

Draft HCCC ILF PROGRAM IRT MEETING NOTES
Port Orchard, WA
June 25, 2013

Attendees: Brad Murphy (Ecology), Gail Terzi (Corps), Cynthia Rossi (PNPTC-Jamestown), Donna Frostholm (Jefferson County), Roma Call (PGST), Steve Todd (Suquamish Tribe), Richard Brocksmith (HCCC), Patty Michak (HCCC), Randy Lumper (Skokomish Tribe), Doris Small (WDFW), Stacy Vynne (PSP), Kathlene Barnhart (Kitsap County), Nancy Brennan-Dubbs (USFWS)

Note Taker: Scott Olmsted (ESA)

May IRT meeting notes are complete and accepted as final.

From the action item list:

In the instrument, provide a list that details the range of impact project types that can use the HCCC interim marine tool. HCCC has been waiting to update the instrument until several revisions have been identified; for efficiency purposes, it is better to make updates in one fell swoop. The first three action items on the list are updates to the instrument. **ACTION: regarding the IRT subcommittee task; be sure to uncheck it as incomplete.**

The IRT was going to draft a letter expressing concerns/perceived deficiencies with the Navy's marine tool. This letter has not been drafted. Some individuals at the Navy know of the IRT's concerns, but nothing formal has been submitted to the Navy. Training manual for the Navy's marine tool should be available by Feb. 2014.

DNR has funding for piling removal and will be completing a number of projects in Jefferson County this summer. These projects have been removed from the draft list of roster sites.

The Skokomish tribe was going to provide a list of piers that could potentially have decking replaced with grating; however, the HCCC ILF Program is not too interested in this work. This work is likely not appropriate for the HCCC ILF Program because pier owners would have to replace the decking with grating anyway if they wanted to modify/work on their piers (work that requires a new permit). There are not many public piers in Hood Canal: Port of Allen, the dock at Twanoh State Park, Triton cove. IRT decision: the Skokomish tribe does not need to provide a list of piers that could have decking replaced with grating. Action item will be marked as completed, with notes.

In general: the action item list will be updated after this meeting and brought to future IRT meetings to be used as a tracking tool.

Freshwater Scoring Criteria:

Patty ran through the revised scoring criteria memo. Many sites remained on the list, but there was some minor movement in the prioritization. To get a better handle on the prioritized list, HCCC needs to get out to the roster areas for field recon and applying the credit/debit tool. The revised scoring criteria memo provides a list of sites that have the most potential for functional lift or should be protected. Do the scoring criteria bias against sites that are developed (the IRT was concerned with this)? IRT does not

want sites to be dismissed outright for being in developed areas. **ACTION: need to provide a definition for “Developed lands” vs “Altered lands.”**

ACTION: Patty will send out the revised scoring criteria memo with tables and maps.

FYI: There are a few Navy projects in the works that may use the HCCC ILF Program to satisfy their mitigation requirements. However, HCCC has not been contacted by the Navy on these projects for any new credit sales.

Most proposed HCCC freshwater wetland mitigation projects to compensate for impacts resulting from EHW2 will generate more credits than needed. These sites could fulfill a credit sale in the future for a future impacting project.

Marine Roster Methodology:

This methodology looks at watershed characterization habitat value scores and PSNERP management recommendations. The “area” of a site was not considered in this methodology (but “area” was considered for freshwater wetlands). **ACTION: indicate on the spreadsheet that habitat value is derived from the watershed characterization and management recommendations are from PSNERP.**

This methodology has not been field verified. **ACTION: send out updated version of marine memo and maps (including maps with marine roster area points).**

The list of marine roster areas is stratified across habitat type for each AMU and is unranked. Once an impacting project is accepted by the Program, filters will be applied to refine the list of potential mitigation sites relative to the specifics impacted habitat type.

Marine roster areas that contain multiple habitat types should rank high on the Program’s roster area list.

Piling projects that will be completed by DNR have been removed from the marine roster area list.

A Foulweather bluff parcel may be available for purchase. This parcel has good potential for protection: It is an important/large feeder bluff. ACTION: Add this parcel to the marine roster list.

The Program sponsor must consider the implications of removing the bulkhead(s) in regards to structures located on and adjacent to the parcel.

There are not a lot of bulkhead removal opportunities in Hood Canal.

Kitsap County conducted a bulkhead removal survey that the IRT can reference; it can be found in the sediment analysis study (at the back of the report).

