



Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting Meeting Summary July 06, 2017

The meeting began at 9:30am with introductions, review of the meeting purpose. The purpose of the meeting is to develop regional ranking recommendations of the 2017 Lead Entity project proposals to bring forward to the Citizens Committee for discussion. The technical ranking and recommendations provide the basis for the HCCC Citizens Advisory Group evaluation and ranking.

CAG attendees		
Cheryl	Baumann	North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon
Thom H	Johnson	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Chris	Jones	Pacific Seafood
Becky	Mars	Kitsap County
Monica	Harle	Hood Canal Environmental Council
Linda	Streissguth	Kitsap County
Julianna	Sullivan	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Ron	Figlar-Barnes	Skokomish Tribe
Other Attendees		
Alicia	Olivas	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Stephanie	Porter	Pacific Seafood
Evan	Bauder	Mason County TAG Member
Lisa	Belleveau	Skokomish Tribe TAG Member
Hans	Daubenberger	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe TAG Member
Marc	McHenry	US Forest Service TAG Member

The agenda was reviewed and the group approved. There was no public comment.

The group reviewed the disclosures of potential conflicts of interest of the CAG members present at the meeting. The group agreed that all members present did not have reason to recuse themselves from project-specific discussions due to conflict to interests.

Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Recommendations to CAG

Representative members of the TAG were present to discuss recommendations and answer questions on TAG scoring and evaluation process.

TAG members discussed final recommendations on Moon Valley Reach – Acquisition Support project in which requested amendments were submitted prior to the CAG meeting. The TAG member present and two members by email voiced support for the project to remain on the list and no longer be labeled as a project of concern. The budget was linked to the deliverables such as the hydrologic assessment and conceptual designs. This strengthened the proposal and the group felt expectations were more clearly communicated. TAG members thought a linear path and timeline would further strengthen the project and add clarity to landowner outreach objectives. The recommendation is to start with landowner outreach on process; then conduct hydrologic assessment components for conceptual design, then use conceptual design for estimation of land appraisals, and lastly circle back to landowners with design and land appraisal estimations to determine feasibility. This process will result in a better understanding of landowner willingness to prepare for a preliminary design phase.

CAG members discussed other options for the sponsor to pursue than a full appraisal process which is likely to expire before funding is realized to acquire needed parcels. An acquisition strategy could include a range



Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting Meeting Summary July 06, 2017

of costs for acquisitions and easements that could inform landowners. There was a discussion around the amount of hours allocated to site mapping and prioritization and whether it offered significant value to the design process. The CAG asked TAG members if they felt the sponsor address their comments by the amendments. The response was that their concerns have been addressed.

The group looked over all the TAG recommendations and discussed the basis of the technical ranking. The group acknowledged the TAG deferred discussions in relation to funding to the CAG as the purview of the TAG include technical merits of each project including: high regional importance with benefits to priority salmonid species and stocks, certainty of success, cost effectiveness, and cost for benefit received. CAG members in attendance of the TAG meeting felt the TAG adhered to these criteria.

The group reviewed the TAG recommendations for the technically ranked list. It is as follows:

1	<u>17-1052</u>	Big Quil Rip. Protection
2	<u>17-1060</u>	Salmon Cr Bridge W Uncas
3	<u>17-1053</u>	L Big Quil Final Design
4	<u>17-1054</u>	Moon Valley Reach Acq
5	<u>17-1056</u>	Snow Cr Watershed Assess.
6	<u>17-1055</u>	Snow Cr Riparian
7	<u>17-1058</u>	Tahuya Watershed Assess.
8	<u>17-1059</u>	Union R Reach Planning
9	<u>17-1057</u>	Tahuya R Estuary Restoration

The CAG members in attendance of the TAG meeting explained the recommendations to look into the split decisions around the Salmon Creek Bridge ranking as well as the cost estimate determination of the Lower Big Quilcene Final Design versus the construction of a bridge cost estimate. The group discussed the certainty of funding completing a project or the risk of a project and previous investments being lost if funding is not realized.

