



## King County

Water & Land Resources Division  
Department of Natural Resources & Parks  
King Street Center  
201 S. Jackson St., Ste. 600  
Seattle, WA 98104-3855  
(206) 477-4654 Office | (206) 296-0192 Fax

## MEETING NOTES

### CEDAR RIVER COUNCIL

February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM  
Riverbend Mobile Home Park Club House  
17410 SE Renton/Maple Valley Rd. #25, Renton, WA 98058

*Meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.*

---

#### **1st Public Comment Period**

There was no public comment.

#### **Clark Springs Water Supply Habitat Conservation Measures – Mike Mactutis & colleagues, City of Kent Public Works**

Mike Mactutis introduced a presentation on the Clark Springs Water Supply System, which comprises up to 60% of the city of Kent's water supply. 15 years ago, the city started working with the Federal Fisheries Service to ensure the city's water supply operation is compliant with the Endangered Species Act. In 2011, the city underwent an Environmental Impact Statement process, which required a conservation plan. One aspect the habitat conservation plan included was implementation of "Habitat Conservation Measures (HCM)."

He noted the water supply's connection to the Cedar River via Rock Creek, a tributary to the Cedar, and whose basin the Clark Springs system originates from. He described several focuses of the HCMs currently being worked on, which have varying implementation timelines. He also noted several HCMs were initiated prior to the completion of the full conservation plan. Some of these include: an ongoing city water conservation program; a habitat conservation fund utilized along parts of Rock Creek; and a culvert along the creek under Summit-Landsburg Road scheduled for completion in 2020, among others.

A colleague of Mr. Mactutis described specifics of the conservation plan, such as which main species were being focused on: chinook salmon, bull trout, and steelhead. He said three HCMs will be implemented this summer, all at the mouth of Rock Creek. He described "HCM 2," whose main goal is to provide easier means for larger fish such as chinook to transition from the small, steep mouth of the creek to the Cedar River mainstem for spawning. Searching of the project site led to discovery of an old channel and several springs, and a proposal of reconnecting these to provide substantial juvenile rearing refuge and habitat for perhaps thousands of fish. The Clark Springs Water Facility also needs enhancement. One enhancement would be adding large wood pieces in the channel, such as engineered log jams, to help fish habitat. Another colleague overviewed ongoing and future projects in the Rock Creek watershed, describing several other HCMs being undertaken by the city.

Nathan Brown solicited questions for the presenters. Questions covered topics such as: low summer flow in Rock Creek due to activities outside the Clark Springs watershed; discussions with state Department of Ecology on Landsburg mine concerns; why grading is so steep at the mouth of Rock Creek; the difference between water HCMs and what water purveyors are required to do by other regulators (none, it's largely a city commitment to certain standards); who installed the original culvert to be replaced under Summit-Landsburg Road (unknown); and how sensitive flows in Rock Creek are to well use (minimally).

#### **Riverbend Levee Setback/Floodplain Restoration Project: CRC Letter Discussion/Action – Frank Urabeck**

Frank Urabeck presented for consideration a draft letter to King County from the CRC about the County's Riverbend project. The letter came as a result of the project discussion from January's CRC meeting, which raised concerns about specific goals of the project and what the CRC's input should be. Desired goals in the letter include flood damage reduction as well as improving opportunities for chinook/sockeye salmon spawning and public access for the area. Mr. Urabeck stressed this letter would be a way to formally document the CRC's position and desired objectives for the project.



## King County

Tom Beavers of KC DNRP observed the original language for the project includes habitat support for other area fish species in addition to sockeye and chinook. Mr. Urabeck agreed to add language addressing this, but said he did not want language addressing sockeye and chinook to be lost. He made a motion to adopt the letter, adding Mr. Beavers' suggestion, as an expression to the County of the CRC's wishes for this project.

Janne Kaje of KC DNRP stated it is important to recognize this project is multi-objective in nature, and that it is also valuable for the County to hear feedback from local citizens who understand the river. He said this letter is an opportunity to address needs on both sides, and might be better-received if framed that way. Mr. Urabeck agreed to add a sentence more explicitly stating that intent. Max Prinsen asked about retaining Cavanaugh Pond's suitability for sockeye spawning. Mr. Beavers suggested the proper term would be to "enhance" said suitability. Mr. Urabeck replied he wanted to keep the term "retain" in addition to "enhance." Mr. Beavers then commented on public use, that it is already a stated goal in the funding documents for the project; Mr. Urabeck replied he still wanted it clearly stated as an objective in the letter.

Mr. Brown restated the motion to approve the letter with these amendments: a statement acknowledging this project is multi-objective in nature, a list item for support for habitat for all area native fish species, and Jeff Neuner's addition that project objectives should not be restricted by funding sources. Mr. Brown noted the exact language in these amendments is yet to be finalized. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

### **CRC Discussion Items**

- **CRC 2017 Work Plan & Schedule:** Mr. Brown directed CRC members to review a list of proposed 2017 priorities and each identify their top three for the CRC to address this year, at which point the council divided into groups and discussed their choices to come to a consensus on three priorities. These choices were then ranked in order of priority by a full council vote. The top-voted priority was to collaborate and have more input with WRIA 8 on their Salmon Recovery Plan update.
- **WRIA 8 CRC Representative:** Charles Ruthford volunteered to succeed Mr. Urabeck as WRIA 8's representative on the CRC. Mr. Urabeck motioned to accept Mr. Ruthford's nomination; the motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
- **"Liberating Structures" Meeting Format Feedback:** Mr. Brown asked for input on the meeting format used at the January meeting. Mr. Beavers observed that of those present tonight who attended January's meeting, less than half understood the County's "preferred alternative" option for the Riverbend project. He asked what could have been done to make it better understood. One commenter said entertaining audience questions arising from the discussion would have been more useful to her. Another person suggested, instead of a chronological presentation, giving a brief "preview" of the presentation to express important thoughts on the project, and ensure all present were on the same page, prior to questions. Mr. Prinsen said his discussion with other CRC members reached a similar conclusion. One question posed whether this format had been appropriate for the Riverbend topic. Another person said they appreciated the emotion the format had brought into the discussion; Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Beavers emphasized that his and Jon Hansen's sole objective at the January meeting had been to present the County's "preferred alternative" for Riverbend to the CRC so that they understood it and would be able to provide feedback on it, and it is a real concern to him that relatively few people came out of January's meeting understanding said alternative. He concluded that he believed a traditional format of a PowerPoint presentation followed by questions would have been more informative to the audience.

### **Updates & Announcements**

- **WRIA 8: Cedar River Corridor Advisory Board:** These topics were not addressed tonight.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Public Comment Period**

There was no public comment.

---

*Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.*

### **Next Meeting**

March 28<sup>th</sup>. 2017, 7:00 – 9:00 pm, Riverbend Mobile Home Park Club House, Renton