



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

6/19/18 1-3:00 pm

Location: Coupeville Library

## Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: Barbara Brock (Citizen), Todd Zackey (Tulalip), Mona Campbell (Business(WebEx)), Tom Vos (SWS), Matt Zupich (WICD), Matt Kukuk (MRC), John Lovie (Citizen), Paul Marczin (WDFW), Greg Goforth (IC Planning), Kristin Marshall (SnoCD (WebEx))

Others: Dawn Pucci (LE Coordinator), Catey Ritchie (SRSC – Program Mgr), Lori Clark (ILIO), Suzanna Stoike (PSP)

---

### 1) Introductions/announcements

Hi Catey!

### 2) Updates

Meeting Notes from May approved

**PSP – Rapid Response Fund Proposal - Draft** (or intention) was approved by the May Salmon Recovery Council. PSP decided to increase funding to \$1million. But is now a “loan against your next PSAR allocation”. Intention is still the same.

**PSAR Large Cap** – Paul and John were on the review team. 17 project submitted and 13 were invited to full proposal. Site visits for habitat component would have been useful and almost necessary in order to score accurately. Had to weed out capital improvement projects disguised as restoration projects.

Suzanna has accepted the PSAR Program Manager position. A new ERC will be hired to work with Island.

**ILIO** – John Lovie and **NTA** – John himself, ranked 29 projects at NTA camp. South Sound LIO submitted 130 NTAs. So a lot of NTAs reviewed in teams. A lot of pruning of projects that were poorly aligned to strategies. Lesson learned for ILIO is that our NTAs must be a great fit to move through the process. The “Camp” was well structured and people were prepared.

Final NTA ranking/scoring due July 15. Next step is to select the project for the local allocation (\$100k).

**Certificate of Appreciation** – Julius Budos

---

## **2B) Cost Increase Request – Kristoferson Barrier Improvements (15-1050)**

Kristoferson culverts bids have come back higher than expected. Need construction and construction contingency. Requesting \$45,000 from PSAR return funds. The LE needs to approve the request prior to submittal to PSP. PSP and RCO have approved this strategy as opposed to trying to get loaned funds back from NOPLA.

Reasons for request – longer to work through permitting (staff changes at both ICPW and SnoCD), material and design changes, culvert cost increase, late to bid, difficulty with engineering costs and 3d party review with Right of Entry permissions.

Requests from the Returned Funds does not need to be paid back by the LE, or reflect poorly on LE.

Would be good to capture lessons learned. Dawn will work with the SnoCD after construction to capture lessons learned and use this project to develop a process.

**DECISION: Approved**

### **3) Lead Entity Scope of Work**

The LE scope of work (SOW) was distributed to the committee ahead of time. PSP has asked that Lead Entities' committees review the SOWs and provide any input. The SOW is the "book of business" for the LE program. It details the deliverables and tasks expected. This SOW will cover 07/01/2018 to 6/30/2019. There was no additional input from the committee on the existing draft.

### **4) Project Pre-Scoring**

Pre-scores for the projects were submitted by most members of the committee. Each project was discussed individually.

*Crescent Creek:* Discussed the "Area Component" score and whether the project should be considered freshwater or stream-mouth. It was clarified that the bottom third of the stream (300') is tidally influenced. It was also stated that the stream mouth was being moved to an area of higher tidal circulation which will also benefit the stream. It is up to each committee member if they feel it warrants 5 points for freshwater, 9 for stream mouth or somewhere in between. They can use the narrative section to explain their decision.

*Oak Harbor Marina Feasibility:* The difference in cost benefit scores was discussed. Some scorers thought about the value to Chinook of the whole project while others considered the value of the feasibility study and the cost associated with it. Scorers can interpret the criteria in whatever way they see fit, as long as they apply it consistently to all projects.

*#1300 N East Camano Dr Culverts:* No clarification needed or concerns to be addressed applying the criteria.

*Camano Country Club Tidegate Feasibility:* No clarification needed or concerns to be addressed applying the criteria.

*Pearson Acquisition:* The benefit to watershed processes and salmon was discussed. The certainty of success was also discussed and whether current regulations would be enough to protect the parcel.

Committee members will submit final scores by July 13 to Dawn. Final scoring and ranking will occur at the next SRTCC meeting.

---

**Adjourn**

**Next Meeting:** July 18 – Padilla Bay