

Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
MEETING SUMMARY
July 21, 2010
Project Tour 5:00-7:00 pm
Meeting 7:00-9:00 pm
Preston Community Center, Preston

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Elizabeth Walker	City of Duvall Councilmember, Forum Chair
Charles Peterson	City of Snoqualmie Councilmember, Forum Vice-Chair
Kathy Lambert	King County Councilmember
Chris Garcia	City of North Bend Councilmember
Cindy Spiry	Snoqualmie Tribe
Bill Knutsen	Citizen/King Conservation District (KCD) Representative

PROJECT TOUR

The Forum held the annual Snoqualmie Watershed project tour in the Preston-Fall City area. 27 participants took part in the tour which featured the following three projects:

1. *Raging River Preston Reach Restoration Project:* Dan Eastman (King County Ecologist) led a tour of this completed levee removal project just north of Preston. In 2006, King County removed 1,200 feet of levee along the Raging River on county-owned property. Boulders were placed at the fringe of the floodplain to protect the toe of Preston-Fall City Road. The project provides the river access to resume natural processes on 7 acres of floodplain restoring salmon habitat for juvenile salmon. Project monitoring efforts show that the project has increased edge habitat by 2,000 feet, increased the channel width by 40 feet, doubled the amount of pool habitat and created 14 new log jams. Control of invasive weeds along with natural recruitment of native plants has improved riparian vegetation on site.
2. *Fall City Park Habitat Restoration Project:* Cindy Spiry (Snoqualmie Tribe's Director of Environment and Natural Resource Dept) led a tour of the tribe's Fall City Park Habitat Restoration project. In 2009, the Snoqualmie Tribe received \$90,000 from the Puget Sound Partnership and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for phase 1 of the Fall City Park Restoration Project, restoring 5.2 acres of riparian habitat along the Snoqualmie River. In 2010, the Tribe was approved for an additional \$250,000 from the same funding source to complete phase 2 including 9 more acres of riparian habitat restoration. The project includes removal of invasive blackberry, injection of knotweed, and replanting of native plants in the riparian area. The Tribe has worked closely with King County Parks, the Fall City Parks District and the local community to design and implement the project. Tribal crews and local volunteers have performed most of the work on the site. A \$30,000 KCD grant awarded in 2010 provides critical monitoring and maintenance funding for the project.
3. *Stewardship in Action: Raging River Project:* Jen Harrison-Cox (Partnership for Rural King County - PRKC) described the history of PRKC – a local resident-based nonprofit that uses landowner-to-landowner outreach to promote conservation on rural properties. Jennifer described PRKC's current partnership with King County and other conservation groups on

the Stewardship in Action (SiA) project – an EPA-funded project that seeks to link landowners in the Raging and Patterson sub-basins to appropriate technical and conservation services according to their interests and needs. Local PRKC volunteers residing in the vicinity have been making initial landowner contacts for the SiA partnership, mostly by mailing postcards and by walking door-to-door in local neighborhoods. The Raging River Project (which extends on both sides of the bridge site we visited on the tour) is just one spin-off project from SiA. Three private landowners representing 8 parcels (9.59 acres) have agreed to participate in a demonstration project to show other landowners how to restore their property to a healthy ecological state. The private parcels spanning over 3,400 feet of continuous private river frontage will be restored, along with 2,000 feet of the adjacent King County owned Raging River Natural Area. The project will include knotweed and English Ivy removal, replanting native riparian plants and public education along the Treehouse Point trails and the Preston-Snoqualmie Trail.

MEETING PROCEEDINGS

Introductions and Minutes

The Forum approved the May 26, 2010 meeting summary.

Updates and Announcements

Yvette Lizée-Smith (Watershed Coordinator) gave the following announcements:

