



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

08/21/2019

Coupeville, Room 131

## Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: John Lovie (Citizen), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Kristen Marshall (SnoCD) (WebEx), Mona K Campbell (Business) (WebEx), Jessica Côté (Business) (WebEx), Paul Marczin (WDFW), Tansy Schroeder (IC Planning), Tom Vos (SWS), Matt Kukuk (MRC), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD)

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

---

## 1) Introductions –

## 2) Updates

- Meeting notes approved – July
- Membership – Greg Goforth is leaving the County Planning Dept and is no longer on SRTCC. Good luck, Greg!
- ILIO - Discussed 2019 local funds allocation for NTAs. The Town of Coupeville, who was initially allocated the 2019 \$100,000, is having capacity issues and cannot engage in their current 2018 NTA. So the 2019 local funds will be re-allocated (once approved by ILIO EC and SIATs) to WICD's project Stormwater Technical Dev and Outreach. The ILIO TC tried the DASEES tool to help quantify subjective data and components.
- PSP – There will be a joint LE/LIO Sept 17. The Salmon Recovery council (SRC) Sept 26 meeting will include a discussion about the Salmon Benefit Index tool being proposed to be used for PSAR Large Capital Project review. The 2020 PSAR Large Cap RFP and Timeline have been drafted and it will be on the same RCO timeline.
- Projects –
  - Greenbank – Needs a pre-application meeting to discuss the changes that have occurred since the original pre-application meeting. Building inspector has serious concerns about the pump component. WDFW recommends a pre-application with them as well.
  - Framework – The draft is available for review. The contractors (Confluence) are on track to be complete by end of September but need the committee's input on the draft. Paul requested another task force meeting so that we could review together in light of the significant edits suggested at the last meeting.
- LEAN & Orca Task Force – no updates
- Chapter Update Development – BICC approved the Adaptive Management text. They are very supportive of the update. They would like it noted in the document that even though Island County may do everything possible for salmon recovery, we are still dependent on partners

from other watersheds to support production of salmon, that we don't have any control or influence over.

- Gwendolyn stated that she has received calls from the general public who have the perception that salmon numbers are up and believe that populations must be recovering based on Whidbey News Times article about fishing in Island County. There is clearly the need for outreach to improve public perception about fish numbers and habitat. It is also important to educate reporters.

### 3) 2019 SRFB Budget Decisions

Cost Increase requests [Jessica recused herself from this conversation]

- E Camano Dr Culverts -\$30,000 in order to contract the work out due to unforeseen PW staff shortage.
- Seahorse Siesta - \$30,000 to address increase in construction costs (smaller barges, more trips).
- OH Marina – \$10,000 to address potential higher costs due to research sponsor has been doing during the bid process.

SRTCC Conversation points:

Seahorse Siesta restoration has had to be postponed until the 2020 fish window due to late delivery of some design documents preventing the project from going out to bid in time. Feedback from prospective bidders is that the barges required for the project will have to be smaller, thereby requiring more trips, due to the shallow intertidal area.

Can the Seahorse Siesta community cover the increase with their own funds? It would be ideal to have that community contribute funds for the removal of their infrastructure. This brought up the need for guidance or policy about the expectations of private property owners receiving state and federal grant funds to address their responsibilities.

Need to be prepared to say “we will pay for this part because it is salmon recovery related. But this infrastructure access is your community’s responsibility”. Be prepared to walk away from projects. Cost Benefit criteria address it? Mason County requires private property owners to pay for a percentage. Ask Mid Sound FEG. What do other CD’s do (useful models or lessons learned; costs share programs are Board approved and setting rules). Prevents perception of “gifting of public funds”.

**SRTCC needs to establish a policy about private property and match requirements. Potentially address this concern with the scoring criteria. But it is recognized that we need to build in flexibility for project specific details (i.e. if the project would be a huge benefit for salmon and there is no requirement for homeowner to address it in near future)**

The culvert project is needing these funds now as it is starting and under a tight timeline in order to get to construction. PW needs to contract this work out now because of sudden internal staff changes.

The Marina Feasibility estimated increase is not yet based on a budget developed by the subcontractor. The subcontractor for this project will be approved by the Commissioners later today. This request was deemed less urgent than the other two, currently.

### **Decision –**

- Allocate what we have up to \$30,000 to the E Camano Dr Barrier Removal project
- If more allocation is available based on the Sept SRFB funding decision, then, after making the E Camano barrier project whole, the NWSF should come back to us for more discussion
- If more allocation is available, then the IC MRC should come back to us with further defined estimates in hand and request the amount necessary.
- Based on the discussions about Seahorse Siesta and the Marina, and if there are no other funds to allocate, SRTCC may support requesting the funds from PSP and the regional cost increase funding opportunity.
- Revise 2020 criteria to address match and private property

### **4) Adaptive Management Targets**

- Use only one target for Armor. Do not split into feeder bluffs or other shoreforms. Technically, armoring of bluffs also affects non-bluff shoreforms downdrift nearby and should be prioritized as highly as bluff armor.
- SRTCC also discussed setting targets by shoreform (Accretion zone, transportation zone, non-appreciable drift, feeder bluff) or by Shoreline Environmental Designation. It was decided that this was too granular a target. We already have priority areas and shore form strategies in our scoring criteria.
- SRTCC decided to use the Properly Functioning Condition threshold of 80% of historic condition as the 50 year target for recovery. This is based on old policy but at least it's based on 'something' rather than just a negotiation. We will use this until there is better research that shows we need something else as a 50 year target.
- We will have a supplemental meeting in early September to discuss the target metrics and bins in order to have a complete table of metrics to approve in September. We are targeting October for Commissioner approval of the Plan. This meeting will be Sep 5, 9-noon at Padilla Bay.

### **5) Adjourn**

Next meetings:

Sept 5 – Padilla Bay – Adaptive Management Target Metrics and Bins

Sept 18 - Coupeville room 131 – Finalize Recovery Plan Recommendation; Acquisition Framework Tool Review.

Oct 16 – Camano Library - future projects, discuss climate change supplemental. 2020 Timeline; potentially Iverson Project Report