



# Salmon Recovery Technical & Citizen Committee Meeting

Mar 4, 2021

## VIRTUAL SITE VISITS

### Introductions/announcements

Member Participants: Barbara Brock (Citizen, Co-chair), Paul Marczin (WDFW), John Lovie (Citizen), Tom Vos (SWS), Todd Zackey (Tulalip, Co-chair), Jon Decker (WCLT), Jessica Côté (Blue Coast Engineering), Tim Hillman (Citizen), Carson Moscoso (SnoCD), Rick Baker (WWS), Eric Mickelson (SRSC), Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD)

Others: Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (LE Coordinator), Anna Toledo (IC DNR/MRC), Ameer Bahr (RCO), Lori Clark (IC DNR), Jen O'Neal (Technical Review Panel), Steve Toth (Technical Review Panel), Lisa Kaufman (NWSF), Laura Rivas (PSP)

---

### Introductions & Updates

- Planning Commission Mar 8 2pm for SMP revision presentation
- 

### Review of Criteria

- **DECISION:** Approved the suggested edits to the Costs criteria to reflect higher scoring if landowner/community match is offered (not required)
  - Will need to further define what is meant by "strategic".
- 

### Funding Proposal

- Developed and discussed a list of potential project development concepts. The funding is a one-time source and can be Salmon State Capacity (deadline of June 30, 2021) or 19-21 PSAR (deadline June 30, 2023). There is ~\$40,000 available. Offer in awards of up to \$10,000. If this program is approved by the fiscal agent, then SRTCC will further refine scopes for the projects at the Mar 17 SRTCC meeting, followed by RFP by email for the new projects.
- **DECISION:** Recommend the following 4 potential projects:
  - Use up to \$10K towards permit-application -required reporting for the existing design project for the Kristoferson culvert under E Camano Drive (sponsor is Island County Public Works) (19-1578).

- Use up to \$10K towards enhancements for the Nearshore Protection Prioritization tool (add parcels that represent historic wetlands associated with nearshore habitats, identify adjacent parcels under the same ownership and add tideland parcels).
  - Use up to \$10K to enable Skagit Fish Enhancement Group to conduct Correction Assessment Forms (CAFs) on 1-3 nearshore culverts recently identified in the Island County Culvert Prioritization 2 project (#19-1343).
  - Use up to \$10K to enable the Whidbey Island Conservation District to assess private nearshore infrastructure that is currently failing.
- 

## Hoypus Site Visit

- 90% Design by end of March and going into permitting from Phase 2
- Phase 3: Fall 2021-fall 2022
  - Need specs and bid docs
  - Outreach plan
  - Permits
  - Construction
- Goals: Increase quality and quantity for FF
- Beach nourishment 50cy
- 350 linear ft armor, 100CY fill
- Convert ¼ mile of the road to a trail
- Removing the abutment offshore was determined to potentially cause more damage than benefit
  - Depth of footing unknown, would require barge removal
- Budget \$304,000. Ranked well in ESRP Small Grant
- \$154K request
- Construction, planting, monitoring
- Fiber optic line will be protected. It is 3' deep at the beach and likely 5' at the slope toe. Discussing burying wood near the cable to act as an indicator if any erosion happens to get close to the cable. The cables

## Hoypus Discussion

### Technical Review Panel

- History and trends of forage fish presence in area. Can't say if the FF population but can say the use Cornet more than they used to pre-restoration
- Nourishment is a jump start to the system. This site is a transition area between the transportation and accretion zone. Trying to mimic what we think was there before. It is expected the sediment used for the nourishment will move.

- LWD purchase and placement in budget is to replace what should have been there normally. It will help stabilize the upper beach (and fiber optic line). The wood won't be anchored
- Are the 60% designs able to be posted? Yes. The initial feasibility study also had cross section elevations.
- Signage was not included because Parks tries to reduce signage through the park. Maybe we can do a storymap.

## SRTC

- Removing the west side of the bulkhead may affect the near slope but not enough to affect the steep slope on the far side of the trail. The Park wants the processes to occur naturally in this area. If the overhanging vegetation and trees fall, it will be welcome.
- Without anchoring the wood, it may move but will more likely start recruiting more wood. It won't be replaced.
- The abutment will be farther from the shoreline after restoration. It doesn't currently trap or negatively impact LWD recruitment in it's closer-to-the-shore location.
- LWD hasn't been recruited in this area because of the wall. Wood is rarely found on any PS shore in front of a wall. There is no where for it to settle. It generally bounces off and keeps moving.
- Littoral drift is driven by wind waves. This drift cell is strongly impacted by the wood on the beach and contains several small pocket beaches between the Cornet Bay boat ramp and Hoypus Point. Tidal current (episodic and brief and balanced) doesn't drive littoral drift as much as wind waves.
- 

---

## Polnell Point Armor Removal & Restoration Site Visit

- Design work is behind schedule, but current funding opportunities are advantageous and makes applying for construction in this grant round high opportunity
- Area is identified as "Restore High" in PSNERP. Ranked highly on current ESRP list (21-23 biennium)
- No data yet on FF spawning. Juvenile salmon habitat use in Crescent Harbor studied extensively by Skagit River Salmon Cooperative
- Lots of LWD on the beach side without armor (east side of spit) but very little wood on the armored side (west side of spit)
- This scope = final design, bid documents, construction, as-builts
- Planting and maintenance won't need to be extensive
- \$66,524 ask from SRFB, \$428,033 match (ESPR, USFWS transfer from previous project, US Navy). May need to pay for some permit preparation (to help USN) and biological habitat assessment (USFW program is understaffed)

## Polnell Discussion

### Technical Review Panel

- 6 months prior to initial designs. Just to good of opportunity to not apply
- Funding necessary for match. May still need more match for ESRP. Some uncertainty around amount of material to be removed and that may affect budget.
- Lack of design makes it hard to review at this stage.
- Criteria to move project forward. Conditions likely
- Appreciate the large amount of leveraged funding
- Working with the Navy to get a better assessment of unexploded ordinance that may be present. The spit between the point and tombolo was not the objective for target practice. The tombolo was the target.

### SRTCC

- Can the big boulders be sold off? The contractors usually sell them back to the quarry.
- USN doesn't think that archeological concerns would impact

### General Discussion with the Technical Review Panel

- Navy capacity issues will hopefully be alleviated now that the Natural Resources Program Manager is back from extended deployment elsewhere.
- Encourage to keep recap at end. Can avoid conflicting comments from SRTCC and Review Panel.
- Committee use of the LE Review Tab in Prism is super helpful to TRP.
- More photos, less words for virtual tours.
- Continue to provide these opportunities to get feedback from the Review Panel at the end of site visits. It helps clarify for the Review Panel what the local committee may be thinking about each of the projects.