



**HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Evaluation Meeting Summary
June 27, 2017**

The meeting began at 9:40am with introductions, review of the meeting purpose. The purpose of the meeting is to assess the 2017 HCCC Lead Entity project proposals and technical scoring in order to determine regional technical ranking and recommendations. The technical ranking and recommendations will provide the basis for the HCCC Citizens Advisory Group evaluation and ranking.

TAG attendees		
Evan	Bauder	Mason County
Lisa	Belleveau	Skokomish Tribe
Joshua	Benton	WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife
N. Eric	Carlsen	North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon
Carrie	Cook-Tabor	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Hans	Daubenberger	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Randy	Lumper	Skokomish Tribe
Marc	McHenry	US Forest Service
David	Nash	Kitsap County
Sam	Phillips	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Micah	Wait	Wild Fish Conservancy
Other Attendees		
Cheryl	Baumann	North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon CAG member
Thom H	Johnson	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe CAG member
Chris	Jones	Pacific Seafood CAG member
Monica	Harle	Hood Canal Environmental Council CAG member
Alicia	Olivas	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Mike	Ramsey	WA Recreation and Conservation Office
Erin	Ryan-Penuela	Puget Sound Partnership
Linda	Streissguth	Kitsap County CAG member
Julianna	Sullivan	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe CAG 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 TAG members and the CAG members that were present at the meeting. Disclosures discussed include:

- Evan Bauder worked with landowners, Mason Co Commissioners, and project sponsors to facilitate project planning on Union River and Tahuya River Estuary projects. Evan will not benefit from the funding of any projects proposed in 2017. The TAG determined he did not have to recuse himself from evaluation.
- Lisa Belleveau works for the Skokomish Tribe and is the immediate supervisor of an employee who would be working on the Tahuya Watershed Assessment if funded. The staff time would be in-kind and used as match to the project. Because there would not be a financial benefit by this project being funded, the TAG determined Lisa could participate in the evaluation. Lisa could have scored the Tahuya projects but recused herself precautionary.



HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Evaluation Meeting Summary

June 27, 2017

- TAG members reviewed the compiled document and were comfortable with the disclosures and did not feel recusals were necessary.
- Of the CAG members present, Chris Jones disclosed his employer, Pacific Seafood, is a partner in the Big Quilcene Final Design project. If the project is implemented in such a way that impedes on the hatchery, the project could greatly effect operations of the hatchery. TAG members discussed the disclosure and welcomed the input from Chris in the evaluation meeting to help the group understand any potential impacts on shellfish.

The group will aim for consensus with recusals noted. The group was reminded that CAG members will not vote during the TAG meeting.

Technical Scoring Review

Carrie Cook-Tabor walked the group through the compiled raw and normalized technical scoring of projects. She noted there was one person who scored Salmon Creek summer chum stock at the Snow Creek scoring level. Marc McHenry responded by pointing out Snow Creek and Salmon Creek Summer Chum are an aggregate stock in summer chum management. Thom Johnson, who was involved in the stock scoring for the HCCC prioritization process addressed the combined stock and how the two stocks align in his thinking of the scoring. It was noted that his score was then averaged with Larry Lestelle's score for the final ranking of stocks. Carrie did an analysis and determined that if all TAG members had increased the score it would raise the overall score but not change the ranking. It was noted that there were two projects that addressed summer chum and were scored as such but there were portions of each of these two projects that incorporated steelhead habitat. Discussion on the issue pointed to the need to look at the watershed especially for sediment transport but that habitat surveys beyond summer chum habitat pointed to steelhead as the focus. TAG accepted the scoring as it stood.

The t-test of normalized scores showed 4 bins of projects. This binning will guide the discussions as the TAG evaluates projects for the remainder of the meeting.

Members discussed the overall scoring of projects, 10 point scale vs 5 point scale, and tips to ensure consistency of scoring across projects.

Funding is currently estimated to be a little above \$1 million for the 2017 grant round. The State Legislature is currently negotiating the State budget which will determine funding need of some of the projects on the list that were proposed last year for various funding sources as match to SRFB funding. The CAG meeting is scheduled on July 6th to address these topics.