- *August 5 Snohomish Forum Meeting:* The Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum will be holding its August 5th meeting in Carnation. The meeting will be followed by a potluck picnic in Tolt MacDonald Park and a tour of the Lower Tolt Floodplain Reconnection project. The Snoqualmie Watershed Forum members, local governments and project partners are invited to join the meeting, picnic and/or tour, as their time allows.
- *Status of the Snoqualmie Forum ILA Amendment:* In June 2010 Forum staff sent a final version of the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum ILA Amendment for ratification by member governments. So far, the ILA amendment has been approved by 5 member governments – North Bend, Snoqualmie, Carnation, Duvall and the Snoqualmie Tribe. The only pending approval is King County. If all goes per schedule, King County Council should decide on the ILA Amendment before they break for summer.
- *King County Sales Tax Ballot Measure:* Over the past 2 months, King County Council has considered several alternatives to address its public safety budget shortfall. Some of the options would have resulted in decreases to the Flood District Levy, and the Parks Levy, among other funds. On July 19 King County Council passed one of the sales tax proposals for inclusion on the November ballot (ordinance 2010-0367). The selected option includes a 0.2% increase in sales tax for 3 years, with no reduction to property tax – and thus does not impact Flood District or Parks Levy funding. Forty percent of the tax proceeds would be distributed to cities. Yvette provided a news release with further information.

- *Status of 2010 KCD Regular Grant Awards:* At its May 26 meeting the Forum recommended that 7 projects be forwarded to the KCD Board for final grant decision. The KCD Board has since approved grant awards for these 7 projects. The Forum also tentatively approved partial funding for 3 additional projects. The Forum agreed to hold these grants until its 2011 KCD grant amount was confirmed. Perry will be working with the Project Review Committee and the 3 project sponsors to adjust their grant requests over the next month. We anticipate submitting these three grants to KCD Board in September.

Forum Comments

Following Yvette's updates, Councilmember Lambert (King County Council) provided additional information on the status of the King County budget.

- The proposed 0.2% sales tax increase (put on the November ballot) will not cover the County's entire budget shortfall. If this ballot measure is approved, King County will still have about a \$9 million shortfall in 2011 and will still need to make cuts.
- In addition, King County has encountered a new issue this year that will further impede funding for certain programs. Under federal law, property taxes cannot exceed \$10 per \$1,000 assessed value. Once we deduct the portion going to State and Federal governments, the aggregate allowance for local levies imposed by counties, cities and most special districts [as set in State law] is \$5.90 per \$1,000 assessed value. This year King County is bumping up against this limit in some of its taxing districts due to the drop in assessed values. The details are complex, but the end message is that some of the junior taxing authorities (like the Flood Control District) are at risk of losing some or all of their funding. King County is considering different options for dealing with the levy suppression and looking at ways to maintain the Flood District funding. Ultimately, however, it will result in cuts to certain taxing authorities. We will not know the level of impact on revenues and programs until November 2010 when assessed values are determined.

Referring back to the King County sales tax proposal mentioned above, Councilmember Peterson (City of Snoqualmie) noted that, according to the news release, cities must spend 1/3 of their portion of the tax proceeds on public safety. He asked if there were any use restrictions on the remaining 2/3 of city proceeds. Councilmember Lambert confirmed that there were not.

Harvest Management Strategy

Janne introduced Kit Rawson, the Conservation Science Director for the Tulalip Tribes' Treaty Rights Office. Kit was invited to give an overview on the coordination of Chinook harvest, hatchery and habitat recovery in the Snohomish Basin – the larger river basin which the Snoqualmie Watershed is part of [and which also includes the Skykomish and Snohomish Rivers]. Below are some key points from his presentation.

- Puget Sound Chinook salmon were listed as threatened in 1999. The Sound has 22 Chinook populations spread across 14 watersheds or river basins. These 14 watersheds have developed a shared Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan aimed at recovering all 22 stocks. The plan was adopted by the federal government in 2007.

- Kit presented a chart showing Chinook population trends from 1952-2000 in the Skagit River – one of the watersheds with the longest history of data collection. The graph demonstrates the drop in Chinook populations over time and is representative of similar trends in other Puget Sound basins. Snoqualmie Chinook populations for example are estimated to be about 10% of their historic potential abundance.
- Chinook decline can be attributed to multiple causes including loss of habitat, overharvest, and detrimental genetic and ecological interactions with hatchery fish. To recover salmon we need to undertake corrective actions on all these fronts. We must also coordinate across harvest management, hatchery management, habitat protection and habitat restoration activities. This coordination across h's is termed "H-integration". Janne and Kit serve on the Snohomish Basin (WRIA7) Technical Committee – a committee of technical experts who work on these different "h" fronts, including fisheries co-managers (Tulalip Tribes and WDFW) and project implementers. One of the Technical Committee's roles is to coordinate H-integration within our basin.