The action scoring for the Salmon Creek Bridge project was lower due to the determinations of keystone actions when the bridge was thought to be fully funded. If the road crossings on Salmon Creek had been identified as a keystone action, the project would have the highest technical scoring on the list.

TAG members noted that Salmon Creek summer chum and Snow Creek summer chum are the same stock. It was also noted that prioritization scores were never intended to be the sole source for determining ranking of a project. The technical merits of a project as listed above are included in the technical evaluation. The HCCC prioritization document has limitations and it takes the technical reviewers to assess the project details.

The group decided by consensus that the Moon Valley Reach – Acquisition Support project would remain on the list and would no longer be labeled a project of concern.

Funding Updates

Alicia Olivas gave an updates on the State budget, current standing of projects from the 2016 grant round, and the estimated funding line for the 2017 grant round. The 2017 estimated allocation for Hood Canal is \$1,129,961.



Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting Meeting Summary July 06, 2017

Group Evaluation of Project List

The CAG evaluated the list of projects using the technical recommendations of ranking as a basis for discussions and the following considerations:

- regional priorities,
- funding availability,
- cost/benefit,
- community support,
- education to community,
- economic implications (socio-political), and
- Likelihood of priority action being achieved.

The group discussed funding strategies including the benefits of funding acquisitions and restoration versus planning and design. The need to get work completed needs to be balanced with work being developed. Sequencing of work is important and often acquisition and design go hand-in-hand. Some of the assessments include on-the-ground project surveys. One project on the list, the Lower Big Quilcene River Final Design, is considerably more expensive than the other projects and if funded would use most of the estimated allocation of funding and it could need more funding in the future depending on how the acquisition and planning processes progress. Even so, allocated to this project will keep the momentum going and the project will keep moving forward. In the case of partial funding, the project sponsor will need to commit to deliverables in the grant agreement. The State capital budget leaves this project in an unknown status of funding need due to pending requests for Floodplains by Design and Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) grants. There is likelihood of funding for either of these sources of funding.

The group considered options to fully fund the first four projects including a consistent cut (approximately 7%) across all four. This would result in the sponsors having to either adjust expenses, scope, or both.

The Big Quilcene River Riparian Protection project had consensus support to remain at number one on the list.

The Salmon Creek Bridge project had a split vote from the TAG. The ranking of the project below Lower Big Quilcene Final Design puts it at risk of not being funded. The group discussed the likelihood of this project finding funding to complete the project. They currently have a funding shortfall of 8%. They requested a cost increase from RCO and were turned down. The group thought the project could find other funding if needed but there was risk of losing previous investments in the project if they do not find other funding. The project, if funded would allow for a complete action and will get work done that has important salmon benefits. There have historically been landowner issues in that area and we have an opportunity to fund Jefferson County Public Works to get it done. There is risk it cannot happen otherwise.

The Moon Valley properties are only six parcels with abandoned hobby farms allowing for a better restoration plan across the entire reach. The group considered moving the project to number three under the Salmon Creek Bridge project. This is a low cost project that would benefit the overall design in the reach and further the investment on the previously funded 2016 project. There is likely to be more community support with six landowners and the Skokomish Tribe owning land across the river. Moving the project to number three would allow for full funding of this project and overall the funding would move forward a balance of two on the ground projects and two design projects.



Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting Meeting Summary July 06, 2017

There was consensus from the group to move the Moon Valley Reach – Acquisition Support project to number three followed by Lower Big Quilcene River Final Design at number four.

The group then considered the ranking of the next two projects; Snow Creek Watershed Assessment and Snow Creek Riparian projects. There was a discussion around the funding need for the riparian project as a 2016 project includes Snow Creek Riparian. The funding is not currently approved through the State legislature and it is likely to not fully fund the proposed scope of the 2017 project. The cost/benefit discussion was extensive with the TAG and some CAG members felt the TAG ranking is best. Other CAG members felt the riparian project put action on the ground and was beneficial to the education of the community and offered opportunities for outreach making landowners more receptive to further the assessment work. The last survey in the watershed is nine years old and conditions can change significantly in that amount of time. The group noted the TAG discussed the importance of issues with the sediment budget and the reconnection of the Snow Creek and Salmon Creek as well as the importance of knotweed and the implications on the riparian habitat also resulting in increased sediment into the creek. Five CAG members voted in favor of keeping the technical order of the projects with three members in favor of changing the order of projects technically ranked at #5 and #6. The projects kept the technical ranking.

