

HCCC IN-LIEU FEE MITIGATION
INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM (IRT) MEETING
November 14, 2014
1pm – 3pm
WebEx conference call & Poulsbo, WA

IRT Participants

Brad Murphy, Department of Ecology
Gail Terzi, Army Corps of Engineers
Cyrilla Cook, Washington Department of Natural Resources
Chris Waldbillig, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Cynthia Rossi, Point No Point Treaty Council
Donna Frostholm, Jefferson County
Gina Piazza, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kathlene Barnhart, Kitsap County
Roma Call, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Steve Todd, Suquamish Tribe
Randy Lumper, Skokomish Tribe

Non-IRT Participants

Patty Michak, Hood Canal Coordinating Council - Sponsor
Tim Goodman, DNR
Celina Abercrombie, Ecology
Clay Patmont, Anchor QEA
John Laplante, Anchor QEA

10% draft design review Port Gamble Mill site – question/discussion on draft design for the Southern Mill Site

- site plan drawing legend correction – colors for habitat elements not correct
- eelgrass Option 2 – why 2 shades? likely overlap of information layers, will be corrected
- extent of eelgrass could be to -17/-18 feet, just outside Port Gamble Bay eelgrass grows to -17 to -18 feet - within Port Gamble Bay it appears that eelgrass is utilizing habitat to about -12 feet
- upland extent of excavation – what drove limit of excavation? budget was a factor as the amount of material to remove and either dispose of or find beneficial reuse is large. Also looked at reference beach slopes in area to match
- discuss the placement of fill – composition/suitability – additional sampling was done last week in the southern mill site area, results will be available in about 2 weeks. The beneficial reuse of materials is dependent on the final land use, need the data from the sampling but to-date soils exceed natural background; would likely meet open space criteria limits but not a land use like a daycare facility.
- proposed redevelopment of the site – how would that affect the criteria? not certain, need to work with Ecology on clean-up standard and requirements in the Conservation Easement that would protect the site and define land use.
- discussion on natural background for in-water work – need for cap to ensure soils do not enter marine waters as standard is natural background.

- within the area between 240 to 290 horizontal feet does not appear to be much of a change from how the remediation will leave the site – why work here? remediation will also add a cap, the line shown is the excavation elevation, mitigation could excavate further and place a cap with more suitable habitat substrate than remediation; better substrate and elevation for eelgrass.
- trees/logs shown at 125-130 – softshore armoring? not determined yet
- decide on the extent of fill removal versus length of project? – how decide? need to have a transition spot on the shoreline that is stable
- credits? have credits been estimated – looked at it, but need acreage of habitats to enter into interim tool; can get preliminary calculations to IRT once determine footprint
- source of subtidal fill material available? high likelihood that material will be available from Snohomish ; mitigation work would be an add on to the clean-up work
- comment - need for softshore armor likely
- pursue Option 2 – maximize intertidal area and fill removal – even if have to shorten length
- CE – should be written so that it does not preclude any future mitigation actions; IRT will have opportunity to review, party holding CE to be negotiated with; preserve for mitigation
- design - flat as we can – maximize – move 0 elevation as far as we can; less focus on subtidal but keep as an option as budget allows
- formalize approval from IRT for credit generation from intertidal versus subtidal? – Yes, co-chairs to follow-up with those not on the call. Co-chairs and HCCC to work on this.
- Interim tool spreadsheet for December meeting
- revise design documents to reflect that this is mitigation not restoration