



Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

5/20/2020

Virtual Meeting – (only 1.5 hours due to COVID testing on Camano restricting Dawn’s availability last minute)

Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: Tim Hillman (Citizen), Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Paul Marczin (WDFW), John Lovie (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Mona Campbell (Business), Jon Decker (WCLT), Jessica Côté (Blue Coast Engineering), Richard Baker (WWS), Tansy Schroeder (IC Planning), Kristin Marshall (SnoCD)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Laura Rivas (PSP), Lori Clark (ILIO), Ryan Elting (WCLT), Ann Prusha (IC NR); Amee Bahr (RCO)

1) Introductions

- COVID-19 update.

2) Updates

- Meeting Notes Approval – April
- Dawn asked for updates to be emailed out rather than discussed at this meeting.
- Gwendolyn: There is a potential lagoon restoration. Dawn and Gwendolyn will discuss further.

3) Rank Projects

- In order to vote or rank, you needed to be at site visit or presentations as well as this meeting.
- Matt Kukuk, SRTCC member, prescored but his scores were extracted from final scores because he was unable to attend all the required meetings this year.
- Conflict of interest: Jessica Cote’s scores for Hoypus were removed since she is the contractor for the feasibility study. The WCLT did not provide scores this year.
- Dawn reviewed the existing policy on ranking projects differently from scoring and when that is permitted. The language is from the Lead Entity Guidance manual and included below at the end of these notes. The policy still references old committee structure but is the most recent and is our current guidance.
- Final proposals are due to RCO June 29 at noon. We have some time for revisions. They are final once they are submitted to RCO. It will then be determined if it is cleared, conditioned or is a project of concern by July 29. The sponsors can then either accept conditions or withdraw their applications. LE submit final list to RCO Aug 14.
- After Aug 14, Projects of Concern can either be withdrawn by sponsor, not included on the project list by the LE or presented to the SFRB for appeal. If it is not cleared at the SFRB meeting in September, it won’t be funded and the funding allocated will not be returned to the LE.
- The June 9 meeting with SFRB Review Panel is only to get clarity. It is not an opportunity to negotiate.

- Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition
 - Applying for several funding sources. They have received Fish and Wildlife funding. Doing well in discussions in the PSAR Large Capital program, but has not been ranked yet.
 - Cleared by the SFRB review panel.
 - This project is not within WRIA 6 boundaries, but is adjacent and would be a huge benefit for the region. The Stillaguamish have helped us with funding in the past. It would send a good political message to help them now.
 - It is possible that we would get this funding returned to us if they receive more than what they need. There would be a handshake agreement that, when they are able, the Stillaguamish would try to help fund the Livingston project when it is further along.
 - The Land Trust is opposed to funding this project over the Nearshore Protection Tool. While the Land Trust recognizes the importance of this project to salmon recovery, they believe the project has a good chance of getting funding elsewhere.
- Hoypus Point Armor Removal
 - Other funding applied for includes design and permitting funding for NTA funds. ESRP and USFWS funds have also been applied for. The NWSF does have USFWS funding from another project that is not moving forward and have requested the funds to be transferred to this project. However, it is uncertain this will be successful.
 - Cleared by the review panel with some comments.
- Polnell Point Road Armor Removal Feasibility & Design
 - Other funding for this project is the same situation as the Hoypus project.
 - Cleared by the review panel with some comments.
- Nearshore Protection Tool Implementation
 - The SFRB Review Panel labeled this project as “Needs more information”. The review panel wants to hear more specificity about region and location, landowner willingness, and social context. The comments are directed more at the LE’s strategy. The Land Trust asked for responses from Dawn as the strategy is a product of the LE. Dawn provided comments explaining how specificity and targeted priorities were utilized by the tool’s criteria to apply scores to parcels. The targeted prioritization is also supported by the scoring of the project and then again by the review prior to fund transfer from the Land Trust to a property owner. Comments also addresses the landowner willingness comments.
 - The sponsors will have the opportunity on June 9 to ask the Review Panel for clarification on the comments to better address them in the final application submitted to RCO.
 - Dawn asked other LE’s with similar strategies and was told the first round for these types of projects is the most difficult. Work done with landowners while holding the first round of funding in these projects usually results in developing more demand than current funding enables and lines up opportunities for future rounds of these protect tool project applications. It helps in the first round to have a small geographic area in mind with the backup of applying the tool more broadly if necessary should the first few properties not work out.
 - The Land Trust is suggesting revising their project to target the North Livingston properties. They were not able to include this level of specificity with the original application as the conversations with the landowners were not at a stage to do so. But there have been developments since January. The WCLT is still asking about landowner

willingness. This funding would be for acquisition only. Two landowners are willing, and the other two have stated they are willing to meet with the Land Trust.

