



HCCC Citizens Advisory Group CAG Ranking Meeting Summary 9:30AM, June 26, 2018

Location: Hood Canal Coordinating Council Office

Attendees:

Richard Wojt
Lisa Bellaveau, TAG representative
Linda Streissguth
Julianna Sullivan
Alex Gouley
Lee Swoboda
Becky Mars
Monica Harle
Cheryl Baumann
Randy Lumper
Thom Johnson
Alicia Olivas

Not in Attendance:

Ron Gold
Chris Jones

Purpose of meeting: Develop regional ranking recommendations of the 2018 Lead Entity project proposals to bring forward to the Citizens Committee for discussion.

Public Comment: Alicia conveyed concerns expressed to her via phone and emails from a Ken VanBuskirk around a proposed project which impacts the Theler trail located in Belfair. "While it may be a worthwhile project it needs considerable more public input. The trail is the responsibility of the NM school district and has been in disrepair for 6 years now. Many in the public would like to see it restored to its original condition and there has not been much media about this project." Several related documents and emails were distributed to the members of the CAG prior to this meeting for consideration.

Potential conflict of interest disclosures were discussed by the group. It was noted that it is important to the process to disclose of any potential conflicts of interests. The group discussed the level of conflict if a member was also a member of a sponsor's board. The board member would not have a financial benefit and therefore did not have a "primary" conflict of interest according to the HCCC Advisory Groups Operating Rules. The group determined no recusals were necessary due to conflict of interest.

The group reviewed the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) recommendations. Lisa Bellaveau, TAG member, was in attendance to address any concerns. The TAG considered sequencing of projects across a watershed, importance of protection projects, monitoring needs and how data would be used on the ground. The CAG received copies of the technical ranking, the cost-benefit qualitative responses, and scoring analyses.

Other considerations for the CAG review were presented. The CAG was given an update of funding status of the 2016 and 2017 habitat project lists and the need for a recommendation for funding across the two lists. They discussed the funding types for the 2018 grant round and the requirements, certainty, and timing of SRFB (including monitoring), PSAR (regular) and PSAR (Large Capital) funding. Regional monitoring project funding is to be from our local allocation of SRFB, however, state-wide, we are capped at \$350,000. It is anticipated that there will be a higher ask, state-wide, therefore, there will need to be a state-wide ranking by the SRFB Monitoring Panel. If the Hood Canal project does not rank above the funding line, the project cannot be funded on our list this year.

The group was briefed on the Hood Canal summer chum recovery status and next steps. A copy of the [*Priorities and Immediate Needs, 2018 Call for Salmon Habitat Projects*](#) was distributed to each member as well as two-pager on Hood Canal summer chum status and next steps.



HCCC Citizens Advisory Group CAG Ranking Meeting Summary

9:30AM, June 26, 2018

The group reviewed the geographic distribution of projects and felt the distribution of the top half of the project list (most likely to receive funding) aligned with the call for projects and summer chum needs as well as Skokomish chinook. The CAG noted the return of Skokomish River spring chinook should be in the news.

The CAG looked at the 2018 project list initially by project type, considering implementation needs, risks, and phasing.

- Construction projects that are ready to go or not ready to go, and what will the contractors availability be like with other projects to implement simultaneously?
- Protection projects, noting the timing of funding, risk of property sales or timber interests, and the overall risk of protection projects not moving forward.
- Planning/design projects, noting the highly technically ranked projects were heavily skewed toward acquisition and restoration vs planning and design, prioritizing “shovel ready” projects over planning projects.

The group discussed the possibility of phasing some projects to get more work on the ground. The group discussed the regional monitoring project and the possible funding scenarios if it is ranked state-wide within the allocated amount or not, and how the funding or need to skip the project for funding, impacts the remaining list.

