

**WRIA 14 Lead Entity Workgroup  
Mason Conservation District Board Room  
7/20/2017**

In attendance	
Evan Bauder, MCD	Brandon Palmer, Port of Shelton
Margie Bigelow, WDFW	Mitch Redfern, MCD
Brian Combs, SPSSEG	Laurence Reeves, CLT
Jonathan Decker, GPC	Gary Schuyten, Citizen
Jennifer Holderman, MCD	Sarah Sedgwick, MCD
Jim Irving, Citizen	Erik Schwartz, MC
Jeanne Kinney, TC	Bill Young, Citizen
Paddy McGuire, Citizen	Sarah Zaniewski, Squaxin Island Tribe
Amber Moore, PSP	

**Housekeeping: Conflict of interest discussion**

Since the June 2017 meeting, a few scenarios have come up that may lead to a conflict of interest. To address these and any others arising in the interim, a round robin was held.

Evan	Not participating in decision making on the committee
Paddy	No conflict of interest
Brian	Declared conflict of interest as project sponsor for Fish Passage Inventory and co-worker is project sponsor for Madrona. Identified as a project partner on Riparian Enhancement. <b><i>Committee decided no perceived conflict of interest because it's a community standard to list parties that support but don't receive a financial benefit.</i></b>
Mitch	Declared conflict of interest as a project sponsor and cosponsor of Riparian Enhancement and Fish Passage Inventory. Co-worker is project sponsor for Harstine.
Jeanne	No Conflict of Interest
Erik	Possible perceived conflict of interest since Fish Passage Inventory may prioritize a county culvert for design. <b><i>Committee decided no perceived conflict of interest because too prospective.</i></b>
Margie	No Conflict of Interest
Sarah	No Conflict of Interest
Brandon	No Conflict of Interest
Bill	No Conflict of Interest
Gary	Wife may provide product to Madrona landowner; <b><i>Committee decided no conflict of interest at this time since the transaction is prospective.</i></b>
Jim	No Conflict of Interest
Laurence	Declared conflict of interest as project sponsor for WRIA 14 Habitat Acquisition Assessment and project partner on Riparian Enhancement.

### **Housekeeping: Process review and next steps**

As the 2017 grant round wraps up under a modified process, the group will reconvene in Sept 2017 to debrief, propose changes and discuss next steps with the freshwater strategy. Members shared a few preliminary thoughts; conversation will continue:

- Only 10 members were eligible to participate in the final approval of the list; winnowed down from 20
- Maintaining the community contribution is essential; the guidance for the Citizen's Advisory Committee is prefaced with a restatement of SRFB mission of making progress towards salmon recovery in a systematic way
- TAG members without a conflict of interest and who have capacity participate on the Citizen's Committee. Serving on both groups ensures the mission of each group are preserved.
- Candace Penn is a citizen/tribal member who also works for the Squaxin Island Tribe. She would like to participate in her capacity as a citizen and not as a tribal employee. Current committee policy states only one voting member from an organization. She is a citizen regardless of what organization she works for or her knowledge base. It's more important to consider where she lives.

### **Ranking discussion and approve list to submit to the SRFB**

The Committee began the discussion with:

*Are there projects that give you pause? Could this project compromise the credibility of SRFB investments? Why?*

#### McLane Cove Acquisition

- Cost: The application proposes full development cost for a property with areas that may be undevelopable. Proposing this cost removes the risk from landowner and places it on the public. This situation makes committee members "uncomfortable."
- On the other hand, shoreline habitat is at a high level of risk due to development. This property will provide good ecological benefit and is essential for anadromous species. A portion of the lot is developable. No matter the cost we need to protect shoreline habitat; once it's gone, it's gone.
- Once the appraisal is complete, negotiation can begin. In limited circumstances, RCO may pay up to 10 percent more than the appraised market value. Project sponsor intends to work quickly to obtain appraisal and initiate negotiation so any return funds can be distributed to other projects on the list.
- The Review Panel reached out to the County after site visit about development prospects. County responded that a path to development is likely for this property.
- Property costs are rising in Puget Sound; capitalize on opportunities now.

#### WRIA 14 Riparian Restoration

- Should SRFB money go towards this kind of work? What are the impacts of knotweed infestation to salmon?
  - It takes hold easily and dominates the landscape, eliminating plant biodiversity which comprises bank stability especially during high precipitation which corresponds with critical times in salmon life cycle. Other basins in Mason County have achieved control, defined as 97% eradicated. These successes were accomplished through early detection/rapid response. Maintenance is also more cost effective.
  - In the past SRFB/RCO have heavily scrutinized these projects, requiring additional information to ensure project success. This requirement lead MCD to begin with assessment work ultimately leading to an approach supported through the literature and effectiveness evidence.
- Are there other fund sources more appropriate to do this work?
  - Aquatic impacts are greater than terrestrial. With that aside, USDA money is providing 50% match for this project.

#### Fish Passage Inventory

- Reduced cost by utilizing existing Green Diamond data? Don't want to see duplication of efforts. Can volunteers and interns be utilized to lower cost?
  - Project sponsor cannot make an estimate at this time on how these suggestions may impact budget but will keep them in mind as options to achieve additional cost saving in the future.
  - Data set may also be outdated; although required to maintain an HPA, updates may occur more frequently in some areas over others due to priorities of the company
- These types of assessments have a shelf life; how can this data remain relevant?
  - This work identifies a point in time, how impacts progressed since the last survey and what sites to continue tracking into the future.
  - This work helps support on the ground projects into the future.

#### **Additional considerations (community impact and education; cost) and Final Ranking**

##### Bulkhead Removals: Madrona Beach and Harstine

- Madrona has good qualities—location, willing landowners, unknowns are minimal and decrease in cost since last grant round; dock is a concern for some TAG members but can be addressed through design and product that minimizes footprint and allows light to penetrate. Design work has been done; also has high value for community impact and education
- Harstine is less certain (stability of imported soil), concrete bulkhead remains; blockage is 300 ft up the stream; beach conditions are already fairly natural
- ***Committee approves moving Harstine to 6<sup>th</sup> in the ranking.***
  - Harstine is not as cost effective (what is this project accomplishing that nature isn't taking care of already; critical piece of this project is removal of concrete which isn't possible);

- Uncertainty about stability of imported soil for plantings since no major excavation can occur on the site due to cultural resources
- The need to implement this project isn't time sensitive especially with natural processes already accomplishing some of this work and due to the appearance that the bulkhead is rapidly deteriorating. Most critical to remove kreosote pillings.

Should Madrona Beach be ranked higher than WRIA 14 Habitat Acquisition Assessment?

- Knowledge is power and getting this information for a good price. In addition, most of the costs in this project go towards due diligence and outreach, directly leading to on the ground projects.
- How do you maintain timeliness with due diligence elements? This project proposes to take two properties through this process with acquisition subsequent.
- Community impact: Madrone Beach has a high level of impact in the community; landowners are community leaders and are happy to host their property as a demonstration site.
- Best acquisition parcels are already known; why not fund actual construction before another assessment?
- ***The Committee failed to bring a motion to rank Madrona Beach over Habitat Acquisition.***

***WRIA 14 LE Committee approved following list to submit to the SRFB for funding:***

- 1-Fish Passage Inventory; Funding Request: \$80,158.
- 2-McLane Cove; Funding Request: \$95,000.
- 3-WRIA 14 Riparian Restoration; Funding Request: \$69,915.
- 4-WRIA 14 Habitat Acq; Funding Request: \$28,403.
- 5-Madrona Beach Bulkhead Removal: \$95,000.
- 6-Harstine Island Bulkhead Removal: \$28,403.