



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

09/18/2019

Coupeville, Room 131

## Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: John Lovie (Citizen), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Tansy Schroeder (IC Planning), Tom Vos (SWS), Matt Kukuk (MRC), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD), Tim Hillman (Citizen), Hannah Liss (IC Planning), Ryan Elting (WCLT) (WebEx)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Ferguson (PSP), Lori Clark (ILIO) Keith Higman (IC PH), Lori Clark, David Trimbach (OSU), Jill Wood (IC PH)

---

## 1) Introductions –

## 2) Updates

- Meeting notes approved – August
- Membership – Welcome to Hannah, IC Planning. She is taking Greg's vacated seat.
- ILIO -
  - Investigating if NTA funding can be utilized for Livingston Culvert and watershed project (PSNERP?)
  - DASEES (decision analysis software) workshop will most likely be scheduled in November/December to add feedback. May need input on how to weigh components.
  - LIO-LE Integration workshop was held yesterday and resulted in suggestions on efficiency and restructure of NTAs and Action Agenda.
- PSP –
  - Save the date for Tuesday, October 8, 2:00 pm - 4:00 pm to join Congressman Kilmer and PSP at the Puyallup Tribe Youth Center to network with others concerned about the health of Puget Sound, celebrate successes, and share diverse perspectives on pinniped management in Puget Sound. This event builds on the tradition of PS Day on the Hill in Washington DC, which is an annual opportunity to thank, encourage, and hear from our Congressional delegation.
  - Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference is scheduled for April 19-22, 2020 in Vancouver, BC. The call for abstracts will be open from September 9 - October 30.
- SRFB – Title 420 WAC changes have been e-mailed out. They add direction on the formation of a lead entity, clarify roles/duties of GSRO and Lead Entities and Citizens Committees.
- Projects –
  - Greenbank – Public Health requesting two more monitoring wells to collect some more information. GBBC and PH will discuss what this means for future permitting timing.

- Nearshore Acquisition Framework – Paul, Todd, Ryan and Dawn met with Paul Schlenger and Phil Bloch to finalize the scoring criteria. Dawn will ask Phil to come present the tool in November. It may be able to be used in this coming grant round.

### 3) Adaptive Management Target Approval

Paul, Todd, Tom, John, and Dawn met September 5 in Padilla Bay and decided on metrics for the adaptive management section of the update.

Recommendations to SRTCC:

- 80% of historic condition was selected as the 50-year target (Properly Functioning Condition = 80% of historic habitat available. It was developed for riverine systems but is the best currently available for nearshore. This may be adapted should new best available science become available.  
[http://www.krisweb.com/biblio/gen\\_noaa\\_nmfs\\_1996\\_salmonconservation.pdf](http://www.krisweb.com/biblio/gen_noaa_nmfs_1996_salmonconservation.pdf)
- The 10-year targets are generally 20% of that required to recover to meet that 80% target except for culverts/barriers. The culvert/barrier 10-year targets were accelerated due to funding source opportunities (Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board) and the Federal Supreme Court decision that requires the State to remove barriers within an accelerated timeline. It was thought that the Lead Entity should put in maximum effort to meet this timeline even though the decision was for State culverts and not County or private culverts. The importance of habitat access is consistent despite ownership of the culvert.
- Progress measured by grouping “bins” (green, yellow and red) and resulting actions were also determined.
- Bill Blake (Salmon Recovery Council co-vice chair and our Ecosystem Coordinating Board alternate representative) approves of the update and said it looks really good 😊.

SRTCC Conversation points:

Intact shoreline goal (armor removal) – Count projects if they are approved and funded but you don’t necessarily need to have permits to be counted. There is still a possibility that new armor go in and measuring by project does not include new armor going in. How to make sure net reduction is measured by accounting for new armor going in? What about sea level rise? This is based on what fish need. If new armor goes in because communities are threatened by SLR, it will come up during the analysis / bin portion. How was “removable armor” determined? The total miles of armor were calculated using the sum of the [Beach Strategies](#) GIS armor data, and subtracting the three lagoon communities, Navy and ferry infrastructure, and High Intensity zoned areas. It is realized that there are other properties with armor that are currently included in the “miles of removable armor” metric that are not actually removable due to risk to private property. SRTCC is not proposing removing 100% of Island County armor. Is the armor data Best Available Science? Yes, we are confident this is defensible.

