



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

01/16/2019 Coupeville Library

## **Introductions/announcements**

Member Participants: John Lovie (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Kristin Marshall (SnoCD) (WebEx), Matt Kukuk (MRC), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Rick Baker (WWS), Greg Goforth (IC Planning), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair) (WebEx), Paul Marczin (WDFW)

Others: Dawn Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Ferguson (PSP), Tim Hillman (guest)

---

### **1) Introductions/announcements**

Meeting Notes from December were approved.

Discussed using abbreviated notes that only summarize decisions with the goal of using the last 5 minutes of the meeting to agree upon the notes then and there. But the Committee prefers to have more details in the notes to refer back to. If in the future, it is decided to use abbreviated notes, then an audio recording of each meeting should be archived for reference.

### **2) Updates**

**Projects** – Nothing new

**Funding/SRFB** – Sponsors are being encouraged to submit projects based on need without using the usual SRFB allocation (\$240K) as a factor. Showing a need for funding and having alternates will provide flexibility in this coming year of unknown funding outcomes.

**PSP** – Legislative session started Monday. Instructions on how to follow PSP's weekly, call-in updates has been passed to SRTCC by email (this morning). Action Agenda approval is delayed due to Federal partial shutdown. PSP is implementing a plan to mobilize funding, potentially through the Foundation. One pager soon.

**ILIO** – Today's meeting was postponed until Jan 30.

**Lean/RCO** – GSRO Exec. Director Steve Martin is leaving. Sarah Gage, who manages our LE capacity contracts and scopes of work will be retiring after the Conference in April

**Orca Task Force** – Second year starting soon. Snake River dams in phase 2 will be via a facilitated conversation once legislature has approved funding. Paul said there was good presentation on cost effective way to remove dams at last year's River Restoration Conference.

**Other Updates** –

King Tides field day – 8:30am Jan 25 at Flintstone Park, UW Sea Grant led.

Habitat Restoration Demystified – 6-8 pm Jan 24 at Coupeville Rec Hall. WICD, voluntary shoreline and wetland restoration strategies and permitting considerations. ECY and Planning will also be there. Consider doing one on Camano.

Rep. Rick Larsen is scheduled to visit the Kristoferson culverts, Friday, Jan 16. Kristin and the SnoCD are hosting and have invited us. Dawn, Barbara and Commissioner Price Johnson will be attending. Commissioner St. Clair was unable to attend. Commissioner Johnson was notified.

---

### 3) Project List Prioritization

Pre-scores were submitted by Tom, John, Matt K, Mona, Todd and Kristin. Barbara offered a list of top 10 projects. Paul M will be submitting his list this week.

Sorting by Ecosystem component and then by Contribution was tried. But this resulted in projects such as piling projects in area 1 outranking estuary projects in priority area 2 and that is not reflective of the true significance of the projects. “If a project scored a 1 for contribution, we shouldn’t do it just because it is in priority area 1.”

Sorting by Contribution, then by Component was also tried. But there was no clear distinction between tiers and the Committee felt that this resulting list was better than the first sorting but still was not well balanced.

The third sorting attempt weighted the Contribution score by a factor of 2.5 so the score range (1-4) was comparable to the Component score (1-10). These were added together resulting in one score. The Committee felt this resulted in the best balanced list that truly reflected the important and significant projects.

#### **Process:**

Scored each project 1-10 using the Ecosystem Component matrix from the annual project criteria (question 1). Averaged each committee member’s scores.

Scored each project 1-4 using the Contribution to Recovery matrix. Averaged each committee member’s scores.

Created one score with following formula:

$$\text{Congregated score} = \text{Avg. Component} + (2.5 * \text{Avg. Contribution})$$

Maximum congregated score = 20.

Tier 1 projects: 20-15

Tier 2 projects: 14-13

Tier 3 projects: 12-1

Only projects that are not yet approved were scored.

Projects considered dormant (have been attempted but were not successful due to significant barriers that are still in place) were scored as they are recognized to be a necessary component to achieving recovery. Situations change and these projects may be attempted again at a later date.

Only projects that are seen as necessary for salmonid recovery were scored. Other projects, such as trail proposals or outfall replacements, remain on the list because they may be involved with other projects and may be used for leverage, or be leveraged, by other restoration efforts.

The overall list includes ILIO, MRC, Parks and Public Works projects but are not scored as Salmon projects. The list is an IC DNR list. The Salmon projects are a subset of the DNR project list. The LE 4 year work plan is a subset of the Salmon list.

**Next steps:**

1. Add Paul's scores.
2. QA that everyone's scores were entered against the correct projects.
3. Refilter the list – remove non-salmon projects and proposed projects.
4. Apply Tiers.
5. Resend to committee. Approval at the Feb meeting.

---

**Adjourn**

Next meeting: Feb 20, Camano (Island County Multi-purpose "blue" building)

Review letters of intent, approve tiered list and process, approve templates for membership application and lessons learned, next steps for adaptive management plan.

## Ecosystem Component

	PE/Streams	Bluff	Beaches	Streams	Uplands	Offshore	Rocky
1 (NE Whidbey & E Camano)	10	10	10	7	5	3	2
2 (Saratoga Passage & Possession to Double Bluff)	9	8	7	5	4	2	1
3 (West Whidbey)	5	6	6	2	2	1	1
	PE/Streams	Bluff	Beaches	Streams	Uplands	Offshore	Rocky

## Contribution to recovery

	4	3	2	1
	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Unknown or not addressed
Relative scale or magnitude of project?	Project is large and would provide exceptional benefit	Project would provide significant benefit	Project may lead to significant benefit	Project has the opportunity to provide benefit at some level

<p>Project demonstrates multiple benefits to ecosystem recovery (e.g. floodplain process, human-wellbeing, shoreline improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>Project would have an immediate impact on recovery efforts</p>	<p>Project may have immediate or short term impacts on recovery efforts</p>	<p>Project will enable future recovery efforts</p>	
--	---	---	--	--