

Field Meeting Notes

DATE: April 1, 2021

LOCATION: 935211 (SR509/176th Street crossing) and 935070 (I-5 crossing)

TIME: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM

ATTENDEES:

Maki Dalzell	x
Kelsey Donahue	x
Martin Fox	x

April Magrane	x
Alex Strom	x

935211 (SR 509/176th Crossing) – UNT to Walker Creek

Downstream of the crossing (Westside of SR 509)

- The group walked to the downstream area to observe the culvert outlet, the WSDOT-owned stormwater ponds, and the channel downstream of the pond.
- April discussed the history of the WSDOT-owned stormwater pond and how Port of Seattle's runoff goes through the stormwater pond. She described the pond has an oil water separator, though the ponds were installed primarily for detention by request of a local jurisdiction.
- Martin said it would be good to separate the stream channel from the stormwater pond. April said that the source of water for the stream is primarily coming from the Port, but if this crossing becomes part of the SR 509 project, WSDOT would investigate the potential to route the channel around ponds.
- Martin asked when this stormwater pond was constructed, and April said it was built 20-30+ years ago. Martin said MITFD would have not supported this configuration if they were around to review/comment on the design.
- April explained that timing of correcting this crossing is still TBD, as it may not be a part of this project because the proposed activity at this location (striping, signage) does not alter the road prism.

Upstream of the crossing (Eastside of SR 509)

- The group moved to the area upstream of the culvert crossing. The group accessed the upstream site by walking along the Port's wall, first to the Port's standpipe source of the northern tributary, then to the source of the southern tributary (T-shaped PVC pipe), then to the inlet of the 935211 structure.
- Alex told Martin that they measured bankfull widths downstream of the confluence where north and south tributaries merge.
- Alex said that this channel appears to be driven by rainfall events based on his field observations. He has been to the upstream site a few times now and has seen more

flow coming out after rain. The channel does not seem to have much flow at the time of this visit, comparatively.

- Martin asked Alex what a likely hydraulic opening width for this crossing, and Alex said it could range 20-30 feet wide.
- Regarding the ditch running north of the inlet, April explained that the construction of the 3rd runway resulted in mass wasting to the constructed ditch, thus filling in the asphalt lined ditch with sediment that has remained in place. April pointed out that the ditch shows no sign of scour.
- Martin asked cost of correcting this barrier, and April said rough estimate would be around \$10M, +/-50% depending on additional information, such a geotechnical data and hydrology.
- Martin stated that the upstream area has substantial length and adjacent wetland features, having potential to support rearing anadromous fish. This reach should not be dismissed due to water quality concerns.
- April asked if this is a location that WSDOT should invest for betterment of fisheries habitat, or it would be better to consider alternative locations for habitat creation/ fish access.
- Regarding potentially mitigating for this site, Martin emphasized that the tribes consider any permanent loss of habitat very seriously, and off-site mitigation should not be a frequent consideration.
- April acknowledged tribal concerns and stated that this crossing is possible and WSDOT recognizes the importance of injunction compliance.
- Martin said the tribe will consider off-site mitigation concepts on a case-by-case basis, emphasizing that replacing other barriers in-lieu of this one or enhancing existing habitat would not be a preferred mitigation approach and the tribe has concern about too frequent use of off-site mitigation and the cumulative loss of potential stream production.
- For where the tribe will consider mitigation, there is a clear preference for creation or re-establishment of stream habitat (which cannot be attributed to another responsible party to do this work) that results in a net gain.
- April acknowledged that there is a habitat value at this location, since it has an open channel and forested, however mitigating for this site at another location can net 5X (or more) the habitat gain by way of new habitat, not just access to existing habitat.
- April also talked about the projects proposed in the WRIA 9 draft Salmon Recovery Plan that King County prepared. She asked how much he participated, and he said he did not participate in that planning document.

935070 (I-5 Crossing) – UNT to SF McSorley Creek

Upstream of the crossing (Eastside of I-5)

- The group walked to the area upstream of the culvert 935070, east of I-5 to observe the upstream habitat, the culvert inlet and Wetland 147.65R.
- April talked about WDFW's determination of this crossing (debris barrier) and subsequent discussion with WSDOT maintenance about challenges associated with debris removal.
- Martin asked who owns the parcel next to WSDOT ROW. April told him it is privately owned and is unsure about the reason for soil stockpiling or tree clearing.
- Alex said the channel is pretty much connecting the two wetlands (147.6L and 147.65R) on either side of I-5. He said construction of I-5 bisected a big wetland into two, and he

suspects that there wasn't a channel here historically. Alex suggested that a replaced structure at this location would serve primarily to connect the two wetlands.

- Martin said a replaced structure here would allow access to upstream rearing habitat in the wetland.
- Alex told Martin that this crossing is relatively flat, about 0.5% slope. Alex also said that they were only able to do bankfull measurements for a short stretch in the area where the wetland was excavated to install the culvert.
- Martin asked about flow rate at this stream, and Alex said it's probably less than 2 cfs (at which flood frequency?) and does not flow much, unlike the stream at SR 509/176th.
- April said that is why maintenance is not doing anything to remove debris because it is not causing any flooding issues.
- Martin suggested that fish would access this area if given the opportunity, though productivity for this small amount of stream would be minimal. Martin commented that this has less productive potential than the crossing at 509/176th, and that this site's primary value is in filtering to enhance water quality and supply to downstream areas.
- April asked if this area is where WSDOT should invest in habitat access / betterment. Martin reiterated his point regarding the tribe's concern of net habitat loss, and that any mitigation proposal should show a significant habitat gain by way of newly created or re-established streams.
- April asked if Martin would want to have another field visit to look at the 194th crossing and Barnes Creek or he prefers to do that through desktop. Martin indicated that he will not return to these sites and a desktop review is adequate.
- Martin explained that this project and associated culverts / mitigation should be discussed with the Puyallup Tribe of Indians (PTOI), and that it is appropriate for the PTOI to take lead for this project. Martin commented that the MIT would like to remain apprised of the project development, however the MIT would defer to PTOI as lead for all future project coordination.
- Martin indicated he would reach out to the PTOI to discuss further.