Group Evaluation of Projects

TAG members discussed technical merits of each project including:

- High regional importance with benefits to priority salmonid species and stocks
- High certainty of success
- Cost effectiveness for project type and location
- Summarized cost/benefit qualitative narratives

It was noted that project applicants may need coaching or training on project scoping and budget development. Feedback is sought on how project applicants can receive this training.



**HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Evaluation Meeting Summary
June 27, 2017**

In bin #1, the group discussed the Big Quilcene Riparian Protection project and Lower Big Quilcene Final Design. Bin #2 included Moon Valley Reach Acquisition, Salmon Creek Bridge – W. Uncas Rd, and Snow Creek Watershed Assessment. Bin #3 includes Snow Creek Riparian and Tahuya Watershed Assessment. Bin #4 includes Union River Reach Planning and Tahuya River Estuary Restoration.

Bin # 1

The group wondered if the 2016 project had the match funded. The acquisitions are included in the Floodplains by Design (FbD) request that is currently awaiting the State legislative budget decisions.

The group would like the sponsor to inform the CAG on the funding plan if awarded FbD or other match funding. What would be the SRFB need and what funding would be used first? Would any funding request be adjusted or would the project come off the list if other funding is realized? **The group would like the sponsor to identify which properties are currently moving forward for acquisition.** Chris Jones was asked to discuss how the process is currently going in the Lower Big Quilcene restoration planning process. Chris noted the relationships are greatly improved, they meet regularly, and the modeling the shellfish community has asked for has been done.

Acquisition is needed for all the work in the reach to move forward; however, design is needed to define key properties. The design work to date has brought the stakeholders along. The TAG recommends the CAG take note and consider timing and funding of these projects. **TAG requests the sponsors provide information to the Citizens Committee on how they plan to handle a final design in the case a key landowner is not on board. It is suggested they identify a couple options, if not done already, depending on acquisition successes. In this information, discuss sequencing and timeline, decision points, and associated costs.**

Bin #2

Planning for acquisitions along the Moon Valley reach in the Big Quilcene River was determined to potentially be a valuable action for salmon recovery in an important area. However, the TAG voiced concerns over the project as proposed. There was a wide range of understanding and inconsistencies in understanding of the components of the project. The cost benefit of the proposed work was inconsistent with the number of landowners and size of the reach; therefore, the group felt clarifications were important in order for this project to move forward. One member consulted a colleague in the costs and they felt they could be in the ball park but the TAG agreed it depended on what the costs were based on and the proposal did not effectively describe the tasks and objectives and how the budget aligned with such. The group considered the timing of the project as it aligns with other planning work could be important and clarification was needed along those lines as well. Three members voiced they would have scored the project lower if they had this discussion before scoring. Options on next steps on this project included, move forward as proposed but adjust ranking; identify the project as a concern, provide feedback, ask for amendments, and commit to a second technical review of the project; provide feedback, ask for amendments, and have the CAG determine project status and ranking, remove project from the list.

The group determined the next steps are to include **identifying the project as a concern, provide feedback, ask for amendments, and commit to a second technical review of the project, and to determine status of the project during the first 30 minutes of the CAG meeting on July 6th.** A recommendation is to developed at that time to move forward into the remainder of the CAG meeting.

A letter is to be drafted by Alicia Olivas, HCCC LE Coordinator and sent to the sponsor in a timely fashion. The elements of the letter are below:



**HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Evaluation Meeting Summary
June 27, 2017**

June 27, 2017

Dear Moon Valley Reach Project Sponsor,

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) Technical Advisory Group (TAG) determined the proposed project, PRISM # 17-1054: Moon Valley Reach – Additional Acquisition Support, is a “project of concern.” The TAG did not understand the budget and concerns were expressed.

This project, potentially, is a valuable project. As this proposal is written, the value of the project is not going to be realized. The TAG asks/requires the sponsor to amend the project by noon of July 4, 2017 in order to meet the TAG needs for review prior to the HCCC Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) meeting scheduled for July 6, 2017. The TAG agrees to review amendments with a one-day turnaround timeframe.