Harvest Management

- Kit explained some of the ways harvest is being managed to support recovery. For example:
 - WDFW and the tribes (fishery co-managers) coordinate fisheries at multiple levels, including locally within Puget Sound and across the west coast of USA and Canada through the Pacific Salmon Treaty. Under the Pacific Salmon Treaty we have negotiated significant decreases in harvest particularly in Canada and Alaska.
 - Chinook salmon migrate for long distances and mix with other Chinook stocks along the way. As a result, a certain number of our Snohomish Basin fish are incidentally caught in each of the fisheries they cross (e.g. in the Alaska fishery, British Columbia fishery, Puget Sound ocean troll, Puget Sound sport fishery, Treaty ocean troll, etc). Prior to each season, the fishery co-managers use a model to estimate the number of adult Chinook from their basin that will be intercepted (i.e. caught) in different fisheries along their migration path. They also set an escapement target – a target for the number of adult fish that need to return to their basin to spawn. Using this information, they then gather with co-managers from other basins and create fishery plans for the season. The fishery plans not only take into account our stocks and escapement targets, but also the escapement targets for the most "at risk" stocks in our region. In short, the harvest targets are set to ensure enough fish get back to spawn not only in our basin, but also in those basins where Chinook population numbers might be even lower. *[Post meeting addition from Yvette – Note that the latter point is important to keep in mind. In essence, it means that even if we recover our own Snohomish/Snoqualmie Chinook populations, we may not be able to increase harvest if other stocks in Puget Sound are at risk (except perhaps to a small level through a very targeted "terminal fishery" in the river itself) due to the potential of incidentally catching at-risk fish in more general fisheries. From a harvest perspective, this is why the Puget Sound watersheds must work together to ensure all populations, and particularly those most at risk, are recovered.]*
 - In case of the Snohomish Chinook stocks, the 2010 pre-season fishery plan estimates that 20% of returning natural origin adults will be harvested along their migration (through all

fisheries they cross). The plan has an escapement target of roughly 80%, which means their target is for 80% of returning natural origin Chinook to return to spawn.

- The high escapement target (80%) noted above is indicative of the lengths that fishery co-managers have taken to reduce harvest and to ensure more natural fish return to spawn. Kit presented slides showing the large decrease in Snohomish Chinook salmon exploitation rates (aka harvest) since the ESA listing of Chinook in 1999. For example, in the 1970-80s, about 80% of Snohomish Basin Chinook were harvested, and only about 20% made it back to the Snohomish Basin to spawn. In the early 1990s (before the ESA listing of Chinook), harvest rates decreased to 50-60%, but were still significantly higher than current levels. The big reductions in harvest, to about 20%, occurred following the Chinook listing in 1999.
- Kit did not have time to discuss hatchery management in detail, but he noted that hatcheries allow us to maintain some level of harvest while reducing impacts on natural origin fish. For example, the Tulalip Tribe fishery has adjusted its harvest by decreasing its area and timing – to target hatchery fish in particular – thus reducing the likelihood that natural origin fish will be intercepted. This is one kind of “selective fishery.” Tulalip Tribes now concentrate their Chinook fishery near Tulalip Bay (rather than further out in the Sound) and time it seasonally to ensure most of the fish they catch are hatchery fish. Hatchery fish are easily recognized because the adipose fin is removed. Sports fisheries often use a selective fishery approach too by requiring that wild Chinook (those with adipose fins intact) be put back in the water.

Habitat Protection and Restoration

- Kit touched on the relationship between harvest management and habitat actions. After harvest levels were significantly decreased in the late 1990s, the fishery co-managers saw an immediate spike in the abundance of Snohomish Chinook, followed by several more years of progressively rising numbers. After a few years of rising numbers, however, the population seemed to peak and then began to slowly go down – despite the fact that the number of returning spawners remained constant or increased over these years.
- The reasons for the recent downturn in Chinook numbers – despite constant spawner numbers – are complex and hard to pinpoint. But, some of the cause can be attributed to the continued loss of habitat even following the ESA listing. Put simply, if the number of adult spawners getting back into rivers have remained constant, it means each of these spawners is producing less surviving fish (i.e. has lower productivity). While it’s possible there may be increased ocean mortality. It’s also likely that less juvenile fish are surviving to make it out to the ocean. Kit presented a few slides showing some of habitat trends in our basin that may be contributing to some of this downturn. For example:
 - Since the 19th century degradation and blockage of habitat in the Snohomish Basin estuary has decreased Chinook rearing capacity there by nearly 70%.
 - Over time, peak flows have progressively increased in some rivers leading to higher flood levels, faster flows and reduced egg survival (as eggs are uncovered and washed away).
 - Even after the Chinook listing in 1999, the amount of mature forest cover in our basin has continued to decrease (based on land cover data for Snohomish County, at least).

