



Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting – Pre-scoring

Island County - WRIA 6

4/15/2020

Virtual Meeting

Member Participants: Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Paul Marczin (WDFW), John Lovie (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD), Mona Campbell (Business), Jon Decker (WCLT), Hannah Liss (IC Planning), Jessica Côté (Business), Tansey Schroeder (IC Planning), Richard Baker (WWS)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Rivas (PSP), Ann Prusha (IC Natural Resources), Lori Clark (ILIO), Pat Stevenson (Stillaguamish Tribe), Traci Sanderson (Blue Coast Engineering), Lisa Kaufman (NWSF), Ryan Elting (WCLT)

Introductions

Updates

- Meeting Notes Approval – March 5 site visits and Mar 18 Presentations.
- Data collection and monitoring:
 - Beach Seining can be put on hold until next year. This year SRTCC will not use the data. It will be 2021-2022 rather than 2020-2021.
 - Forage fish monitoring is on hold for now. There should not be a huge data gap. For many sites, there are additional months during which sampling occurred. It will be picked up again when possible.
 - There has been mention of monitoring marine mammals while there is less noise in the water.
 - Smolt trap molt migration monitoring has decreased activity. WDFW has shut down gathering out migration data.
 - The Stillaguamish Tribe is monitoring their smolt traps. They worked with the Governor's office – their salmon recovery efforts are critical.
 - Eelgrass monitoring using the underwater camera has been stopped because of the loss of Ken. However, Greg Ridder is continuing with the aerial monitoring.
 - Green crab monitoring is considered essential. For the month of April it will occur, and there is hope it will be approved for May.
 - Fish and Wildlife is not able to do field work to collect data, but are able to analyze data.

- Thank you to Keith for giving us approval to continue our grant round!
-
- Puget Sound Partnership update:
 - The PSP has decided to telework through May 31.
 - Please send questions about projects through RCO. If you can go forward working on it, make sure to have a C-19 protection plan in place.
 - The Day on the Hill has been postponed, likely until the fall. They are sending out a letter of support for now instead. Federal contacts say that their budget process will continue as normal as much as possible. Puget Sound recovery is a key part of economic recovery.
 - There may be something to worry about with the state budget in the next round. Governor Inslee signed the supplementary budget. There were successes for natural resources work. The WDFW increase has been cut. This year, the PSP is still in good shape.
 - There will be a toxic/fish report for public review coming out.
 - The Salmon Recovery Council is coming up (virtually). There were 12 Large Cap applications from 9 watersheds with requests of \$60million. They are inviting projects for full proposals in May. They are updating the regional salmon recovery plan.
 - The Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference was canceled and is back on for virtual live sessions April 21 and 22. Register online. This email has been sent out.
 - THE RCO PRISM outage has fully recovered. Please let your grant manager know if any data is missing.
- NOAA's 5-year status review of Puget Sound Chinook is open for public comment right now.
- The SRFB is developing a targeted investment strategy (looking at what to do with any extra money received above the usual \$18 million). They want to develop a process to make this decision clear, and what to prioritize each year.
- ILIO's meeting ability is limited to approve Technical Committee (TC) recommendations. They are hoping to get the Executive Committee together next month, or do an electronic vote. They are able to continue meeting now during this grant round. The TC decided to take advantage of the Habitat SIL Shared Investment Pilot. There is an extra \$100,000 available if the ILIO picked a project on the Habitat SIL's list. The group decided to put Livingston forward. If approved, it will be funded for \$200k.

Scoring

- Please ask questions and send score adjustments to Dawn and John. Dawn offered to get answers if you need them. Please get everything in by May 18.
- The review panel comments have come back; Hoypus Point, Polnell Point, and Florence are already cleared. The Nearshore Protection Tool requires more information.
- Remember that scoring is important, but it does not absolutely dictate project ranking.
- The Lead Entity needs to submit the final ranked list in August. The review panel has one more round of reviews and may come back with concerns to address. There is time to do this. SRTCC does not want to put forward projects of concern.

[Hoypus Point Armor Removal #20-1124](#)

- Costs: There was discussion around the uncertainty of how to judge how much a project should cost and identify if it is a cost effective approach for specific projects. SRTCC has tried in the past to get cost information about past projects to develop some sort of guidance, but it is all over the board and site specific. The best way to gather information is to ask sponsors during site visits and presentations. The cost spreadsheet attached in prism breaks down costs for this project.
- Certainty of Success: There are uncertainties of scope moving forward due to road issues. The review panel, based on feedback from project sponsors, did clear this.