Culverts – The 50-year target is set at 100% ( a deviation from the 80% PFC target) due to the Supreme Court Decision setting precedent on removing all (State) barriers. The 10-year target of replacing 16 barrier culverts in Area 1 is ~20% of the known (or suspected) private and public barrier culverts. Targets for Area 2 will be set once the Area 2 Inventory has been completed in 2022.

Pocket Estuary Connectivity – The historic acreage was calculated using digitized T-sheet GIS from the [UW River History Project](#). The current status of acres of accessible pocket estuarine habitat was calculated using the GIS data associated with Beamer et al (2018) “GIS Census of Pockey Estuaries Accessibel to Juvenile Salmon in the Whidbey Basin and Western Shore of Whidbey Island, 2014”. The vast majority of the pocket estuary habitat that is required to be restored to meet PFC is concentrated in 6 areas: Livingston, Iverson, N Davis Slough all in Area 1, Useless Bay, Maxwelton and Cultus Bay in Area 2. SRTCC decided to set the 10-year target to the acreage encompassed by the Area 1 estuaries. It is recognized that if opportunities arise in Area 2 estuaries, they would count toward meeting the target despite not being in Area 1.

The same 80% PFC science is being applied to nearshore, culverts, and estuaries. Is the study that broad? It was originally for riverine habitat. No one has produced anything better yet. How will adaptive management play out? It seems like we know the barriers so how would we change our approach for adaptive management. We may know the current barriers but over time, conditions change.

#### **Decision –**

Armor – Targets as written are good.

Culverts – Targets as written are good.

Pocket Estuary Connectivity – Have the 10-year goal be the total acreage of high priority locations in Priority Area 1 in goals – Iverson, Arrowhead, Livingston, and Triangle Cove

#### **Next Steps –**

Make sure Stillaguamish and SRSC get a copy of chapter update for review.

Ensure Livingston is added to the Historical GIS layer and adjust the PE targets accordingly.

#### **4) Salmon Recovery Plan Update Approval**

Dawn shared edits that she received for the recovery chapter updates for changes that will be made. SRTCC members shared ideas for improvement.

- Add appendix of reference materials used, inventories, limiting factors analysis.
- Inset map for reference to study areas on page 27.
- Page 15 – Somewhat conflicting sentences. Either remove the paragraph or clarify the better understanding of how fish use the nearshore.
- Bottom of page 14 – last sentence continuing onto next page is an incoherent sentence.
- Page 16 - Cite sources when including specific numbers of project = increased fish. Remove sentence of “pocket estuary restoration resulting in...”
- Check for technical fish jargon

Do we need to crosswalk this with the old plan to say what is staying and what is being replaced? Consider doing that and more clearly indicating what and where the changes happen.

Use language in the adoptive resolution to clarify where the old plan continues and the new plan replaces it.

Action – Dawn and Keith will get together to draft resolution language to be prepared ideally for work session.

Any action to adopt a plan must be included in a public hearing.

Take to work session. Tell Board to take it to a public hearing. Consent agenda to set a public hearing. Then usually two weeks later there is a public hearing. It will take about 4 weeks from first meeting to public hearing. They can adopt it at the public hearing.

**Decision –**

It is ok to push out the approval into the next month. Aiming for November Work Session.

**Next steps –**

Everyone send edits to Dawn by October 2

Final approval of document at the October SRTCC meeting.

**5) Adjourn**

Next meetings:

Oct 16 – Camano Library – Final Plan Update approval, future projects, 2020 Timeline, potentially Iverson Project Report

**Nov 20** ?– Coupeville – Project development, 2020 Grant Round Prep, discuss climate change supplemental