

**Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
MEETING SUMMARY
January 17, 2018, 6:30-8:30 pm
Carnation City Hall, Carnation**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Spiry	Snoqualmie Tribe, Chair
Henry Sladek	Town of Skykomish Councilmember, Vice-Chair
Chris LaPointe	Stewardship Partners, Non-profit Organization Representative
Peggy Shepard	City of Snoqualmie Councilmember
Jason Walker	City of Duvall Councilmember
Trevor Kostanich	City of North Bend Councilmember
Brian Bodenbach	SVGA Citizen Representative
Becky Chaney	Citizen Representative

Other Attendees: Matt Baerwalde, Joseph Old Elk & Dave Steiner, Snoqualmie Tribe; Jamie Burrell, City of North Bend; Dawn Huss & Matt Distler Oxbow Farm & Conservation Center; Ed Hazen & Sue Holbink, Raging River Conservation Group; Jordan Grant & Jessica Lange, Sound Salmon Solutions; John Velimesis; Tim Woolett, City of Carnation; Josh Kubo, King County; Charlie Kellogg; Dylan Brown, King County Council; Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish County; Perry Falcone, Elissa Ostergaard, Beth leDoux & Laura West, Forum Staff

MEETING PROCEEDINGS

I. Introductions, Updates and Announcements

Cindy Spiry, Forum Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and led off introductions.

ACTION: The Forum approved the minutes from the November 15, 2017 meeting.

Update on Citizen Representative Selection: Elissa Ostergaard, Snoqualmie Salmon Recovery Manager, shared that Becky Cheney's seat is up as of this month. The County Executive offered to reappoint Becky if she is willing to sit for another term. Becky stated she would let the Forum know at the next meeting.

Puget Sound Net Pens: Elissa Ostergaard, Snoqualmie Salmon Recovery Manager, informed the Forum that King County has issued a six month moratorium on net pens in Puget Sound. The County may renew the moratorium repeatedly until they renew their Shoreline Master Plan. The three King County salmon recovery groups (Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, Cedar/Lake Washington, and Green/Duwamish) prepared a joint statement in support of the moratorium, and it was presented at the King County Council public hearing on January 8th by the Co-Chair of the WRIA 9 Forum, who is a Councilmember from the City of Covington.

II. Stories from the Field – Dave Steiner

Dave Steiner, Habitat Restoration Program Manager for the Snoqualmie Indian Tribe's Environmental and Natural Resources (ENR) Department, presented on the habitat, water quality, and education projects the department is working on in WRIAs 7 and 8. ENR has 14 current active habitat restoration sites in WRIA 7 and 3 in WRIA 8. Dave highlighted the Tolt-MacDonald Park Restoration project, which is a 20 acre site that was in need of noxious weed control, enhanced tree canopies, monitoring, education, and

stewardship to provide adequate habitat for the wildlife that use the site. In phase I, ENR designed educational signs with cultural and historical information. Phase II is currently underway with tree plantings and ongoing maintenance. Since the project began, they've already seen adult salmon and juvenile salmonids there. To date, they have removed and controlled 10 acres of noxious weeds, planted over 10,500 native trees and shrubs along 2,800 linear feet, and hosted 6 volunteer events with 200 volunteers contributing over 700 hours. The project is funded by a King County Flood Control District (KCFCD) Cooperative Watershed Management (CWM) grant, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tribal Implementation Funding, Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust (through National Fish and Wildlife Foundation), and King County Parks. ENR is also working with EPA on a few monitoring projects, looking at riparian shade and temperature simulations.

Cindy Spiry remarked on the importance of partnerships and the City of Carnation's involvement in Phase I.