HEA update from Gail:

NOAA is using HEA more in south Puget Sound. Impact project results in DSAYs, but most people are not sure what DSAYs means from a functions standpoint. Navy initially used HEA for EHW2 and the interim marine tool; the two assessments did not align well. At this time the Corps is not going to use HEA to assess impacts; NMFS is still using it to determine ESA mitigation. Stephanie Ehinger is working

on a regional permit (RPG6) for overwater coverage and is using HEA. Rather than use HEA, the Corps has created a simple assessment matrix, based on HEA, which focuses on habitat types (this work was done for the upper Columbia River). NMFS is willing to consider a simplified assessment matrix, based on HEA and habitat types, for Hood Canal (the assessment matrix is intended to be understandable and transparent). At a later time, the use of this simplified matrix may expand to Puget Sound. A simplified HEA would require less mitigation because of shorter temporal loss, as compared with the HCCC interim marine tool that assumes a temporal loss of 3 years.

South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group is currently working on multiple projects for private applicants, but they do not sponsor an ILF Program.

The King County ILF Program will be implementing mitigation for maintenance projects on Lake Washington. NOAA is asking for mitigation on maintenance/replacement projects b/c impact will likely persist for another 50+ years. King County is setting up a separate account in their ILF Program to track this work: maintenance of bulkheads, boat ramps, and overwater structures.

HEA is not used for streams. Oregon is developing a stream assessment tool, but it's intensive. King County ILF Program has accepted some stream projects and uses linear feet/square feet/ratios to determine the amount of mitigation (debits/credits) on a case-by-case basis. NMFS understands the HCCC ILF Program will be using the interim tool for the next few years. NMFS may use some sort of HEA in combination with HCCC's interim tool for Puget Sound.

EHW2

Marine impacts were of critical ecological importance; wetland impacts were not, but the same methodology used for finding a mitigation site for marine impacts was applied to freshwater wetlands.

In the EHW2 memo, the IRT was unsure which activities resulted in the impacts displayed in the table;

ACTION: put a footnote in the table match up impact area with impacting activity.

ACTION: provide more explanation for the sentence that references DNR, creosote pilings, and a partnership.

HCCC is looking to mitigate for both subtidal and intertidal impacts at one site.

Thorndyke sediment processes project is not feasible because? ACTION: add notes to explain why it is not feasible (also, ACTION: change "feasibility" to "feasible" in the header).

ACTION: flush out the feasibility column a bit more in notes (e.g., Bridgehaven, coordinating with multiple property owners makes this project unlikely at this time/worthy of consideration at this time).

Cattail Creek Causeway project may have already been implemented (or was it Devil's Hole?) ACTION: Switch with Devil's Hole? HCCC to double check.

ACTION: For projects that receive “yes” in all categories, provide a map with big dots as a geographic frame of reference (projects from Table 9). HCCC has the map, but is holding on to it for now (all sites listed in Table 9 are contained in the marine roster area map).

ACTION: in the “notes” section of the table, include the last time landowners were contacted (e.g., June 2012).

At White Rock Cove, is it possible to just remove the bulkhead rather than add bio-stabilization; it is unclear, the feasibility of this work has not been flushed out. **ACTION: in the mitigation actions section, word-smith to read “remove bulkhead, may need stabilization.” Other actions should be word-smithed to only reflect the needed action, not options that address the needed action.**

ACTION: clearly state that the watershed characterization assesses “existing” conditions rather than “potential” for improvement.

ACTION: clarify what the shading of table cells (in gray) represents.

Point Whitney Parking lot roster site: Troutlodge Inc is taking over the facility and has a 30 year lease from WDFW. WDFW is interested in restoration work at the south lagoon (north lagoon is off limits, as is the parking lot and facilities), but not sure if Troutlodge will allow restoration work to remove a dike at this location.

Walkers Creek-“not rated” because ESA only used the PSNERP beach strategies (the not rated represents a data gap); HCCC or ESA can check the other PSNERP strategies to determine the shoreline rating. This site is on the marine list because it has subtidal and intertidal habitat.

Navy is buying sub-tidal land leases from DNR along the marine shoreline on the western shoreline from the floating bridge to near Mason County line. The limits extend to deepwater (~18 ft and lower?) limiting commercial/industrial development; this lease is currently only on the Jefferson County side of the Canal.

Freshwater WL-a few other criteria were considered to identify freshwater sites to mitigate for Navy impacts: shoreline proximity, proximity to impact, functional lift for restoration and protection.

ACTION: weigh preservation less because no functional lift.