The group of projects discussed were the Tahuya Watershed Assessment, Union R Reach Planning, and the Tahuya River Estuary. The Tahuya Estuary project had concerns and the need for modeling. In the event that this project receives funding. The group would like the scope amended to remove the engineering design of the bridge and focus on modeling and conceptual designs of alternative options to bridge replacement. The group had consensus around the stipulation of the Tahuya Estuary project and the overall ranking of these projects.

Becky Mars motioned to accept the list as it stands. Chris Jones seconded. The motion passed by consensus. The final recommendation of ranking is as follows:



**Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting
Meeting Summary
July 06, 2017**

2017 HCCO Lead Entity CAG Ranking Recommendation				Estimated SRFB Allocation:		\$1,129,961		
CAG Ranking	TAG Evaluation Ranking	project	Name	Normalized TAG ranking	average raw score	SRFB Request	CAG Funding Recommendation	Running Total
1	1	17-1052	Big Quil Rip. Protection	1	93.4	\$82,660	\$82,660	\$82,660
2	2	17-1060	Salmon Cr Bridge W Uncas	4	89.9	\$145,472	\$145,472	\$228,132
3	4	17-1054	Moon Valley Reach Acq	3	89.1	\$45,463	\$45,463	\$273,595
4	3	17-1053	L Big Quil Final Design	2	92.6	\$962,732	\$856,366	\$1,129,961
5	5	17-1056	Snow Cr Watershed Assess.	5	86.0	\$199,847		
6	6	17-1055	Snow Cr Riparian	6	84.1	\$114,567		
7	7	17-1058	Tahuya Watershed Assess.	7	82.3	\$229,124		
8	8	17-1059	Union R Reach Planning	8	79.9	\$122,635		
9	9	17-1057	Tahuya R Estuary Restoration	9	76.4	\$287,134		



Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Ranking Meeting Meeting Summary July 06, 2017

Next Steps

The Citizens Committee Meeting will take place at the HCCC Board of Directors Meeting on August 12, 2017 at 1 PM at Olympic College. A parking pass will be needed and was distributed to CAG members.

The meeting was opened up for feedback on the 2017 lead entity process. The group gave valuable feedback on what is working and on what should be considered in the next steps for the 2018 RFP process.

Overall comments include:

- The process is improving every year
- More funding is needed
- The prioritization document is written as guidance and needs revisiting
 - It is a great starting point, but what needs updating in the stock scores, issues and actions?
 - Dig into the scores and add (+/- 1) refinements
 - How broad is the inclusion of partners?
 - Review status and trends
 - There has not previously been a lot of involvement in reviewing document, but now people have seen how it has been used.
 - A consultant did the work and voting to approve the document occurred while review was ongoing.
- RFP process
 - What projects did not come forward due to RFP? Nearshore?
 - Survey partners, sponsors, and TAG
 - The process is based on valid thinking to cut projects that will not get funded before extensive effort is put forth. Focus capacity to develop the highest priority projects.
- Interaction with sponsors has great benefits and discussion was around when in the process was a good time for this. Presentations before the application development or presentations after application development results in different levels of formality of feedback.
 - We can better document comments to sponsors by collating TAG feedback.
- There needs to be updates to include the West Kitsap area priorities for Summer Chum recovery
 - Adjustments need to be data driven
- We need to understand where projects have been done and what still needs to be done.
- 2018 RFP is now on a tight timeframe in order to tap expertise and refine. Meetings to discuss priority watershed needs will need to happen soon.
 - Expand for agency review; NOAA, USFWS, ...
 - Include county and tribal experts
 - Alternate funding sources?
- Consider climate change adaptation
 - Should be included in the RFP itself
 - Questions should be considered in the Letter of intent about resiliency.

3:00 PM

Adjourn