Please provide the following in your amendments:

- **Describe how “design” of the 2016 Moon Valley project informs the 2017 project.**
 - **Will there be modeling in 2016 project that will inform the need for acquisitions/easements?**
 - **What is the level of modeling and what do you expect it to tell you as far as what is needed?**
 - **How does the 2017 project tie into the 2016 project design?**
 - **Give an outline of the design process. Is the design process robust enough to inform feasibility? Does the 2017 project make the 2016 project more robust?**
- **What are the specific outcomes/objectives that the 2017 project will fund? Tie the budget to the tasks and objectives.**
- **Clarify the landowner engagement to date for the parcels in the 2017 proposal.**
- **Describe the level of parcel acquisition feasibility needed in the 2017 proposal.**
- **Describe how the site assessment component in the 2017 proposal provides benefit to the overall project.**
 - **Describe the sequencing efforts of the 2017 proposal and how the assessment fits in.**
 - **Justify the need for habitat surveys. It seems a more detailed hydrologic and geomorphic evaluation would better inform feasibility.**
- **Provide a proposed approach for prioritization and tie the budget to the specific tasks needed for prioritization.**

The TAG strongly encourages the sponsor to focus the project on acquisition feasibility and show the task-specific line items in the budget, or have a design focus and show the specific line items in the budget. Either way, focus less on the site planning which can be achieved via maps with much less administration effort.

Alicia Olivas



**HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Evaluation Meeting Summary
June 27, 2017**

HCCC Lead Entity Coordinator,
On behalf of the HCCC Technical Advisory Group

There has been a large amount of local funding invested in fixing the fish passage barrier on Salmon Creek. The proposed project would open up habitat up stream that some consider a lot for summer chum habitat and others felt was a small amount. There was concern around the slope upstream of the culvert and the stability of sediment there. Planting is not part of the proposal and it seems important to the project. **The group wants to ensure there is erosion control within the project area and would like future work to be considered upstream to ensure riparian planting is pursued along the reach, possibly by a project partner or other organization.** The group looked at the SRFB Review Panel comments about reconciling “other” expenses and determined the tasks were further described in detail in response to the comments.

Marc McHenry proposed moving Salmon Creek Bridge up in rank to the top of the bin #2, rank #3 overall. Hans Daubenberger seconded it. The group agreed to the move by consensus.

The scope of surveys in the Snow Creek Watershed Assessment is beyond summer chum and the project is scored for addressing summer chum. The river is moving sediment in the upper reaches into the estuary; therefore, the focus on the sediment budget for summer chum is at a watershed scale. Steelhead recovery is coming and if an assessment is going to be in the works, you may as well include steelhead. The priority of this proposal is sediment budget for summer chum and project development. 10% of the habitat surveys are in summer chum habitat. There were concerns around landowner access but the sponsor has a good track record working with landowners and there is hope these limitations can be overcome.

Sediment Budget in Assessment Discussion

The group discussed modeling of sediment in an assessment. Bathometric data is good to use. The hydrologic modeling will give different results from the hydraulic model. Hydrologic modeling is not sufficient to assess the movement of sediment through a system. It is a 1-D model using precipitation and flow levels showing depths and shear. Hydraulic models use flow depths and velocities, are 2-D and more appropriate for sediment transport evaluation. The costs can vary greatly depending on the level of data used, i.e. blue-green LIDAR usage to show cross-sections and thalweg profiles. The budget can vary greatly depending on how extensively the road system and potential sediment sources are considered in the sediment budget assessment. The approach will vary by the contractor selected. It is important to spell out details of specific tasks in regard to the sediment budget analysis and then tie them to the specific outcomes/objectives.

Bin #s 1&2

The group considered the technical ranking of the projects #'s 1-5 across bins #1 & 2. The discussion of the projects focused on the Lower Big Quilcene River Final Design and the Salmon Creek Bridge. The group understood the available funding is likely to fall within the range of project numbers 2-4 but that the funding line decision was in the purview of the CAG evaluation. The TAG understood the funding order in this range will affect the certainty of success of some projects more than others. A partially funded project may affect the cost effectiveness of the project not to mention the extended risk to salmon of a project being delayed.