ACTION: explain why freshwater was not critical ecological importance and why HCCC still went through the mechanistic approach to offset these impacts (the explanation can be pulled from credit sale document).

ACTION: explain why 20 miles is the cutoff for selecting a freshwater mitigation receiving site (table 10 goes to 15 miles).

ACTION: Would like watershed/ecologically based criteria rather than distance based criteria for “Proximity to impact site” (e.g., within the same basin or the next basin over); they would like it more ecologically based. If the distance based criteria is kept, explain the rationale=20 miles was chosen

because this particular site does not have potential mitigation sites within adjacent subbasins/need to move off of the military base.

Shoreline proximity, proximity to impact, functional lift for restoration and protection: these three criteria have weighting factors applied to them. In theory, different mitigation projects would have semi-unique weighted scoring criteria based on the type of project. The IRT has some concern that this weighting may be arbitrary for each project and scoring criteria. Since the ILF program will have multiple impacting projects feeding into one mitigation site, this arbitrary weighting may not be appropriate. **ACTION: consider not weighting scores.** The marine roster area list will be “fluid” since multiple scoring criteria will change with time, such as ownership, development, and proximity to impact site. The HCCC mitigation site selection process is much different from King County, which owns their sites. **ACTION: IRT members would like to have scoring criteria unweighted.** The scoring criteria total “scores” are fairly tight because initially, HCCC was looking for large wetlands/mosaics that were not highly developed, thereby resulting in the identification of sites, from the get-go, that are fairly similar.

Marine-site selection rationale for EHW2

Is it necessary to have both intertidal and subtidal at the mitigation site? What if HCCC looked for sites that had one or the other habitat type? Would the IRT agree to a resource trade-off if a mitigation site offered a large functional lift and only contained one habitat type? The IRT may consider this for some projects. Consider adding a column to the marine roster list for subtidal and one column for intertidal (the marine roster area memo already has a table that identifies these habitat types by site). HCCC’s subtidal habitat includes vegetated and unvegetated.

Port Gamble site: 2.7 acres, 900 ft of shoreline, intertidal habitat, activity: fill removal. At the southern portion of the site. Property owner would sell development rights to about 9 acres, residential development adjacent to the potential mitigation site. HCCC would increase the size of the mitigation site by grading down to match up with the elevation of eelgrass beds located near the site. Costs:1.5M+ for HCCC project. There is a non-voluntary clean-up of the water portion of the site; there was a breakdown in upland clean-up negotiations.

Walkers Creek barge site-near Dosewallips; there is a proposal in the current Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) process for this project. The project would remove the barge, improve riparian condition and acquire lands. HCSEG is proposing this project in the SRFB process. \$200,000 for acquisition, removal, and planting. Mainly intertidal with limited subtidal. About 0.25 acre of estuarine nearshore and 385 linear feet riparian nearshore.

Private bulkhead north of Hamma Hamma site-590 acres total, 7,500 linear feet of forested riparian, lakes, spring feed streams, upland forest. 8 houses could be built; HCCC would buy development rights, may remove building and pull back armoring. Concrete bulk heads. Landowner is interested, coastal assessment will be conducted to look at feasibility—look at high value areas from bulkhead removal, plus preservation of un-bulkheaded areas. HCCC could buy development rights for the whole parcel with partner; maintain current forestry activities above the road while excluding forestry below the

road. Approximately 2,400 ft of armoring, some could be available for removal, but HWY 101, steep slopes, and historic structures are adjacent to the armoring.

Private marine site-subtidal habitat, proposed to reduce development of the site from 10 acres to approximately 7 acres; there is eelgrass and marine debris (impairing geoduck establishment and eelgrass) according to an underwater survey. Potential mitigation project would reduce the footprint and work with DNR to pick up the lease to prohibit future expansion. IRT has concerns about marine traffic affecting eelgrass (create exclusion areas). There could be permitting issues related to expired permits, which is a landowner issue but HCCC will need to discuss and verify status.

Freshwater sites-a number of properties are for sale. Some have tidal influence.

Summer field schedule-ESA supporting freshwater component. This work will verify and modify roster area scoring based on field assessment.

ACTION: Freshwater-HCCC will develop a list of sites to visit based on location/geographic distribution and provide to IRT so that they can coordinate their schedules accordingly.

Marine-HCCC will do most of this work in-house.

ACTION: Marine-HCCC will develop a list of sites to visit based on location/geographic distribution and provide to IRT so that they can coordinate their schedules accordingly.

Next meeting: 11th September—potentially at Port Orchard, 10-3pm.