

**WRIA 9 Implementation Technical Committee
Target Subcommittee**

July 19, 2017 – 9:00 am to 11:00 am
King Street Center, 7th Floor – North and South Wind

Attendees: Karen Bergeron, WRIA 9; Chris Gregersen, King County; Kollin Higgins, King County; Abby Hook, Hook Environmental; Josh Kahan, King County; Janne Kaje, King County; Kathy Minsch, City of Seattle; Doug Osterman, WRIA 9; Tyler Peterson, City of Tacoma

Recap

The purpose of this subcommittee is firstly, to provide some context for presenting the habitat goals document to the WRIA 9 Forum by developing key points and a format to communicate this information. Secondly, to decide how to present the goals document and at what level of detail.

From the last meeting, we sent out the habitat goals document that we had worked on for further comment. From this, we received limited comments and it seems that members are okay with the direction we are heading with the document. We discussed introducing the document to the forum in August, but the problem is that we can't give it to them in its current form.

Regarding the document itself, the group discussed how to proceed with the short term goals. They are listed as 10 year goals, but after some input from Elissa and other ITC members we should stick with 20 year targets. To avoid confusion about the 20 year targets, we should call them "2028 targets".

Context- What are we asking the forum to do and why?

We will need to re-orient the forum about how this piece fits into our overall timeline. Must remember that the necessary future conditions are from the 2005 plan, and we won't be introducing any new ones. Also, the goals document will not be used to re-do the monitoring priorities. They will, however, effect the adaptive management and potentially minor fixes that need to be made to the draft MAMP.

Abby presented a one-page document with 3 examples of adaptive management considerations that will likely need to be discussed with the forum. These examples bring to light issues that influence pieces of our goals document, such as enforcement and regulatory issues. These issues are important to bring to light to the forum, not only for explaining some rationale with our goals document, but for helping to find solutions to some of these in the future. The group discussed some examples of this, including supporting removal of single family exemptions for bulkheads, or increasing/enhancing enforcement for land use permits. Many of these issues are political decisions, but are examples of questions that might be raised by the forum that we will need to answer.

Doug suggested making a decisions document with columns and rows to help the forum see clearly the goals, the problem, and options or solutions to overcoming them. This would help them see how the goals document works and the flow of these issues. Janne also added to this that providing an explanation to the details behind some of the targets would be useful, explain why targets have changed, what this means, and what is realistic. The first 10 years of implementation of the salmon

recovery plan affected how the 2028 targets were set. In some cases, the 2015 targets were unrealistic. In order to develop 2028 targets, staff considered potential projects that could be completed.

The group agreed that this would be a good way to bundle up information for the forum. Abby discussed that for the August meeting, we would like to give them pieces and make sure we're going in the right direction. There is no pressure to make a decision – this is just information sharing. We want to provide some context and brief details to start the conversation rather than overwhelming them with everything at once. If anyone has any more ideas on types of questions or considerations to think about when presenting the goals to the forum that should be added to this decisions document, let Abby know. The group agreed that this would be a good way to present the information to the forum in August, but the way to proceed from August to November is less certain. At some point after we introduce the concepts, we will need to send out the goals document and likely follow up with forum members and jurisdictions on specific issues (e.g. Ag policies in the Middle Green, which complicate being able to implement our habitat goals). Once we have the decision document out and approved, then we can move forward by discussing in detail the issues.

The group discussed some additional questions regarding topics that the forum could bring up and ask us to answer. As part of example #3 in Abby's handout, the 20 year target may conflict the GMA, so we should be clear on this and how development could be done as not to conflict. Stormwater retrofits could be a large part when discussing development, and this could be a route to support our stormwater targets. For the impervious example, it was pointed out there's actually separate goals for forest/upland areas and impervious area, which we may need to fix in the plan. As part of example #2 in the handout, the group discussed trails as a major issue along with roads in implementing some of our goals. This brought up the point of having goals for urban areas vs. non-urban areas, as the politics of implementing goals in these areas can be vastly different. Possibly separate out differences between goals for UGA areas vs. non UGA areas. This is something that could be included in the adaptive management recommendations associated with each subbasin in the goals document. It was suggested that in the future we break these out.

Presentation – how do we present the current condition, new targets at NFC and at what level of detail?

Abby requested again that any recommendations regarding sticking points with the forum be emailed to her. Abby will make a PowerPoint with context and examples and possibly include a decisions flow chart. Presenting the issue of regulations and enforcement could be tricky, and this is something that we might want to include in the decisions document under an "implications" section.

It is important to set context and put everything on the table for the August meeting. We want to present the information as well as possible, along with compiling any potential issues. We might want to consider bringing folks like Mike Mactutis and Ron Straka or others who would likely be dealing with potential issues to introduce this conversation and decide the best way to proceed. We should also include the key points of our background information/white papers to support our overarching message with our goals document and what we need to do. The white papers contain useful information that support our goals.

It may be useful to boil down these white papers into useful bullets that can be presented with our goals, or, along with the goals presentations we also present a short version of the white papers to

provide more context to our goals and the considerations. The science summit this fall would be a good chance to do this. Abby will be putting together the decisions document and PowerPoint, which will then be sent out for input.

Next steps/Action Items:

- Recirculate edited examples (Abby)
- Develop presentation (Abby/Kollin)
- Develop draft executive summary (Abby)
- Contact Lower Green representatives (Abby with contacts from Karen)
- Brief King Co Council staff (Doug)
- Schedule follow up meeting after the Forum (Abby)