- At the same time, the amount of impervious surface has continued to increase in our basin. In fact, it has increased at a faster rate than human population growth in this basin.
- Kit felt that the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum and our implementation partners are doing the right things to improve habitat conditions in our watershed including: targeting the right habitat projects and getting them done; working to protect intact habitat; and working with landowners to increase stewardship and protect forest cover on private lands.
- In closing, Kit encouraged Snoqualmie Watershed Forum to continue what it is doing. He also highlighted one of the challenges ahead for our watershed and the region – responding to future growth in our watersheds in ways that minimize habitat impacts, and reversing the continued trends in habitat loss.

WRIA9 Analysis on Salmon Recovery Funding Mechanisms

The Forum welcomed three representatives from the Green/Duwamish Ecosystem Recovery Forum (WRIA9) to speak on WRIA9’s analysis of alternative funding mechanisms for salmon recovery. The representatives were:

- Mayor Joan McGilton of Burien – Chair of the WRIA9 Management Committee
- Councilmember Marlla Mhoon of Covington – Co-chair of the WRIA9 Forum
- Doug Osterman – WRIA9 Watershed Coordinator

Mayor McGilton and Councilmember Mhoon reviewed the reasons behind WRIA9’s investigation of alternative funding mechanisms and the process they worked through. Below are some of key points from their presentation:

- The WRIA9 Salmon Recovery Plan was completed in 2005. Like other basin plans [including our Snohomish Basin Salmon Conservation Plan] it identified a suite of priority projects and actions to help recover salmon over the next 10 years. It was intended to be the first 10-year recovery plan of what would be a longer term effort to recover salmon. The estimated budget to complete all projects in WRIA9’s 10-year plan was about \$300 million.
- WRIA9 is now entering year 5 of its 10-year plan. Unfortunately, implementation has been significantly slower than needed – largely due to a lack of funding. In fact, since the plan was adopted, some of the traditional grant sources for salmon recovery projects (such as the Salmon Recovery Funding Board aka SRFB grants) have significantly decreased -- further slowing their ability to implement projects. Like other basins, WRIA9 finds itself in a situation where project sponsors take years to cobble together enough grants to implement their projects. Currently WRIA9 may obtain about \$3 million for projects annually (primarily from KCD and SRFB), but this can vary considerably and is highly unpredictable. WRIA9 has found it difficult to prepare a bona fide capital improvement program with such uncertainty in funding. Some years, grants expire before the other patchwork of funding can be obtained, literally setting implementation backwards. Even if \$3 million is available, this amount represents about 10% of the funds they really need to implement their projects on the original 10-year schedule. *[Post meeting addition from Yvette – Note that at this rate of funding it would take WRIA9 100 years to implement their original 10-year plan. WRIA7 is in a similar situation, as are other basins in Puget Sound. We are all far behind our 10-year implementation schedules.]*

- In light of these challenges, WRIA9 initiated a contract with Earth Economics (funded with a KCD grant) to investigate different types of funding mechanisms that WRIA9 might set in place to fund their salmon recovery projects. Earth Economics was chosen because of the extensive valuation of ecosystem goods and services that they had previously prepared for WRIA 9, including Chapter 6 of the WRIA 9 recovery plan. Earth Economics initially considered 23 types of mechanisms. These were evaluated against criteria identified by the WRIA9 Forum such as: feasibility, amount of funding generated, equity and fairness for rate payers, administration cost, threats to other funding sources (just to give some examples).
- The initial list of funding mechanisms was condensed to 8 options. These, in turn, were further evaluated and whittled down to 3 options. The final 3 options now being considered by WRIA9 are: 1) increasing the Flood Control District levy; 2) implementing a watershed assessment or fee; or 3) creating a watershed investment district.
- WRIA9's analysis included an examination of the ecosystem services provided by restoration projects. Not only do such projects improve habitat and fish populations (which result in economic benefits), but they also provide other services that are routinely overlooked in traditional cost-benefit analyses – such as recreational value, water quality improvements, flood reduction benefits, just to give a few examples.

