



Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

8/16/17 1-3:00 pm

Location: Oak Harbor Library

Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: Nathan Howard (IC Planning), John Lovie (Citizen), Paul Marczin (WDFW), Greg Goforth (IC Planning), Julius Budos (Citizen), Matt Zupich (WICD)

WebEx: Barbara Brock (citizen), Kristin Marshall (SCD)

Others: Dawn Pucci (LE Coordinator), Jennifer Riedmayer (IC DNR), Lori Clark (IC DNR), Suzanna Stoike (PSP)

1) Introductions/announcements

Dr. Craig Thomas and Austin Sell from UW interviewed SRTCC members about the types and application of scientific research in our process. This meeting occurred over lunch prior to the SRTCC meeting.

2) Updates

The meeting notes for July were approved.

ILIO – There is a joint ILIO Executive Committee and Technical Committee meeting on 8/23/17. The Ebeys Stormwater Retrofit, Kristoferson Culverts and Maylor Pt projects will be presented.

PSP – Still no capital budget. There is a special SRFB meeting being held 8/23/17 to decide on temporary funding and contract extensions for Lead Entities and Regions, as well as deciding how to proceed for the rest of the grant round.

Dawn introduced the plan update timeline to the Board of County Commissioners (BICC). The Board requested that we reach out to our respective communities to obtain feedback from the public. It was not seen as a necessity to hold special public hearings and that networking through the citizens committee would be sufficient. Dawn will have one-on-one meetings with each of the Commissioners once targets have been agreed upon by SRTCC and prior to the BICC work session meeting 9/7/17 when Dawn will ask for their support to move on to strategies and project ranking criteria.

Jim Somers has resigned his seat for the Skagit Fish Enhancement Group. SRTCC agreed that Dawn should reach out to both FEGs to determine interest and capacity to attend SRTCC. This is an agency seat so the BICC does not have to approve the member.

3) Goals

SRTCC approved targets for (target-specific conversation below):

1. Beach armor removal
2. Feeder bluff armor removal
3. Barrier replacement

SRTCC tabled the following targets (reasons included):

4. Marine riparian vegetation because of needing approved protocols and units of measure from PSP,
5. Intact drift cells because of needing approved protocols and units of measure from PSP,
6. Pocket estuary habitat because the status and trends report will not be complete until December 2017, and
7. Stormwater projects installed because it is uncertain how these will be funded as they are not yet an approved project by the SRFB but have been proven applicable in addressing survivability of salmonids.

The tabled targets will be presented to the BICC, via adaptive management, when appropriate.

Conversations regarding the specific targets that were identified were as follows:

Beach Armor Removal – getting to 80% natural shoreline for 50 year target is appropriate and reflects the reality that there is armor protecting homes and historic communities that were built in the intertidal areas before the negative impacts were known. This type of armor is not a target for removal. The definition of softshore protection needs to be better defined. When is softshore protection beneficial (or at least not harmful) enough to be counted towards our target? Are all softshore protection projects good for habitat? The probability of success for softshore installations are done on a project by project basis. Todd asked if a broader assessment of appropriate/not-appropriate areas had been done at some point. There is a Beach Strategies analysis that was done by CGS for ESRP titled “Identifying Target Beaches to Restore and Protect” (14-2308) but the final report is not due until January 2019. The description of the project:

“This project will advance our knowledge base for identifying restoration and protection priority drift cells, and will identify the highest priority beaches and bluffs to focus efforts upon within drift cells.”

Feeder Bluff Armor Removal – some members argued that getting to 100% natural shoreline was not realistic and others argued for a very aggressive target since armor on feeder bluff beaches is considered more impactful than armor on transportation zone or accretion beaches. The committee agreed to a 95% target for the 50 year goal with the 10 year goal being 1/5th of the 50 year goal. Ideally, we would have an assessment of where this is feasible and have a more certain, less arbitrary number. However, that assessment does not exist, currently. The above mentioned project may provide better metrics and the long range goal can be adjusted at that time via an adaptive management process.

