

WRIA 9 Implementation Technical Committee
Meeting Summary – March 21st, 2018 10:00-11:30am
Tukwila Community Center, Meeting Room A

Attendees: Kerry Bauman, King County; Katie Beaver, King County; Karen Bergeron, King County; David Casey, City of Maple Valley; Sophie Chiang, King County; Jeanette Dorner, Midsound Fisheries; Larry Fisher, WDFW; Chris Gregersen, King County; Matt Goehring, WRIA 9; Matt Knox, City of Kent; Kathy Minsch, City of Seattle; Amber Moore, PSP; Joan Nolan, Ecology; Tyler Patterson, City of Tacoma; Jen Rice, King County; Kaitlin Whitlock, USACE

Plan Update: Habitat Goals – Matt Goehring

As a committee, we have OK'd the middle Green monitoring targets/metrics. Our task now is to revisit the lower Green numbers before we finalize our goals for the habitat plan update. First, the "off-channel" habitat metric we've developed is designed to measure off channel habitat (habitats outside of bankfull width). Habitats outside of bankfull width include abandoned/high flow side channels, floodplain tributary channels (Perennial and intermittent), backwater, floodplain wetlands, and other 100 year floodplains (high and low). For in-channel habitats, we've included low flow side channels (like riverview), banks (armored/unarmored), bars, pools, and benches. These habitats are located within the river's bankfull width, and we've changed them so that things like benches are not included as "off-channel" habitat. Kerry mentioned that in-channel low velocity habitats within the lower green are not well represented in this table. Kollin clarified that the purpose of this exercise is to create a simple and clear way to measure and track progress in a way that will be repeatable in the future. There is currently not a good repeatable way to measure mainstem bank condition/treatment. There are many ways that we can improve a bank, but they aren't necessarily natural or ideal. Kerry will look at possibly improving the presented methodology. We will revisit this in the next meeting.

Matt also presented the implementation targets. These are based off the categories that were just mentioned, with estimated values for projects coming up in the next 10 years to help us calculate a potential target value for the 10 year target. To set implementation targets, these numbers were added up, then increased by 10% to give us a reasonable but optimistic goal. This will be the implementation target for 2028.

CWM Funding – Monitoring Priorities- Karen Bergeron

Karen presented project funding package and is seeking to have the ITC approve the CWM funding amount before it goes to the forum for their approval. The total CWM allocation for 2018 is \$1,746,431, out of that we have \$1.15M available for high priority projects. We have \$296k for SRFB funding, and PSAR of \$1.17M for a total of about \$2.6M. CWM funding will be available in August 2018, and SRFB and PSAR won't be available until 2019. We have been following the 40, 30, 30 split (40% for transition zone, 30% rearing, 30% spawning habitat), but as we go forward with the habitat plan we will be examining if this the best way to do this.

Karen presented the breakdown for the CWM funds. It was suggested that we see a list for revegetation for the forum. Karen clarified that they will have this, right now it's just a placeholder while the projects

are compiled. Also, the revegetation funding is separate from the 250,000 CWM funding that is generally set aside for small projects which include revegetation. Under the WRIA 9 Capital projects implementation, this category covers Karen's salary, and she's also proposing funding for a vet for hire to help with the plan implementation. The communications and Outreach for Habitat Plan Update was from savings from Maureen Judge leaving early.

Next, Karen discussed with the ITC the ideas for CWM monitoring funding which is decided by the ITC. Currently, the following are the ideas on the table for the \$120k allocated:

- Smolt trap, WDFW \$40,000 (Kerry- is there a good place to get this data up to date? Kollin- during the HHD instream flow conference call, Pete gives preliminary numbers every couple of weeks).
- Another round of otolith analysis (Year 4): \$50,000 for 100 fish. 1st year, WDFW funded, we funded last 2 years. Do we want a 4th year to capture the full generation?
- Pre- and post project fish usage monitoring for upcoming projects including Riverton Creek and Duwamish Gardens - \$20,000. Kollin-consider bumping this up to include Leber as it's more of an experimental project design.
- Upper Green – Assessments needed to create protection and restoration strategy (Program U-1) \$45,000. This includes subprojects such as (get from presentation)
- Vashon-Maury Forage fish studies. Volunteer forage fish spawner surveys throughout Vashon-Maury Island: \$15,000
- One additional suggestion Kollin had- sample 3 to 4 restoration projects (e.g. Cecil Moses, Duwamish Gardens, North Winds Weir) in Duwamish to look at potential for sediment recontamination - \$30,000

After some discussion, the group came up with the follow three potential funding options:

- 1) Keep the otolith analysis and have 30k remaining for sediment or fish monitoring. A tentative vote gave preference to fish sampling over sediment sampling.
- 2) Don't continue otolith analysis and have 30k for fish, 30 k for sediment, and 15 for forage fish.
- 3) Fund only 30k for otolith collection, and hold off on the samples until a later date, then have 30k for fish, 30k for sediment.

The group voted for option number two, pending the results of year 3 of the otolith study. They decided the fish monitoring should take priority over sediment sampling should the results come back drastically different from the past two years.

Kollin also gave a couple of quick updates regarding the 2016 Green river otolith data. They believe that hatchery fish, or Soos creek itself, has a signature that can be differentiated from natural origin fish. About 25 percent of the unmarked "wild"/natural origin adults evaluated appear to be of hatchery origin. Average size at estuary entry for natural fish is 79mm, while hatchery fish average is 94mm.

March 27th Workshop Update- Matt Goehring

Currently about 70 people signed up, breakout groups for subwatersheds. Final agenda has not been sent out yet. Currently working on graphics for breakout groups.