



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

02/20/2019 Multi-purpose Building, Camano

## **Introductions/announcements**

Member Participants: John Lovie (Citizen) (WebEx), Paul Marczin (WDFW), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Mona Kristoferson Campbell (Business), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Matt Kukuk (MRC) (WebEx), Greg Goforth (IC Planning) (WebEx), Tom Vos (SWS)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Ferguson (PSP), Tim Hillman (guest), Lori Clark (IC DNR)

---

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

Meeting Notes from January were approved.

Congrats to Matt Zupich on being selected as the new Executive Director of the Whidbey Island Conservation District.

### **2) Updates**

#### **Funding/SRFB – PE Monitoring**

**PSP** – Chinook Vital Sign Indicator updated. PSAR Scope changes and cost increase requests due. Sheida Sahandy, PSP ED, announced her resignation, effective May 3. She has endorsed Laura Blackmore as her successor. For cabinet-level positions such as this, it is standard for the Governor's office to conduct an open search, which they will likely conduct. If the Governor does not select a candidate by May 3, the Governor's office will appoint an Interim Director. Action Agenda has been approved by EPA.

**ILIO** – SI funding recommendations released. No regionally funded projects in Island Co. But Sound Horsekeeping and Coupeville Outfall Study, local recommendations, were approved for funding.

**Lean/RCO** – no news

**Orca Task Force** – No news

**Other Updates** – RFP for chapter update writing was distributed and will close on Friday, 2/22/2019. The request is for a draft document be written and designed that will encompass the new and revised mission statements, goals, strategies, targets and adaptive management plan.

SRTCC will review the draft in July and August. The Board of Island County Commissioners will review and approve in the fall.

---

**3) Returned PSAR Funding allocation approval**

*Return funding status:*

2015-2017 PSAR - \$100,000 returned from Camano Island State Park project complete.

2017-2019 PSAR - \$80,000 returned from Maylor Armor Removal project is still being processed.

*Kristoferson request:*

From Kristin Marshall:

“We are requesting **\$5,274.25** for contractor costs (we will charge no District staff time, travel, or other cash costs to this cost increase). We over-ran our budget right at the end of the project when the contractor and I realized that I had omitted a bid line item for the coir lifts built at the toe of the slope at the Russell Rd. crossing. The contractor was very forthright about actual costs for the lifts, and we negotiated a reasonable price for this work. I authorized the contractor to complete the work (so as not to delay construction) and had planned to use our local Assessment funding to cover my error. However, if we can request PSAR return funds with no negative impact to our Lead Entity, I'd like to do so. We use our Assessment funding to implement small-scale water quality and habitat BMP projects on Camano Island, and that funding is pretty limited; me pulling from our small annual Assessment cost-share budget will result in fewer water quality cost share projects implemented during 2019.”

*Pearson:*

The appraisal was below the previous estimate of \$2.5million. The WCLT now estimates they only require \$162,605 of PSAR to complete the project. The project will be withdrawn from the large cap list.

*Remainder of returned funds:*

The remainder of the 17-19 PSAR funds will be allocated in the upcoming grant round.

**DECISION:**

**Kristoferson (15-1050): \$5,274.25 in 15-17 PSAR**  
**Pearson (18-1832): \$94,725.75 in 15-17 PSAR +  
\$67,879.25 in 17-19 PSAR**  
**2019 Grant round: \$12,120.75 in 17-19 PSAR**

---

#### 4) Project List Prioritization

The committee discussed the results of the project list tiering. There was some discomfort with the results of the #899 Barnum culvert project scoring that resulted in it being a Tier 1 project. Many in the committee decided to change their Ecosystem Component score to reflect the project as a freshwater stream culvert (7 points) rather than a tidally influenced culvert (10 points). A few members also changed their Contribution to Recovery score. As a result the project moved down to Tier 2.