- The ILIO recommended funding for a feasibility and scenario study for \$200k from the Habitat SIAT. It is expected to be funded; it was approved by the Executive Committee and everyone is on board. It will begin this fall.
- Dawn stated concern about the political message that submitting this proposal would send. Applying for something that has so many concerns and was rejected in 2012 rather than helping the Florence Island Tidal Acquisition project might not reflect well on our decisions regarding funding priorities. Dawn will get more information about the 2012 and 2013 project proposals and what the Review Panel concerns were at the time.
- There was discussion about this project being modeled after a successfully funded project with the Stillaguamish. For this project, SRFB seemed to be worried about the strategy being too broad (the Stillaguamish's project was more specific location-wise).
- There was discussion about rescoring. Some other aspects of this proposal are going to change, and we need that information as a basis for scoring. We will likely not need to rescore as the Land Trust's proposed changes are in line and in response to what is being requested by the Review Panel. The review panel will likely want to be assured that our strategy is getting large benefits for fish and that the area proposed by the change in scope of this project can be restored. This was a primary concern with the 2012-2013 projects.
- The restoration feasibility study is to determine what is necessary for a meaningful project and if there are interim steps that can happen with willing landowners now for restoration. It will begin this fall. There was discussion about funding this project when the study is further along.
- Having acquisition funding in hand will allow the Land Trust to maximize their funding, work more efficiently, and have access to more opportunities.
- We only lose the money if we decide to take this project to the SRFB as a Project of Concern and they do not approve it. We would have time to pull the project and re-allocate the funding before this.
- If we don't put this project forward this biennium, it will likely be high priority in the next biennium.
-
- Dawn is going to see if any money from Greenbank project will be returned to us.
- There is not enough time to make a final decision today. Final decisions will be made at the June meeting. More information (outcome of Jun 9 clarification meeting with the Review Panel, proposed changes to the project by the Land Trust, details of the 2012 and 2013 project, clarification of time lines and decision points) will be provided before the next meeting to help clarify some questions.

4) NOAA 5-yr Status questions

- Dawn will keep us posted. There will be opportunities for input. They are drafting this right now – if you have input, please let Dawn know.

5) Adjourn

Next meetings:

- June 17 – Final 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

D. Ranking and Approval of Proposal List

(Pg. 20 of LE Guidance Manual)

The Water Resource Advisory Committee will review and discuss the Salmon TAG comments, scoring at a WRAC meeting. These meetings are open to the public, and project sponsors are welcome to attend for the discussion portion of the meeting. Using consensus process, the committee will either accept the scoring and ranking as submitted or change it based on additional community issues criteria and/or the appeals submitted by project sponsors. The Water Resource Advisory Committee's rationale for making changes to the ranking will be clearly documented and included in the SRFB documentation when the list of proposed projects is submitted.

The Water Resource Advisory Committee will review and discuss any written appeals to the recommended scoring and ranking that have been submitted by the project sponsors prior to making their final decision on the official ranking. Based on their review of the Salmon Technical Advisory Group's recommended ranking and the project sponsors written appeals the Water Resource Advisory Committee will determine the final ranking of the projects. Adjustments to the final scores and project ranking will be made if the Water Resource Advisory Committee believes that the project sponsors appeal is valid. The Water Resource Advisory Committee may determine that the project sponsor's appeal is not valid or does not warrant a change in either the score or the ranking of the project.

Once the Water Resource Advisory Committee has officially adopted the ranked proposal list it will be submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board with a full documentation of the ranking process that was followed. The final adopted ranking by the Water Resource Advisory Committee is final. There will be no other appeals allowed after the WRAC has formally adopted the project ranking.