



Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

1/15/2020

WebEx Only due to Epic SNOW!

Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: John Lovie (Citizen), Tim Hillman (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD), Matt Kukuk (MRC), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Paul Marczin (WDFW), Kristin Marshall (SnoCD), Jon Decker (WCLT), Jessica Côté (Business), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Mona Kristoferson Campbell (Business)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Ferguson (PSP), Lori Clark (ILIO)

1) Introductions & Announcements

2) Updates

- Meeting notes approved – December
- Membership – All full! (Except for COG seat).
- ILIO – A workshop on the Decision Analysis for Sustainable Environment, Economy, and Society (DASEES) tool was held last week. It is a decision analysis software to aid the ILIO in looking at return on investments while comparing projects. The software has been loaded with ILIO-specific data but linkages have not yet been made. A second workshop will be held on Tuesday February 11 in Coupeville, room 131. Let Lori know if you want more info or are interested in attending.
- PSP –
 - The federal government appropriated \$33M, an additional \$5M from last year, to the Puget Sound NEP budget for 2020!
 - PCSRF was appropriated \$65M for 2020, the same amount as last year.
 - Pacific Salmon Treaty – There is \$9M available for this fiscal year and NOAA will be deciding which projects to fund. Direct questions to Elizabeth Babcock at NOAA.
 - 10 year treaty signed earlier this year and now finally being implemented (funding component)
 - Dawn will get more info on this for a future meeting
 - The deadline for Floodplains by Design grants pre-applications is coming up – due January 31.
 - The Salmon Recovery Council will be meeting on January 23. Topics are largely informational as they get the year started.
- Chapter Update Approval – Still waiting to complete a one-on-one meeting with Commissioner Johnson so she can take a closer look at the Adaptive Management component. It can then be approved to move to adopt the resolution at a public meeting shortly thereafter (likely end of February). Send the draft resolution

- SRFB – No news
- BOX site! <https://pspwa.box.com/s/ct2ccb5k6ac0807o9zai62t2crfqvldn>
 - Meeting notes and large documents (reports and work plans) will live in this site. Contact Dawn if you need help accessing.
- WDFW is in the final design phase for Leque North (north of Hwy 532) which will remove tidal barriers and create new channels. Public access is unlikely due to constraints of the site.

3) Nearshore Prioritization Framework Integration into Scoring

Report is available [here](#).

Each parcel earns a “protection” score, 100 points max. Scoring criteria was based on Landscape Context (20 points), Ecosystem Processes (60 points) and Habitat Function (20 points). There is a separate score for the “restoration” potential (65 points max).

Phil encouraged the scores to be used to determine relative importance of parcels between one another and not to be used as a cut off. For example, it isn’t recommended to state that “all parcels that score less than 40 points are not fundable”. But it is appropriate to say “the parcel that scored 49 is of higher protection value than the parcel that scored 40”.

The Stillaguamish Lead Entity scores projects proposing to use their protection prioritization tool with the same criteria as all other projects proposed.

The West Sound Watershed Lead Entity does not use parcel scores or values developed by their nearshore prioritization tool in their grant round ranking. The results of the prioritization tool are being used by sponsors to identify projects to undertake and propose knowing they are high priority in a given watershed.

Our criteria did have a place holder for scoring protection projects using the Acquisition Prioritization tool. However, the criteria currently has language for acquisition project scoring in the Watershed Processes & Actions component. This language can incorporate references to the tool. The tool developer, Phil Bloch (Confluence), encouraged avoiding using the parcel scores developed by the tool as an absolute value. He stated the scores are meaningful when comparing parcels to other parcels but not parcel acquisitions to other recovery actions or projects.

Decision

- Use the criteria as is this year. Use the Pre-scoring discussion meeting to work through concepts and get more information about the framework tool should it be used this round. If no projects use it this year, we can run a couple of ‘fake’ acquisition projects through the criteria with this year’s projects to see how it would work hypothetically. The results will be discussed and adaptively managed for 2021.

4) Workplan

A draft meeting topic schedule was discussed. It is available on [Box](#). Discussed a permanent agenda item once a year to discuss Adaptive Management considerations (lessons learned, new BAS, gaps) and how

to address them. Discussed a permanent agenda item for December to celebrate accomplishments with a site tour or recently completed projects or slide show, maybe a presentation of new science if no new projects were constructed. Added the possibility of a summer potluck just as an optional social gathering. Perhaps make that into a DNR volunteer appreciation day for ILIO, MRC and WRAC. Discussed the need for a new or revised LE Guidance Manual.

5) Big Project List Scoring – Supplemental

Ten newly identified projects were discussed and scored to determine tiering on the big list. One project needed to be rescored due to significant shift in scope (North Livingston Culvert). Discussion points added below.

	Project Name
1	SeaPlane WAIF Groin Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could we lose more FF habitat than we'd gain?
2	Davis Slough Restoration Feasibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant size
3	Joseph Whidbey Beach Derelict Boat Ramp Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be fast and cheap • But is there FF benefit?
4	Barnum Point Armor Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score as if the rock was removed and not replaced against the toe, even though we know the actual project will have to consider the stability of the road on the feeder bluff
5	Mutiny Bay Condos Tide Gate Fish Passage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Postponed until February</i>
6	Glendale Culvert and Armor Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Postponed until February</i>
7	Maylor Point Beach Debris Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two parts – armor along the road, road and fill removal plus derelict armor off the beach at the end of the channel and path from housing
8	Geck Rd (Ala Spit) Softshore Armor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks like erosion may be a surface runoff issue, not coastal erosion issue. Alternate solutions should be addressed • Is this a case of armor prevention? IC SMP will prevent armor from being installed • Why would salmon money be used to install armor, even softshore, where none now exists? • Could the road be abandoned by acquiring parcels nearby and putting parking elsewhere?
9	Barnum Rd (Top of Triangle) Softshore Armor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same arguments as for Geck Rd (except the alternate parking suggestion) • If there is creosote here that needs to be removed, there might be some value
10	Crescent Harbor Riprap (Phase 1) Feasibility and Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long stretch of beach • Superfund concerns?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FF habitat gain? Or is the armor impacting despite all the wood in front of it?
11	North Livingston Culvert Private <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Postponed until February</i>

Decisions

- Continue scoring projects for tiering in February.
- Dawn will take feedback to Public Works about the Geck Rd and Barnum Rd projects. The message is that:
 1. Surface run off should be evaluated and alternate solutions should be considered. If the erosion isn't coastal erosion, then coastal erosion fixes aren't necessary.
 2. Consider an alternate parking area and road removal for Ala Spit.
 3. If PW wants fish design feedback, then an application submittal will get that. But the projects will be scrutinized heavily and likely to not be funded without alterations to the intertidal fill and softshore solution. SRTCC does not see value to use fish money to install any armor – even softshore – where no armor currently exists.

6) Adjourn

Next meetings:

Feb 19 – Stanwood library – 2020 project proposals review

Mar 5-6 – Site visits

Mar 18 – Padilla Bay - Project Presentations & Open House