[Polnell Point Road Armor Removal Feasibility & Design \(#20-1146\)](#)

- Areas and Ecosystem Components: Scorers were able to score the “Geographic Area” however they felt fit, whether it is a priority area 1 or 2 since the border of the areas is on that exact shoreform. But the map is of Areas 1 and 2 are somewhat subjective and nothing special happens on the ground at that delineation. So there is room to score this however the committee members feel is correct. Either way, the difference in scores was small.
- Cost: More information is needed from the Navy, especially about the length of shoreline to be restored and amount of upland habitat (the proposal states 875' of armor removal). However, the costs can be anticipated if more or less shoreline is restored. SRTCC is not yet judging the cost of whole project, but its design. *[Note for Criteria edits: Criteria for costs include language around design vs whole buildout.]* Permitting costs should be less than what was in the budget because it is on Navy property. Design costs may be high due to the unexploded mines concerns.
- Certainty of Success: Permits have not been applied for. This project is in an early but necessary stage of a multi-phased project.

[Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition \(#20-1092\)](#)

- Certainty of Success: This is based on the acquisition of the property only. The threat of this land being used for agriculture, rather than restoration, should be considered. However, the sponsor knows the process well and is likely to do a good job with the acquisition. *[Note: Assess criteria certainty of success comments.]*
- Climate Resiliency and Considerations: Scorers would like more information for climate considerations. This project is about protecting habitat as we go into the future.

[Nearshore Protection Tool Implementation #20-1134](#)

- This project is difficult to rank because it is not for a specific project.
- Areas and Ecosystem Components: The Land Trust would specifically focus on priority 1 areas. They could be able to move other projects forward, and it would help when there is a rush to get funding.
- Watershed Processes and Actions: There should be better criteria for ranking projects like this one – perhaps SRTCC can discuss this later. This project is about acquisition, and is difficult to rank because there is not a specific parcel.

- Costs: Based on the cost/acre of other WCLT acquisition projects, they could likely acquire 1-3 properties based on their request. It will help save money because closing faster typically saves money overall. This is a local project and the WCLT wants to get the best projects for cheapest price and maximize the value of the funding. They are looking at the highest value habitat – this funding is specifically targeting salmon habitat. All of the parcels in priority 1 areas will have salmon habitat. There are checks and balances in place for moving forward.
- Climate: The scores are likely reflect that SRTCC is not judging a specific parcel. Climate change is an adjustment that can be made to the framework or strategy document. *[Note: assess the framework strategy to include climate change]*. SRFB would not spend funds on farmland unless a restoration plan is attached to it.
- Certainty of Success: The WCLT has good reputation, but there is uncertainty around how this project will be implemented. SRTCC would be able to approve project acquisitions. Even if a project gets tossed, another will move forward. There is confidence in the WCLT to identify projects.

Adjourn – 3:02

Next meetings:

- May 20 – Scoring and Ranking

Island

Project Name	PRISM #	Contact	Sponsor	Apr Status	Project Type	Metrics	Grant Request	Match	Total Cost
Nearshore Protection Tool Implementation	20-1134	Ryan Elting/ Jon Decker	WCLT	Needs more Info	Acquisition	~20 Acres	\$ 795,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 940,000
Hoypus Point Armor Removal	20-1124	Lisa Kaufman	NWSF	Cleared	Planning	~325', 0.3 acres nearshore habitat, 1.5 acres incl upland	\$ 170,488	\$ -	\$ 170,488
Polnell Point Road Armor Removal Feasibility & Design	20-1146	Lisa Kaufman	NWSF	Cleared	Planning	~1700' (TBD)	\$ 149,355	\$ 26,731	\$ 176,086
Total							\$ 1,114,843	\$ 171,731	\$ 1,286,574

Draft Applications Submitted to Stillaguamish Watershed Council Lead Entity Program 2020

Project Name	Prism #	Contact	Sponsor	Partners	Project Type	Metrics	Grant Request	Match	Total Cost
Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition	20-1092	Pat Stevenson	Stillaguamish Tribe	Cleared	Acquisition	571 Acres, 11,600 ft shoreline	\$ 4,910,200	\$ 980,000	\$ 5,890,200
Total							\$ 4,910,200	\$ 980,000	\$ 5,890,200