Technical Ranking	PRISM #	2018 Lead Entity Projects Proposed	Requested Amount	Large Cap Request	Total Project Cost
Large Cap	18-1235	Skokomish R USACE Project Implementation		\$7,175,486	\$ 8,528,943
1	18-1230	Duckabush River Protection	\$131,000		\$ 154,250
2	18-1236	Skokomish R RM 5 LWD Enhancement Construction	\$729,781		\$ 858,526
3	18-1234	Skokomish R RM 5 Side Channel Reconnection	\$1,831,693		\$ 2,154,934
4	18-1225	*Lower Big Beef Creek Acquisitions PSAR	\$ 2,695,100	\$ 2,695,100	\$ 3,695,100
5	18-1232	Skokomish R Confluence LWD Construction	\$2,636,035		\$ 3,101,218
6	18-1239	Snow Cr Middle Reach Forest Protection	\$126,515		\$ 151,900
7	18-1227	Lower Big Quil Floodplain Acquisitions 2018	\$439,902		\$ 517,902
8	18-1242	Union R Summer Chum Out-migration Assessment	\$102,497		\$ 190,140
9	18-1233	Lower Skokomish R Mainstem LWD Design	\$227,211		\$ 227,211
10	18-1228	Dosewallips R Powerlines Acquisitions and Design	\$306,274		\$ 360,323
11	18-1231	Duckabush R Oxbow Final Design and Restoration	\$202,419		\$ 242,419
12	18-1226	Big Quil R Moon Valley Reach Preliminary Design	\$146,645		\$ 183,306
13	18-1237	Snow Cr Middle Reach LWD Design	\$178,014		\$ 178,014
14	18-1238	Snow Creek-Salmon Creek Reconnection Feasibility and Alternative Analysis	\$199,291		\$ 199,291
15	18-1229	Duckabush R Estuary Restoration Design Support	\$103,242		\$ 129,052
16	18-1240	Tahuya River Snowcap Floodplain Planning	\$38,698		\$ 45,813
17	18-1241	Lower Hood Canal Wetlands Restoration SRFB	\$268,083		\$ 906,780
		Total	\$10,362,400	\$9,870,586	\$ 21,825,122
	construction				
	acquisition				
	planning				
	monitoring				

There are two proposals that are applying for Large Capital PSAR funding: 18-1235 and 18-1225. These projects were technically scored and ranked along with the other projects for vetting purposes. Projects submitted for PSAR Large Cap funding must be submitted separately to RCO. If a portion of the project were to be funded out of the regular allocation, that piece must be a standalone project and must be removed from the overall Large Cap project. 18-1225 could be split into two projects by parcels boundaries. 18-1235, if not ranked well on the Large Cap list and not likely funded, could be removed and



HCCC Citizens Advisory Group CAG Ranking Meeting Summary 9:30AM, June 26, 2018

project 18-1234 would remain on the regular list. The sponsors will have to make the decisions which project moves forward after the release of the Large Cap ranking.

The group discussed the concern of projects that ranked high on the technical list are also the highest cost, leaving a large disparity in implementation of projects. The group felt the monitoring project filled a high need in recovery efforts. Two projects in particular were able to be phased, 18-1225, 18-1232. Phasing and funding the highest priority portion of the project would allow funding of a few more projects which are also a high priority.

18-1225 needs to move forward with the priority habitat to protect and restore for salmon recovery is in the lower reach. There was concern voiced of UJW not willing to sell part of the properties, but Forterra is bridging the loan for all the parcels. If phased, funding would need to be sought for the remaining uplands which are a high risk for logging. A call to the sponsor during a break clarified the lower reach of the parcels could be protected for \$1 Million, as a standalone project that is fully funded.

18-1232 is in the final stages of design and a call to the sponsor informed the group that the project that stems across two areas, North Fork and Swift Creek in the South Fork, could be scaled to one or another. The Swift Creek piece is approximately 60% of the cost.

There is uncertainty around 18-1242 receiving funding due to the state-wide cap on monitoring funding. If the project is not ranked in the funding line, it will not rank. The group decided by consensus to move the project from #8 to #4, above the funding line. If the project does not qualify for funding the funding will move to the next project on the list.

18-1227, is an acquisition project that builds off of past projects. It is important to keep the momentum moving on the work in the area, but the requested amount is based on anticipated parcels needed for acquisition and can be scaled back and still achieve the goals.

The group decided to move the project 18-1232 to the funding line, below #7. At this ranking, the project is partially funded and if funding were to move down the list, this would be the first project to receive funding.

The technical ranking would apply to the remaining projects on the list.