Doug Osterman gave a quick overview of the 3 funding mechanisms being considered by WRIA9.

- *Increase Flood District Levy:* This proposal would add 1 cent to flood district levy – thus increasing it from 10 to 11 cents per \$1000 assessed value. The extra penny would be dedicated to watershed activities. Doug added that this proposal was deemed a viable short-term option for increasing salmon recovery funding when initial analysis was done last winter. Since then, however, a new property tax suppression issue has arisen (as mentioned by Councilmember Lambert at the opening of the meeting). Increasing the flood district levy is likely not a viable option in the near term due to the levy suppression issue – as it already puts Flood District revenues at risk. However, it could be revisited in the future, once the property tax suppression is addressed. A big advantage of this proposal is that it builds on an existing funding mechanism and is consistent with current legislative authorities. It would be intended to function mostly as a near-term “stop gap” measure while other more long-term funding mechanisms are advanced that raise funds at the levels needed to implement the recovery plans over 10 years. [NOTE - See the Meeting Announcements for more info on the property tax suppression issue].
- *Per Parcel Assessment or Property Tax Levy:* This proposal would involve establishing a property tax levy or watershed assessment -- similar to the assessments collected for conservation districts. The legislation for establishing such mechanisms are already in place, though extra legislation might be required if it was set up along watershed lines (if that was desired). This funding mechanism has a greater potential to be aligned to the actions and funding needs that are required to implement the recovery plans.
- *Watershed Investment District* – A final, longer-term option would be to establish a Watershed Investment District which could either be funded through the per parcel assessment or property tax options mentioned above, or alternatively could be empowered as its own taxing authority. The latter taxing authority option would provide the highest level of

funding but would also require state legislative action. It would therefore take at least several years to establish. This funding mechanism offers the greatest flexibility in implementing integrated watershed restoration and protection programs, including creating a governance structure that is watershed-based. For example the watershed forums could be authorized as taxing districts and governing bodies.

In closing, Mayor McGilton invited Snoqualmie Forum comments on the funding mechanisms presented. She explained that WRIA9 is currently meeting with different cities, watersheds and governments in King County (as well as Puget Sound Partnership and some other basins in Puget Sound) to get input on these three possible funding mechanisms. WRIA9 also wishes to gauge if there is interest in initiating any of these mechanisms at a broader county, multi-watershed, or regional scale.

Snoqualmie Forum Comments

- Councilmember Charles Peterson (City of Snoqualmie) explained that the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum has had issue with the distribution of the KCD assessment and the fact that the Snoqualmie Watershed receives half the grant allocation of WRIA8 and 9. Our Forum has hoped that WRIA 8 and 9 would agree to provide at least a small increase to our portion of the WRIA grant funds. He noted that while the Snoqualmie Watershed has a low population, it still encompasses over 40% of the King County land area and also serves as the playground for many county residents. Charles highlighted the need to resolve some of the unresolved issues around the distribution of the current assessment funds as a first step. He was also concerned that a new assessment might spark the same volatile environment encountered during the KCD assessment renewal processes.
- Councilmember Elizabeth Walker (Duvall) seconded the desire to avoid the volatility of the last KCD assessment process. She questioned whether an assessment would be an appropriate and stable mechanism for salmon funding given the KCD assessment seems repeatedly at risk whenever it goes up for renewal. She invited Bill Knutsen (KCD Chair) to share his thoughts on this question.
- Bill Knutsen recommended that if a levy or assessment was pursued for salmon recovery, it be approved for a longer term (such as 10 to 15 years) to give it more stability.
- Councilmember Kathy Lambert (King County) recounted the difficulty of keeping assessments or levies focused on their initial purposes. Once a funding source is set in place many interests will turn to it for funding and may seek to expand its use to other needs. As an example, she explained how the Flood District levy was initially intended to fund a 10-year capital implementation plan. Over time however, it has extended to a 12-year, 14-year, and possibly now an 18-year capital implementation plan as new needs are identified or put forward by different interests (including sometimes needs that are quite different than the original intent). With each addition, the original set of projects gets shuffled. The Snoqualmie Watershed has seen our flood hazard projects pushed further and further down the capital project schedule as new needs are added. Councilmember Lambert encouraged WRIA9 to help support the Snoqualmie Watershed on some of these issues. The challenge for our watershed is we do not have a large population and thus we do not have a strong voice or tax base. We rely on the good will of other cities and King County watersheds to support us on some issues.