There was general discussion about whether we should be funding restoration projects that would be required to be completed by current regulations at some point. Specifically, where a culvert owner is legally required to build to fish passage standards when a culvert is being replaced, why should we use precious restoration funding to do this. There are other sources of funds to do this work. Counter points included the fact that our culverts in Island County very rarely qualify for the Fish Barrier Removal Board funds (watershed is not big enough for 'watershed pathway' and streams don't often have multiple culverts to replace so don't usually qualify for 'coordinated pathway'). Also, funds are used to frequently assist private landowners with shore armor work. Public culverts are not under any legal obligation to be brought up to passable standards until they require replacement. May have a culvert that won't need to be replaced for 40 years but is blocking great habitat. Recovery funding will need to be deployed to fix that barrier. A suggestion was made to fund the difference between replacing the culvert like-for-like and what it would cost to make it passable. More discussion is needed on the topic about what type of projects we want to focus on. This will be a future agenda item.

The committee approved the tiering approach used for the list rather than approving the specific projects and the order they fall into. Committee members can revise their scores at any time of the year. Projects can be added to the list at any time of the year and will be scored using the process. The list will be reviewed at least annually and the edits will be reviewed.

The order of the projects on the list does not dictate its priority during a grant round. The details of the project and how it is to be implemented may affect its ranking during a grant round. Social and community support is not reflected in the order of the projects in the list and may also affect the order of the projects once proposed for a grant round.

**DECISION: Approved the process to score and tier projects on the 'big list' according to the process detailed in January 2019 notes. Edits to the list can be made at any time by sending them to the coordinator, who will manage the master list. The list and edits will be reviewed annually.**

#### Summary of Process:

- Each project is scored based on Ecosystem Component (same criteria as grant round scoring template) and Contribution to Recovery (subjective).
- Ecosystem component = 1-10; Contribution to Recovery = 1-4.

- Final score is (Ecosystem Component) + 2.5(Contribution to Recovery). Total possible = 20.
  - Committee members' scores are averaged.
  - Tier 1 = 20-15; Tier 2 = 13-14; Tier 3 = 12-2
- 

## 5) Templates

### *Membership Application*

Some edits were made to the proposed template and approved for use.

### *Lessons Learned*

Template was approved. Notify sponsor of this expectation in the beginning of the project.

**DECISION: Approved both templates.**

---

## 6) Letters of Intent

*See below*

7) Letters of Intent

project	sponsor	type	grant ask	match	total	Questions
Elger Bay Acquisition (phase 2)	WCLT	protect 15 acres estuary, 5 acres mesic forest, adjacent to 38 acres recently acquired.	\$ 191,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 225,000	none
Culvert List	SFEG	private culverts in Area 1, public and private culverts in Area 2.	\$ 83,778	\$ 14,784	\$ 98,562	none
Penn Cove Armor Removal	NWSF	100-200' Feeder Bluff armor removal	\$ 170,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 200,000	could it go ahead if only one landowner is interested?
Hidden Beach Restoration	NWSF	750' beach restoration	\$ 255,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 300,000	none
Livingston Parcel Acquisition	IC PW	nearshore parcel for future open channel restoration	\$ 100,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 120,000	what are habitat gains? Maybe phrase it as making a pocket estuary rather than connecting a stream. Help to have a rudimentary design, how much pocket (micro) estuary could be gained.

Greenbank Restoration Phase 3 of 4	GBBC	permitting, construction of culverts and installation of tidegate	\$ 674,000	\$ 119,000	\$ 793,000	what is the tidal range proposed for SRT. Must include results of geomorph, saltwater studies, BSA. Ask about how much private money will be invested by final project and what is the final build out cost. What are the plans for the boat ramp? What assurances are there for future fish access. Who's paying for the parking lot raising?
------------------------------------	------	---	------------	------------	------------	--

**DECISION: Invite all to apply. Dawn will communicate questions and concerns to sponsors so they can ensure they are addressed in application and presentations.**

**8) Adaptive Management**

Paul and Todd volunteered to help review Adaptive Management products between meetings. The goal is to have a SRTCC approved Adaptive Management plan by mid-May so that it can be incorporated into the chapter update draft.

**9) Adjourn**

March 20 – Coupeville Library – Project scoring review, adaptive mgmt, project funding discussion

April 17 – Coupeville rec hall – ILIO mtg. Presentations!!!