Barrier replacement – The committee recognized that we know current status for high priority geographic area 1 only because of the 2014 Public Works’ inventory and assessment. The 10 year goal was set at 1/5th of the 50 yr goal. However, it is also recognized that barriers being replaced in the second highest priority geographic area may count towards the target as well.

Adjourn –

Next Meeting: September 20, 1-3pm **Camano Library** – Strategies and Criteria

	STAT	Historic amount	current amount	2005 - 2016 amount	50 yr goal	10 yr goal	Notes	Data Source
Non-feeder bluff armor removed	217 miles total shoreline 122 non FB miles 94 miles of accretion & transport 32.7 armored, non FB miles	122.8 miles	32.7 armored miles 26.8% armored 73.2% unarmored miles	better to get number from permits	80% of (non-feeder bluff) beaches are unarmored	2.2 miles armor removed; (move from 73.2% to 75% on our way to 80% unarmored)	Define soft shore in criteria. Adaptively manage refined goals as more conversation is had around definition of soft shore and as we learn exactly needs to be recovered to actually recover salmon. Prioritize areas and specific armor for removal in criteria. Delineate how many feet of armor are in historic communities, intertidal homes.	MacLennan, A, B. Rishel, J. Johannessen, A. ubeck and L. Ode. 2017 in draft. Beach Strategies Phase 1 Summary Report. Rishel, B, A. MadLennan, J. Johannessen and A. Lubeck. 2016. Island County Armor Mapping (Nearshore Data Collection and Synthesis) Final Technical Memorandum. Island County Dept of Natural Resources
Feeder bluff armor removed	94.2 miles FB 15 miles exceptional FB 21.3 miles armored FB	94.2 miles	21.3 armored miles 22.6% armored FB miles 77.4% unarmored FB miles	better to get number from permits	95% of feeder bluffs are unarmored (remove 16.6 miles of existing 21.3)	1.6 miles of feeder bluff armor removed		MacLennan, Rishel, Johannessen, Lubeck and Ode. 2017. Beach Strategies Phase 1 Summary Report.
Intact marine riparian vegetation	Waiting on PSP protocols							

Pocket estuary reconnected to tidal inundation	Waiting on completed study, Dec 2017). Also waiting on guidance as to how to measure - # of estuaries vs. # or acres habitat	56 pocket estuaries	28 without access, 28 with access but 5 Not fully functional	2.5 restored (Crescent, little Livingston, little Dugualla)	☑All Pocket Estuaries that are feasible to recover, i.e. not canal communities	# acres pocket estuary habitat made accessible. Adjusted to accommodate the number of years it takes to realize a restoration project of this type. i.e. fewer in first 20 years and increasing as time goes on.		Beamer, E, A McBride, K Wolf, A Hook, and WG Hood. 2015. Skagit Monitoring Pilot Project: Methods and results for estuarine and nearshore habitat targets identified in the 2005 Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan. Skagit River System Cooperative, LaConner, WA. Report to Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) under PSP Interagency Agreement #2015-64. Beamer et al. 2005. Delta and Nearshore restoration for the Recovery of Wild Skagit River Chinook Salmon: Linking Estuary Restoration to Wild Chinook Salmon Populations. pg 17.
Barriers replaced			21 Public culverts, ~60 private culverts from Area 1	15 replaced (mostly private) across County, 2 public culverts from Area 1 list (in fall 2017)	☑100% of freshwater streams containing juvenile anadromous rearing habitat are accessible (not natural barriers).	16 culverts/barriers made passable		Island County Public Works. 2015. Island County Fish Passage Barrier Inventory.
Drift cell continuity	Waiting on PSP protocols							
Stormwater treatment projects installed				2		# of stormwater projects installed	Currently can't fund stormwater projects with SRFB. Still a goal and vision. Adaptively manage as more info becomes available	

Protection Goals	Via Adaptive mgmt. once nearshore strategy has been developed.							
-----------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--