- Councilmember Chris Garcia (North Bend) questioned whether this was the appropriate time to introduce a new taxing mechanism given the current economy. He suggested delaying for several years.
- Yvette noted that these funding mechanisms would likely take several years to set in place, which is why WRIA9 is continuing to work on them even under the current economic climate. She added that an alternate funding source might be a good solution. It is acknowledged that KCD has had issue with some of the salmon recovery actions and large capital projects they have had to fund through the WRIA grant allocations. Having a more dedicated funding source for salmon recovery might allow the KCD assessment to be shifted to more stewardship-related activities and small projects that align with the district's interests. Yvette also encouraged the Forum to keep the door open on this funding mechanism issue. If WRIA8 and 9 move forward on a funding mechanism and the Snoqualmie Watershed opts out, our watershed risks being an even greater "have not". She added that the watershed district option poses particular challenges for the Snoqualmie Watershed if funding is collected and spent along basin lines. Given the Snoqualmie Watershed has a low population and tax base, this type of mechanism would not generate sufficient revenue for us unless other geographic lines were used, or the watershed was expanded to include the full Snohomish Basin. However, setting up a watershed district that transects two counties and includes cities of Snohomish County will take a lot more work.

2011 Snoqualmie Forum ILA Budget / Grant

Yvette presented on the Forum's 2011 ILA budget and draft grant submission to KCD.

Snoqualmie Watershed Forum 2011 Budget

- Yvette explained that traditionally the Snoqualmie Forum approves its next annual ILA budget and cost-share in July of each year. However, this year King County has requested that the Forum delay its 2011 budget approval until its September 15 meeting. By then King County will be in a better position to confirm its contribution. In addition, the Forum should know whether the KCD Board has approved its project support grant submission. In short, September would be a more appropriate time to finalize budget decisions on all counts. On that note, Yvette advised that she would not present on budget at this meeting, but will plan to address this topic in September. In the meantime, Yvette provided estimated cost-share fees for 2011, based on the May 26, 2010 Forum recommendation that cost-shares be kept at 2010 levels.

Snoqualmie Forum Grant Submission to KCD

- Traditionally, the Snoqualmie Forum has submitted a grant request to KCD for some of its project support and capacity building activities. If successful this grant has been used to offset the cities' cost-shares for the following year. Yvette reviewed the draft grant submission for 2011. It included two elements of the Forum's work program – Perry's project support work, and a new initiative aimed at revisiting KCD-funded projects to assess their success, make corrective actions and inform future project decisions and design.
- Councilmember Lambert noted that the draft application did not make it clear that the deliverables and actions funded through the grant were intended to support project partners in advancing capital projects through stages of planning, feasibility, design, and

implementation, and that Forum staff would not be implementing the capital project themselves under the grant. She recommended adding extra language to clarify that the actual on-the-ground work and project construction would be done by partners.

- **DECISION:** The Forum authorized staff to submit the forum's 2011 grant application to KCD once they had integrated Councilmember Lambert's suggested changes.

Public Comment

- Jessica Saavedra (KCD Grants Program Coordinator) mentioned that the Forum grant submission would require extra work on the part of KCD staff to support the project quality assessment and site visit piece. Bill Knutsen added that KCD currently does some post-project closeout visits itself. Yvette clarified that the Forum proposal would seek to compliment, and not duplicate, the closeout work. Before submitting the application, Forum staff will follow up with KCD staff to provide extra clarification and adjust the application content (if needed) to ensure it is non-duplicative and mutually beneficial.
- Sarah Ogier (Manager – King County Regional Partnerships Unit) encouraged Forum members to review the Watershed Investment District summary included in the meeting handouts, if they had not had a chance to do so. She noted that this funding mechanism could be tailored in many ways and that there might be opportunity for the Forum to guide development of a mechanism that bases allocations on ecological parameters rather than on population, parcel or tax base. Councilmember Walker said that it would be useful to have practical examples of watershed investment district models that have been used elsewhere.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be September 15, 2010 from 7-9 pm at the Carnation City Hall.