



Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Oct 21, 2020

Virtual Meeting

Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Paul Marczin (WDFW), John Lovie (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Jon Decker (WCLT), Jessica Côté (Blue Coast Engineering), Tim Hillman (Citizen), Richard Baker (WWS), Laura Rivas (PSP), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD), Mona Campbell (Business)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Tom Slocum (WA Conservation Districts), David Gerth (Citizen), Anna Toledo (IC DNR), Carson Moscoso (SnoCD), Ann Prusha (IC DNR), Rodney Pond (Sound Salmon Solutions)

1) Introductions

2) Updates

- Meeting Notes Approval – July and September
- PSP –
 - PSP is hiring a new Monitoring Network Coordinator, and are interviewing candidates now.
 - They hired a new Planning Manager to coordinate Action Agenda development. They will begin November 9.
 - The PSP's lease expired at Center for Urban Waters offices in Tacoma, and they are scoping out new offices for drop-in meeting space (Seattle, Tacoma and Olympia).
 - The Science panel sent out a request to review their 4-year work plan. Dawn will send this out.
 - The Nearshore Marketplace was presented at the last Salmon Recovery Council meeting. A lot of projects were applied for through the Army Corps permitting system. NOAA/NMFS decided to take a programmatic approach and look at the permit applications together. Because of the cumulative impact of all the projects, a finding of "jeopardy" was declared and a biological opinion was developed. The need to mitigate these impacts was determined and a calculator was developed to assess mitigation credits. PSP will be the 'broker' of these credits and will develop a process to apply these credits towards creosote removal projects. Other project types may be included in the future. We may be able to look at how projects and proposals (like the Derelict Infrastructure Removal Program – DIRP) tie in to this. The calculator for this program will be released next week.
 - The comment period for the Toxics in Fish Implementation Strategy has been extended until November 6. Dawn will send this out.
 - The next SRC meeting is November 19. Same day as the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

- The PSP has hired consultants to help with the Puget Sound Chinook Regional Plan update. They used our recently updated plan, along with 2 other chapter updates, as an example for the regional plan.
- ILIO
 - The Human Wellbeing Survey went out – they have already received 200 responses. Thanks to Gwendolyn for posting it in so many places!
 - David Trimbach and John Lovie were part of a recent webinar talking about Structured Decision Making and DASEES.
- Funding/SRFB
 - All projects were approved in early September. RCO's Manual 18 will be up for revision soon. The Maylor Point project closed. \$11k was unused and given back to us. Dawn suggested putting it towards the Polnell Point project, since it is awaiting more PSAR funding. This was approved by SRTCC.
- Projects (Elger Bay, Hoypus and Polnell, Seahorse Siesta)
 - Seahorse Siesta: they are going to be on the beach removing the barge soon. Lisa has faced a lot of difficulties with this. Dawn wants to congratulate her once it's complete because there were a lot of setbacks.
 - Hoypus and Polnell: they are raking well in the ESRP grant rounds and are expected to receive the funding requested. They will need to be proposed for SRFB funding for construction.
 - Elger Bay: This closed in September, and adds more to the pocket estuary. There was a lot of local support. There is more work to be done; WCLT will be doing outreach and expanding on that. A community member on Camano came in and saved the project with a huge donation. Thank you to them!!!!!!
- Sunlight Shores update
 - There was a community meeting about the breaching of Henny Spit on Useless Bay. We submitted a letter to the Army Corps regarding this. The diking district (project sponsor) held a meeting for neighbors and stakeholders. The two neighboring communities had a productive conversation, and worked on finding solutions that preventing flooding while respecting private property.
- Mukilteo building
 - The old building is being emptied in preparation for demolition. We have not heard if NOAA has made the decision yet to rebuild as originally planned, build a smaller one or abandon the location.
- Site Visit dates – March 4 again?
 - Proposing March 4th or 5th. Applications would be due mid-February (same as last year, but it won't be as large a grant round). The group agreed to this. There is one revision opportunity this year, and we will receive feedback sooner than we did last year.

3) Bylaws

- Dawn walked through the edits that she and Laura suggested. Every change is editorial. For each comment, she asked the group if there were any suggestions for updating the changes that she and Laura are proposing. The changes made at today's meeting were:
 - i. Section II – include electronic communication.
 - ii. Section II E – Dawn made minor changes to wording to ensure that the meaning is clear.