The discussion around the Quilcene R. Final Design and the Salmon Creek Bridge included past investments in both the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca sub-population of Salmon Cr summer chum and the Hood Canal



HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Evaluation Meeting Summary

June 27, 2017

sub-population of Big Quilcene R. summer chum. The spoke to timing of the projects and the likelihood of funding of future phases vs completing a project with this year's funding. They considered the likelihood of either project finding the remaining funding if partially funded and the level of certainty of the cost estimate projections. Sam Phillips motioned to move the Salmon Creek Bridge project to number 2. Hans Daubenberger seconded the motion. The TAG was split in the decision to move it up with 6 members agreeing, 2 against, and 3 undecided. There was concern about crossing bins in moving projects. The motion carried but the TAG asked the CAG to consider the funding level and the level of TAG support with this recommendation. It was also noted that Salmon Creek summer chum are scored lower in prioritization than Snow Creek summer chum although they are managed as one aggregate stock. Also noted is the keystone action scoring process took place at a time this project was considered fully funded. Members who participated with the keystone action discussion agreed Salmon Creek fish passage at Uncas Rd would have been listed as a keystone action if it was known to have a shortfall in funding. These reasons could have potentially raises the raw scores of the project.

Bin #3

The riparian project on Snow Creek is systematic including identifying the upper watershed extent with surveys. The last survey was done 9 years ago. **The TAG would like the sponsor to check the metrics of treatment and ensure it isn't inflated. It is important to be realistic in the metrics of a project in order to meet the objectives. How a project meets the objectives, as represented in metrics, is reported to NOAA.** It is an important project especially if there is little knotweed as the infestation spreads rapidly as they have noted in other watersheds. The risk of knotweed to riparian habitat is high. There were concerns about landowner engagement. The benefits of riparian work was compared to assessments. The benefits of riparian work on the ground is an investment in a habitat issue that is known to exist. Marc McHenry motioned to move the Snow Creek Riparian project above the Snow Creek Assessment. Randy Lumper seconded the motion. The discussion continued about the projects both addressing an immediate threat (knotweed and sediment) and the sequencing of the two projects. The project movement would cross bins. The cost of riparian work is low and important to address now. Three members voted yes, five voted no, and Carrie Cook-Tabor and Sam Phillips abstained. The ranking remained with Snow Creek Assessment at #5 and Snow Creek Riparian at #6.

Members voiced the Tahuya Watershed Assessment was a more detailed assessment than others but it also included more than summer chum habitat. They are planning on using the hydraulic model (see Snow Creek assessment discussion). The channel is avulsing so it is good to focus on hydraulics rather than hydrology. There is a need to understand what is happening in the system due and development pressures in the system.

Bin #4

Sediment is less of an issue in the Union River and the approach to the project is reasonable to focus on improvement of conditions and develop projects. It was noted that the main limiting factor seems to be instream habitat. The actions prioritization was referenced noting the call for projects missed some important factors. Why put an emphasis on bridges rather than floodplain connection, side channel habitat, and instream habitat? This should be revisited.

There were comments on the cost/benefit of the Tahuya River Estuary Bridge project with concerns voiced. The TAG recommends including other options including restoring channel features beyond the bridge. ESRP is asking for modeling which should help describe the potential benefit of replacing the bridge. **A hydraulic model would help understanding of the ecological benefit of how the river will respond to the change in**



**HCCC Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Evaluation Meeting Summary
June 27, 2017**

channel width. This should be used less to inform the design and more to inform benefits of potential design alternatives. Are there historic maps that show the extent of the salt marsh? It is critical to have the tidal information to calibrate the model. How does restoration affect housing at the mouth of the river? It is recommended that the sponsor step back to the PSNERP feasibility study and focus on continued feasibility only, not beyond.

The group reviewed the ranked list as it stood at this point. 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

Hans Daubenberger motioned to approve the TAG evaluation ranking as it stands to be the technical ranking recommended to the CAG. Josh Benton seconded the motion. The group voted with eight members approving and one member against. The reason for the no vote was noted to be because of the movement of Uncas Bridge project being moved and a recommendation for the CAG to consider the split TAG vote in their evaluation. The motion carried and the list will be sent to the CAG as a recommended technical ranking. Outstanding is the status of the Moon Valley Reach Acquisition Support project status to be determined on July 6th.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.