The group discussed the project 18-1241 which has mixed community support around the trail and the pond that was once in the location of the project. The nearshore restoration would be the last piece in a larger restoration plan across the Union River Estuary. Salmon recovery funding would be appropriate for dike removal however recreation funds would be appropriate for the trail. The group decided the cost compared to the benefit to salmon did not warrant funding of this project and the group decided by consensus to remove the project from the list.

Reviewing the list of projects and the various options for funding, the group decided by consensus to recommend funding according to the following list:



HCCC Citizens Advisory Group CAG Ranking Meeting Summary

9:30AM, June 26, 2018

2018 HCCC Lead Entity Citizens Advisory Group Recommendation

Rank/Status	PRISM #	2018 Lead Entity Projects Proposed, <i>Project Sponsor</i>	Requested Amount	PSAR Large Capital Funding	SRFB/PSAR Funding	Alternate Funding
Large Cap	18-1235	Skokomish R USACE Project Implementation, <i>Mason Conservation District</i>	\$7,175,486	\$7,175,486	(see #3)	
1	18-1230	Duckabush River Protection, <i>Jefferson Land Trust</i>	\$131,000		\$131,000	
2	18-1236	Skokomish R RM 5 LWD Enhancement Construction, <i>Mason Conservation District</i>	\$729,781		\$729,781	
3 or Large Cap (18-1235)	18-1234	Skokomish R RM 5 Side Channel Reconnection, <i>Mason Conservation District</i>	\$1,831,693		\$1,831,693	
4	18-1242	Union R Summer Chum Out-migration Assessment, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$102,497		\$102,497	
5 (or Large Cap)	18-1225	Lower Big Beef Creek Acquisitions, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$2,695,100	\$2,695,100	\$1,000,000	
6	18-1239	Snow Cr Middle Reach Forest Protection, <i>Jefferson Land Trust</i>	\$126,515		\$126,515	
7	18-1227	Lower Big Quilcene Floodplain Acquisitions 2018, <i>Jefferson County</i>	\$439,902		\$300,000	
8	18-1232	Skokomish R Confluence LWD Construction, <i>Mason Conservation District</i>	\$2,636,035		\$1,003,480	\$1,632,555
9	18-1233	Lower Skokomish R Mainstem LWD Design, <i>Mason Conservation District</i>	\$227,211			\$227,211
10	18-1228	Dosewallips R Powerlines Acquisitions and Design, <i>Jefferson County</i>	\$306,274			\$306,274
11	18-1231	Duckabush R Oxbow Final Design and Restoration, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$202,419			\$202,419
12	18-1226	Big Quilcene R Moon Valley Reach Preliminary Design, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$146,645			\$146,645
13	18-1237	Snow Cr Middle Reach LWD Design, <i>North Olympic Salmon Coalition</i>	\$178,014			\$178,014
14	18-1238	Snow-Salmon Reconnection Feasibility & Alt. Analysis, <i>North Olympic Salmon Coalition</i>	\$199,291			\$199,291
15	18-1229	Duckabush R Estuary Restoration Design Support, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$103,242			\$103,242
16	18-1240	Tahuya River Snowcap Floodplain Planning, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$38,698			\$38,698
Remove	18-1241	Lower Hood Canal Wetlands Restoration SRFB, <i>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</i>	\$268,083			
Total			\$17,537,886	\$9,870,586	\$5,224,966	\$3,034,349

Projected Allocation

Large Cap:	no allocation (Projects ranked across Puget Sound)
SRFB:	\$1,129,961
PSAR:	\$4,095,005
Total:	\$5,224,966

Alternative funding sources for projects listed on the 2016 and 2017 lists has allowed for projections of funding to move down the list to fund alternate projects. The Lower Big Quilcene Design Project was listed on both lists. Depending on which list the project receives funding determines the funding level of the remaining alternates below the project on each list. By funding the Big Quilcene Design project on the 2017 list, alternate funding will be made available to the Skokomish River Mainstem LWD project. Alternatively, by funding the Big Quilcene Design project on the 2016 list, the Tahuya River Estuary feasibility project would receive funding. The TAG recommendation was to fund the Big Quilcene Design project on the 2017 list. The CAG determined their recommendation to be consistent with the TAG's recommendation as the Tahuya feasibility would be the beginning of a very large effort with the Mainstem LWD project is ready for construction.

In the next steps, CAG members will meet with the HCCC Board of Directors for the HCCC Citizens Committee meeting on July 18th. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM.