

HCCC IN-LIEU FEE MITIGATION  
INTERAGENCY REVIEW TEAM (IRT) MEETING  
June 15, 2015  
10am – 3pm  
HCCC Office - Poulsbo, WA

IRT Participants

Patricia Johnson, Department of Ecology  
Gail Terzi, Army Corps of Engineers  
Cyrilla Cook, Washington Department of Natural Resources (by phone)  
Cynthia Rossi, Point No Point Treaty Council  
Kathlene Barnhart, Kitsap County  
Roma Call, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe  
Steve Todd, Suquamish Tribe  
Linda Storm, EPA  
Donna Frosthalm, Jefferson County  
Zach Hughes, NOAA Fisheries  
Chris Waldbillig, WDFW

Non-IRT Participants

Patty Michak, Hood Canal Coordinating Council - Sponsor

Review and approval of April 13, 2015 meeting notes – No revisions were made by the IRT. Notes will be finalized and posted to HCCC website.

Nearshore Tool

Navy staff (David James, Mike Schwinn, and Cindi Kunz) attended the meeting to review the Nearshore Assessment Tool development.

- A final version of the Nearshore Tool is available. Document was finalized on June 5, 2015. David thought that it had been sent to the IRT but it has not yet been distributed. David will send the link to access the document.
- A general discussion of the Tool occurred with IRT members commenting on both the Tool methodology and the development of the Tool. The following are topics/issues that were raised:
  - loss of habitat types in model – special habitats
  - methodology of VEC's across all nearshore forms – loss of resolution, likelihood of false negatives
  - Navy asked: shift to HGM's? geomorphic approach – this seems to have been lost
  - regulatory connections not made, doesn't track issues/needs of agencies
  - issues of scale – not able to address small scale impacts
  - how designate assessment area – not clear, may not capture indirect impacts, need some level of guidance to users for consistency; needs to be defined
  - precision and repeatability needed
  - Navy suggests use of COE Institute of Water Resources (IWR) – modelers review
  - Possible to use IWR – need credit/debit and all other issues for integration, HEA analysis (fish only) how to apply?
  - need a tool Puget Sound wide but brings in other geomorphic issues
  - need IRT support before others review

- local and state jurisdictions have issues to address –Ecology utilizes a geomorphic approach, needs consistency to regulatory approach
- suggest use Shipman landform, break to function groups, still be able to identify specific or important habitats
- use data collected in the development of the tool and stratify by shoreform
- calibration sites – unknown representation by shoreform types
- lack of calibration site distribution in HC, limited to public lands in a large extent and lack of sites across jurisdictions (counties)
- expansion out of HC not vetted through IRT
- value assessment of habitat types
- lack of transparency on how VEC's feed into habitats
- Navy requested an MOA with HCCC and/or IRT members
- IRT needs to review revised version before determining what the next steps are; were comments/concerns of reviews addressed?
- next steps:
  - Navy to provide link to documents
  - IRT to review
  - possible use of IWR review

#### Irene Pond update and draft Mitigation Plan review

A draft Mitigation Plan was provided to the IRT for review. Some initial comments on the document:

- change the term nuisance species to noxious weeds – need a definition of what weeds are an issue; reference Mason County and/or State's noxious weed list
- risk assessment – need to mention risk to the property/habitat from possibility of logging
- provide credit calculation sheets as an appendix
- clarify size of wetland scoring area – document refers to the 11.9 acres of wetlands on-site versus the full wetland that extends off-site
- revisions needed to discussion on Long Term Management and Maintenance (LTMM) plan discussion; credit release (10%) tied to fully executed LTMM plan
  - once executed release credits and formally enter long-term
- monitoring needs to cover the full site not just the enhanced buffer area
  - need to establish monitoring transects across the full site
  - need to describe control of noxious weeds based on level of coverage
    - threshold for implementing control – baseline level or 20% coverage
  - encroachment to the site is identified but make sure address full site
- develop a second performance standard for the rest of the site outside of the buffer enhancement area
- no tolerance for knotweed on the site
  - HCCC concurs and will work with the county for control of knotweed within the road right-of-way; plan discusses monitoring of expansion and proposed control should additional knotweed be found
- yellow flag iris on-site – need to determine a control action – access to the plants will be challenging as some are only accessible by boat
- credit release for as-built submittal – separate from year 1
- need to prepare a separate document for the Public announcement – select segments of the mitigation plan
  - summary

- map
- monitoring standards
- brief summary of impact project

**ACTION ITEM: IRT comments due July 15, 2015**

Port Gamble update

- Pope Resources/OPG are in discussions with DNR concerning tideland ownership; unknown at this time where the tideland ownership line will be established; there is the possibility that some of the mitigation footprint will be identified as state owned aquatic lands and would then be under DNR management; does this impact the projects ability to generate credits?
  - DNR can issue a conditional easement over the mitigation project footprint
  - mitigation site protection instrument would provide protections on the property greater than that with DNR management
  - credit could still be generated within the footprint as the project would afford a higher level of protection and the protection would be in perpetuity
- HCCC is talking with agencies and Anchor QEA about the possibility of integrating the mitigation project into some of the permitting being completed for the clean-up project
- asphalt removal – quantity and cost analysis presented to the IRT. Discussions with Ecology and Anchor QEA staff concerning the toxicity of old asphalt indicates that impact is low; however the recommendation was to not pulverize the material but bury large chunks of the material under the deep fill.
- planting options – a cost analysis was presented for three planting options; 1) current plan to fully plant a “riparian area” (as shown on the 30% design) and hydroseed the remaining area; 2) plant to 200 feet from MHHW and hydroseed the remaining area; and 3) plant the full site with a lower density at the area farthest from the shoreline
- cost estimates based on the current 30% cost estimate show that the site can be fully planted but some cost savings may need to be identified as the full planting slightly exceeds the available budget
- updated habitat credit generation – the Excel spreadsheet was updated based on the changes to the planting area and identification of the upland area that is being converted to intertidal habitat. It is proposed to utilize a conversion factor for the area of degraded upland habitat being restored to intertidal habitat that is less than 1. The ecological rationale was based on the degree of lift generated by this action including; added food chain support, increased productivity, and indirect benefits to subtidal.
- IRT member asked: why was this rationale not considered in the development of the Instrument? IRT response: Just didn’t think this way.
- how to compare to impact site? benefits, food chain support, shoreline process restoration
- IRT review of 30% design and credit generation – needs acceptance at this point
- no net loss federal rule – no net loss in area and function; still trade-off of habitat type but achieving functions
- trade-off of resources - subtidal
- need to carry resource trade-off consideration to next credit sale cost and number of credits
- design question – need to make sure that upland fill slopes are stable

**ACTION ITEM: IRT comments due by June 30, 2015**

**ACTION ITEM: HCCC to verify fill slopes are stable and utilize appropriate stabilization methods**

Overview of other potential marine receiving site

- reviewed a number of other opportunities for marine shoreline mitigation
- HCCC will continue to track these and other opportunities as they arise

Next IRT meeting

- co-chairs will send a list of dates in August that they are available
- HCCC will send a Doodle Poll to IRT to schedule the next meeting