- iii. Section VII C – Dawn made minor changes to the wording to ensure that the meaning is clear. The last sentence was changed to clarify that if the member has abstained from voting, their vote is not counted. The group agreed that abstentions should not be counted as a vote for the majority decision.
 - iv. Section IX – The group decided to do more research. This section needs to be changed to clarify the process for when a consensus cannot be reached by a voted decision. There needs to be strengthening of the ‘consensus-based’ language. Ann and Barbara will research this.
 - v. Section X – Update “majority” and “super majority” to have consistent definitions, and move the definitions to Section X.
- The group decided to leave the conflict of interest policies as a separate document.

DECISION – Revise the consensus based language and then review/approve in November.

4) Greenbank Restoration Project – Final Outcomes and Lessons Learned

Tom Slocum gave a presentation about the Greenbank Marsh Restoration Design. The Final Report was distributed ahead of time. Final construction for this project will not be pursued due to issues with the water table. He discussed the challenges for this project, reviewed the project specs, and pointed out issues on the site plan. Sea level rise is going to cause difficulties here, even without the proposed restoration. IC will likely need to do something to protect North Bluff Road.

There was discussion about lessons learned, where to go from here, ways to realize the potential for this site, and ways this can be leveraged for issues with land use. This type of system needs enough of a channel to allow tidal exchange to flush it out completely. Realizing benefits is not likely with the current IC resistance to bridges and openings of certain sizes. There are similar projects occurring in Kitsap County. Gratitude was expressed to SRTCC for the huge attempt to push this project forward.

Tidal influence is a weaker channeling force than a river. Other projects that have relied on tides carving channels don’t necessarily get the channeling they want. Channels need to actually be dug out, and then they can maintain themselves. River flow has a lot more power than tides, but tides can help a little.

To date, there have not been any successful reconnection projects of tidal marshes that have been cut off from tidal connectivity. All successful (to date) reconnection projects have involved removing or adjusting tidegates, not long culverts.

Piezometer installation is important – you need to know where the groundwater is going. For deciding if new projects should be implemented, you first need to determine if it is in a place where a tidal channel can go. Then groundwater needs to be assessed. For property owners, FEMA issues and flood zones need to be considered. Next, hydraulics need to be considered.

In 50 years, this area will not look the way it does today. This project is an opportunity to have that conversation. Before we have those conversations, we need to determine what we're trying to change (IC or State policies) and who we are trying to reach. We probably need something at the Partnership level to talk to the state about the scope of problems. Other parts of the country are considering strategic retreat, which requires federal and state support. In Alaska and coastal WA, native communities have been starting this process. Our local government is not considering or thinking about it to the extent they likely need to be. The message that needs to be shared is that we likely need a strategic relocation plan. When people do move, it can be an opportunity to gain habitat.

A part of this is dealing with real estate, capitalism, and rights. At the end of the day, it's who has the most money. A change of system is needed. This is a conversation that ILIO would be most effective at advancing. We can support them in this.

If there's another opportunity (to reconnect a tidal marsh) how do we use Greenbank to assess it? Lessons learned:

- 1) First, conduct a groundwater assessment – see if the project would affect wells and if a freshwater wetland can be changed to a saltwater marsh.
- 2) Also, see if there is room (location and space) for an actual tidal channel.
- 3) Next, assess the water table and communicate with the neighbors that the vegetation will be affected.
- 4) Next, consider if the base flood level will be raised. This may have impacts regarding FEMA NFIP maps and possible revisions.
- 5) Next, consider the hydraulics – how does the water flow now and how will it likely flow after.
- 6) Landowner willingness and community buy-in are very important.
- 7) Consider using allometry models to make sure we're digging enough channels. They should be able to have full flushing and be able to clear out midway for a healthy marsh and channel functionality.
- 8) We can potentially look at scoring criteria – maybe areas with a lot of small lots can score lower.
- 9) We can see if the project could go to IC, a diking district, or homeowner's association. We could have a long term partner, who can do long term stewardship. Current funding mechanisms do not provide that flexibility.
- 10) It's possible that at some point, tribes take their rights and make injunctions on fish passage barriers.
- 11) We can do some screening and work with sponsors ahead of time. If we want to have a subcommittee, we can.
- 12) There has been some informal nay-saying. We can put criteria into a format to help show actual feasibility.

Next month, Dawn can send criteria and materials to look at as a group, then determine how we use the information we learned from this and Iverson to see how to apply it to salt marshes and other projects (like the Oak Harbor Marina Feasibility Study and Kristoferson culverts). The

group decided to work on this as a group, rather than forming a subcommittee. Laura and Dawn will talk it through and think of a good way to structure the conversation.

Dawn will send edits to the by-laws, and summarize lessons learned.

5) Adjourn

Next meetings:

- Nov – Lessons learned actions, bylaw approval
- Dec – Grant Round Prep