russ volunteered.
- c. Puget Sound Partnership South Central Action Area workshop – The workshop was held on July 30 in Tukwila. The primary items discussed included the action area profile and the four strategic priorities: (1) ensure that activities and funding are focused on the most urgent and important problems; (2) protect intact ecosystem processes that sustain Puget Sound; (3) implement restoration projects that will reestablish ecosystem processes; and (4) prevent the sources of water pollution.
- d. Steelhead Recovery Plan – Discussions are ongoing about development of a Puget Sound Steelhead Recovery Plan. NOAA Fisheries is emphasizing that the plan should be built upon ongoing (Chinook) recovery work as well as existing, local technical work. The PSP was asked to tell NOAA that the lead entities need additional capacity to work on the steelhead plan.
- e. RITT/PSP Feedback on the 3-year List and Narrative – Kirk Lakey (RITT) and Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz (PSP) met with interested WRIA 10/12 CAC/TAG members on July 15 to discuss feedback on the 3-year project list and narrative. There was a good discussion about numerous topics and feedback that will help in future updates.
- f. Habitat Work Schedule – The WRIA 10/12 HWS hierarchy has been populated with project information from the 3-year project list. A demonstration will be made at the next CAC/TAG meeting in September.

3. CAC Evaluation/Ranking and Selection of Projects for 2008 SRFB Funding

Lorin gave a brief update on some project changes. The most significant was the removal of the Lake Kapowsin parcels from the Middle Puyallup acquisition project. Seven final applications were submitted in the 2008 round. The TAG scoring of the projects was completed on August 7 and resulted in the following average scores for the

seven projects, using the three criteria and cumulative score (based on a maximum of 26 points):

	Benefit	Certainty	Fit to Strategy	Total
1. Boise Creek Restoration Design	9.2	4.6	9.3	23.2
2. South Prairie/Silver Springs Restoration	8.8	5.4	8.8	23.0
3. TransCanada Levee Setback Design	9.0	4.6	9.3	22.9
4. Middle Puyallup River Acquisition	8.5	4.7	8.4	21.6
5. Calistoga Setback Levee Design	7.4	3.9	8.2	19.5
6. Morey Creek Fish Passage	4.4	4.0	5.8	14.2
7. Leach Creek Acquisition	3.4	3.3	3.5	10.2

David Swindale expressed some concerns about how the projects were ranked and the situation with the field trip, which didn't allow for adequate time at the Leach Creek sites and we were 1.5 hours late. Bob noted that the main issue with the Leach Creek site was the lack of benefit to listed salmon. Tom K. asked for clarification about how coho get recognized in the evaluation. Tom N. and Hans noted that "fit to strategy" and life history criteria give points for coho. Keith asked about points for fit to strategy. Lorin noted that this primarily comes from Tables 3 and 4 (pp. 37-8) of the strategy. Dave Seabrook asked why Calistoga scored low. Bob noted that many TAG members felt it could have examined a broader area (left and right bank) and included more setback area. While the ball fields placed outside the levee are preferable, this means a more limited area for the setback. Tom K. asked about how it compares to the setback feasibility study boundary. It was noted that it could have extended back further laterally. Bob noted that TransCanada will be modeled hydraulically and they will examine both sides of the river.

CAC Scoring – All 12 CAC members submitted preliminary scores for the seven projects in advance of the meeting. Lorin noted there were 14 criteria with a maximum score of 5 for each criterion, for a total of 70. It was noted that there can be challenges in comparing and ranking design, acquisition and restoration projects against one another. Keith noted that if CAC members are consistent with how they apply scores for different projects, the variations between CAC members should not be a problem. Dave noted that he considered both the response to CAC criteria and the application in scoring the projects. Keith expressed disappointment that more effort isn't put forward to involve the public and increase visibility. Tom K. echoed Keith's comments, noting that particularly in urban areas, we should have more public involvement. Hans noted that the applicants may not have expressed those elements as much as they could have, but the top 3 TAG projects have potential for more public exposure. Al noted that it was unfortunate that a construction project like Morey Creek fish passage ranked so low and will likely not receive funding.

There was discussion about whether CAC members wanted to make any changes to their scores to reflect any new information. Ron said he is comfortable with the scores as they are. Bob moved to accept the scores as shown on the draft spreadsheet. Tom K. seconded. **The CAC scores were accepted by consensus.** Keith recommended that we do a "post-hoc" evaluation of the scores to see what we can learn for future rounds. The summary of CAC scoring of projects and the overall scoring (combining CAC and TAG scores and using a normalized 100-point scale) is as follows:

Socio-Econ	Combined (TAG/CAC)	Rank
------------	--------------------	------

1. Boise Creek Restoration Design	39.6	79.4	1
2. TransCanada Levee Setback Design	40.1	78.8	2
3. South Prairie/Silver Springs Restoration	37.3	77.8	3
4. Middle Puyallup River Acquisition	41.9	76.0	4
5. Calistoga Setback Levee Design	40.2	69.8	5
6. Morey Creek Fish Passage	33.7	52.7	6
7. Leach Creek Acquisition	42.6	45.7	7

Scott made a motion to fund the top three projects on the combined CAC/TAG list (for a total of \$545,000) and then to fund the top WRIA 12 project (Morey Creek fish bypass) at \$79,463. Bob seconded. Mike (vice chair of the Chambers Clover Watershed Council) noted that there is a lot of momentum behind the Morey Creek project. Al noted that this includes Executive Ladenburg, and Council-members Muri and Gelman. Bob noted that the Morey project has match equivalent to four times the request. Tom K. mentioned the section of the strategy that addresses not raising one project above another in a different benefit to salmon category. Scott noted that we also voted earlier in the year to allocate up to 10% to WRIA 12 and that this should trump the strategy. **The CAC approved funding of the top four projects as shown in the attached list.** The other three projects will remain on the list, in the event that we issues are raised with the top four projects by the Science Review Panel.

Project Name	Applicant	Project Cost	SRFB Request	Match
Boise Creek Design	Puyallup Tribal Fisheries	\$120,000	\$95,000	\$25,000
TransCanada Feasibility and Design	King County DNRP	\$200,000	\$150,000	\$50,000
South Prairie/Silver Springs Restoration	Pierce County SWM	\$380,800	\$300,000	\$80,800
Morey Creek Fish Passage	Pierce County SWM	\$422,640	\$79,463	\$343,177
Total (funded)		\$1,123,440	\$624,463	\$498,977
Middle Puyallup River Land Acquisition	Cascade Land Conservancy	\$400,000	\$300,000	\$100,000
Calistoga Setback Levee – Design	City of Orting	\$175,000	\$148,750	\$26,250
Leach Creek Corridor Acquisition	City of University Place	\$135,200	\$50,250	\$84,950
Total (unfunded)		\$710,200	\$499,000	\$211,200

Grand Total		\$1,833,640	\$1,123,463	\$710,177
--------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------	------------------

4. Next Steps in 2008 SRFB Funding Process

Upcoming dates for completing the 2008 SRFB process include:

August 29 – Final Project List due to Puget Sound Partnership

September 8 – Final Applications submitted in PRISM

October – SRFB Science Review Panel review of projects

December 12 – Final SRFB Funding Decision

5. Brief Updates

Bob noted that one of the WDFW watershed stewards has resigned his position, and due to the state hiring freeze, he will not be able to hire a replacement. This will partly limit Bob's time at watershed council meetings for the foreseeable future. Al noted that Kennedy Creek is holding an event this Sat., Aug. 16 at 3:00 pm.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:40pm

Next meeting will be September 4, 4-6pm, at the Pierce County TMOB.