



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Island County - WRIA 6

6/17/2020 1-4pm

Virtual Meeting

\*Audio Recording of meeting is available upon request

## 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),

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Ann Prusha (IC DNR), Lori Clark (ILIO), Ryan Elting (WCLT), Ameer Bahr (RCO)

---

## 1) Introductions

## 2) Updates

- Meeting Notes Approval – May
- Laura had her baby! Baby Samuel is doing great. She will be back in September.
- PSP:
  - Puget Sound Day on the Hill – Virtual meetings (almost) every Friday, featuring discussions with different elected officials. Pre-Registration is required.
  - Staff will be furloughed this summer, 1 day a week through the end of July, and then once a month after that until Jan 2021. They are working this out now.
  - Meetings will be held virtually until at least September.
  - They currently have a freeze on hiring.
- ILIO:
  - Please send any questions to Lori.
  - They are creating a structured decision making (SDM), values-based approach and are trying to engage partners. She can give an update at the next meeting.
  - The Habitat Strategic Implementation Advisory Team (SIAT) approved the ILIO recommendation to fund the Near Term Action (NTA) that helps advance PSNERP projects and which our part will focus on supporting a feasibility study in North Livingston Bay.
- Others:
  - Funding and SRFB: SRFB asked for a 15% reduction, which would have come out to about \$2000 taken from outreach and education. However, RCO redirected funds from a position that received allocation but was put on a hiring freeze.
  - The Salish Sea Marine Survival Symposium, likely in November 2020, will feature results for a synthesis of research from the last 5-6 years.

- The Greenbank project: Dawn forwarded the final report. After the final billings from contractors come through in June, we will know how much can come back to us. It is estimated to be around \$70-90k. This project could not be arranged to be affordable or beneficial for fish. The GBBC have decided to cease looking for salmon recovery funding.
- Planned Project Forecast List (PPFL):
  - This will be a 2-year look at what projects are likely to be proposed for salmon recovery funding. RCO will use the PPFL's to inform their request for legislative funding. We do not need to rank and approve for these projects. We need put forward a best faith effort that these are projects that will be proposed. Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is also requiring an updated 4-year workplan. We need to do this next meeting in July so it's ready to go by Aug 14 due date.
  - SRTCC needs to discuss strategies. There are serious difficulties and barriers with inundation projects, especially involving neighboring private property, wells, and septic systems. Jessica will bring in talking points about this because the projects are not insurmountable. We do not need to cancel this strategy, but we should talk about a pivot.
  - Lori commented that we are looking more at a local integrated approach to all Vital Signs. This applies to the ones in Island County as well as in the Salmon Recovery Plan. It is important that we work on this together, bring these difficult barriers forward, and figure out how we can have these hard conversations. We need to consider how we can get behind more difficult projects to influence change in Island County.
- The WCLT has requested a letter of support for the Livingston Bay Restoration Feasibility and Design Project and their application to the NFWF for grant funding. The group is in favor. Dawn will provide a letter to Jon Decker on SRTCC's behalf.

### 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 submits the 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 SRFB 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.

- Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition: This project will have a direct, positive impact on the region and Camano Island. SRTCC agreed that we can give them a letter of support (if requested) and some funding, but not have them be our primary recipient. Florence will probably be funded by other sources. However, the other projects (Hoypus, Polnell, Nearshore Tool Implementation) may not be funded unless we fund them. If the end goal is benefiting fish, then Florence scores the highest. Anything given to Florence is a handshake loan, and we may not get it back. However, if they are overfunded, we can request to get our funding back first. If they are able to, the Stillaguamish Lead Entity would try to help us with the Livingston project in later phases. The Livingston Bay Project is important to the Stillaguamish Lead Entity, as well. Providing funding for them is good for our relationship with them. The group discussed the amount of funding that this project should receive, and decided \$200,000.
- Hoypus Point Armor Removal: Hoypus and Polnell are relatively small dollar amounts. The group decided to fully fund Hoypus and Polnell, and then figure out how to allocate the rest.
- Polnell Point Road Armor Removal Feasibility & Design: Same as Hoypus Point Armor Removal.
- Nearshore Protection Tool Implementation
  1. **Discussion with the project sponsors**: Comments from SRFB Review Panel have been addressed, and this project is now more geographically-focused. The North Livingston area has ranked in the top 1% of priorities with the Nearshore Protection Prioritization tool. The restoration feasibility report, funded with ILIO funds, will determine the next steps to determining if an inundation project will be available in the North Livingston Bay area, including the Leque parcel (NOT the WDFW Leque site – different project). The WCLT are attempting to acquire other parcels in the area with other funding sources. There is one landowner in this area that is unwilling to sell right now though they are willing to have their property looked at during the feasibility study. The full PSNERP project will only be able to be realized should this landowner change their mind and agree to sell. The appraisal will determine the value for these properties. There is hope that the lower tideland property will be donated or sold below market value. If the acquisition is less costly than the funding amount, they are hoping to use the remainder for other projects with the Lead Entity. This tideland property has value because it helps lock in connectivity. The parcel has some small opportunity for aquaculture, which this acquisition would prevent. The WCLT is building off of the momentum of Port Susan Bay projects, including large acquisitions of the Bay by the WCLT and TNC. It is tough and expensive to determine how far the tidelands extend – they are basing this on Island County parcel data. There will be complexities with this project, which is why they're getting more funding for feasibility. This is a starting point. Because PSAR funding is delayed, they wouldn't be getting any until July 2021. This timing aligns with the next round for Conservation Futures Funds (CFF), nicely. Utilizing CFF to protect property for this project also enables the future use of M&O funds for restoration efforts. To begin the appraisal, they need \$10,000. They could get the ball rolling with under \$50,000. The ILIO's funding focuses on feasibility. From the ILIO perspective, this is the kind of project that all partners and stakeholders can work together on. It is a multi-benefit project. It would be implemented with the WCLT, Fish and Wildlife, and the Conservation District.
  2. **Discussion for funding allocation**: The updated grant proposal went into PRISM today. John Lovie read it, and reported that the changes were all addressed in today's discussion. The group decided to move forward with final ranking today. There was discussion that some parts of this are not salmon recovery related. This project protects beneficial areas. It is unlikely to see aquaculture due to the proximity of private

residential property. The Dugualla Bay – Ducken tidelands project received funding because there was an application in to designate it for shellfish growing operations. The WCLT is not likely to use all of the funding that they have requested, and is hoping to get the tideland parcel donated. We are not Livingston Bay’s only funding source. There was discussion that the amount of funding seems very expensive for the acquisition of 34 acres. Others commented that it was a reasonable estimate. WCLT submitted the funding amount because they will not know the amount for certain until the properties are appraised. We can likely reduce the funding amount and still have some certainty that it will be enough to acquire the proposed parcels. This proposal is to fund the Nearshore Protection Tool implementation. The WCLT will use funding for this acquisition, but we will still have to approve any spending from remaining funds. It would give them some assurance that they have funding for other acquisitions. The WCLT could also decide to close out the project and return unspent funds. If we fully fund Hoypus and Polnell and give \$200k to Florence, the WCLT is still left with the bulk of our funding, even if we get less back from PSAR and Greenbank than we are expecting. We will know this for sure in June 2021. The group decided to allocate the remaining funding after Hoypus, Polnell, and Florence projects were funded.

- General funding allocation discussion:
  - John put together a spreadsheet with different funding scenarios (thanks, John!).
  - There was discussion about allocating funding cuts if we receive less than expected. The group decided give the remainder of funding to Livingston after providing the below allocation to the other projects.

**DECISION:**

**All agreed to allocate funding to the projects in the ranked order as follows:**

- 1. Hoypus Point Armor Removal: \$170,488**
- 2. Polnell Point Road Armor Removal Feasibility & Design: \$149,355**
- 3. Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition: \$200,000**
- 4. Nearshore Protection Tool Implementation: All remaining funds (currently estimated at \$605,000)**

**4) Adjourn**

Next meetings:

- July 15 – PPFL review, Lessons Learned
- Aug 19 – Lessons learned actions, bylaw review

## Island

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

## 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
<a href="#">Florence Island Tidal Wetland Acquisition</a>	20-1092	Pat Stevenson	Stillaguamish Tribe	Cleared	Acquisition	571 Acres, 11,600 ft shoreline	\$ 4,910,200	\$ 980,000	\$ 5,890,200
<b>Total</b>							<b>\$ 4,910,200</b>	<b>\$ 980,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,890,200</b>

## **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.