III. Chinook Yearling Pilot Study Results

Josh Kubo, Water Quality Planner at King County, presented on the results of the Chinook Yearling Pilot Study. In late-Summer 2017, pilot study surveys were done on the mainstem Snoqualmie and a select few tributary locations, looking for yearling Chinook salmon to learn more about them. Josh explained that there are two types of Chinook salmon in the Snoqualmie: sub-yearling and yearling. In most years, the majority of the population is sub-yearling. However, up to 30% of adults that come back are yearling. So while a smaller percentage of the juveniles are yearlings, more are surviving. We don't know a lot about the life history of the yearling cohort and much of our habitat work is focused on the sub-yearling cohort. They weren't sure they would find any yearling Chinook in the study, but were surprised to find 40 yearling Chinook at 10 out of 18 of the mainstem sites. All 40 were found in one habitat type on the mainstem Snoqualmie River: sand/gravel bar edges (no wood or vegetation), whereas coho were found almost everywhere. A comprehensive follow-up study is needed to sample further across seasons, times of day, and locations. This information could inform restoration and juvenile rearing strategies, increase support for coordinated WRIA 7 activities, as well as lead to increased habitat connectivity, improved bank conditions, and improved summer habitat conditions.

Discussion

Brian Bodenbach, SVGA Citizen Representative, asked if there has been any association between particular runs of Chinook and yearling or sub-yearling fry that come out of those runs. Josh said there is variation year to year but the observed data set is limited. Further studies would help them get a better idea of the proportion. Brian followed up by asking specifically about a run from the Raging or Tolt Rivers. Josh replied that they haven't looked at that, but yearling Chinook end up everywhere; there might be a certain location producing them, but they end up coming back everywhere. Brian mentioned back in 2004-2005 he had a conversation with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Snoqualmie 205 project (widening Snoqualmie Falls), in which the WDFW staff mentioned that similar projects had impacts on salmon spawning. The Army Corps of Engineers was supposed to do mitigation by creating off-channel habitat, which never happened. Brian heard via word of mouth that they weren't obligated to do this mitigation by law, but that not doing so violated tribal treaty rights. Brian asked if anyone else knew anything about this.

Dave Steiner asked if similar studies have been done on the Skykomish. Josh said there hadn't, but that a follow up study might generate the interest of other partners to look into it. Yearling Chinook are also very common in the Skagit River Basin so it is possible they will be found elsewhere.

John Velimesis noted that temperature would be an important variable and the use of thermistors in the next study might be helpful.

Beth leDoux, Forum Technical Coordinator, added that there is a technical memo that goes along with the study that she'll send around and will put up on the website.

IV. 2018 Cooperative Watershed Management (CWM) Grant round launch

Beth leDoux presented on the launch of the 2018 CWM grant round. Beth stated that we have \$897,324 allocated in funding from KCFCD (increased from 2017 with inflation) and we'll likely have some return funds this year from projects that came in under budget or were discontinued. Beth noted that most habitat projects should have a focus on Chinook, but we also fund projects for coho and other species. Other types of potential projects include acquisitions and monitoring projects, watershed plan development, and technical assistance to jurisdictions and non-profits. Beth noted that the proposals should span a three year time frame, as a new KCFCD policy makes it harder to add amendments at a later date. The Forum has provided guidance that approximately 70% of our funds go to capital projects like plantings, acquisitions, and project feasibility studies; 10% to monitoring (\$60K was set aside for Tulalip Tribes screw trap, so that leaves about \$30K for monitoring this year); 5% for education and outreach; and 15% for watershed coordination (includes the Forum's technical planning grant). Beth explained that over the course of the last five years which CWMs have been distributed, we are mostly on target for those distributions.

Beth walked through the 2018 grant timeline. Pending approval at tonight's meeting, Beth will send around the solicitation for CWM RFPs. Pre-applications are due 2/8 and the preliminary budget should be within 10% of the final budget. The project review committee will review and provide feedback to applicants by February 16. Final applications are due on April 3rd. Project presentations will be at the April 19th project review committee meeting, for recommendations at the May 18th forum meeting. Pending approval from the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, the KCFCD executive committee will approve the funds sometime likely in Summer 2018. We normally get 18-20 applications.

Discussion

Trevor Kostanich, City of North Bend Councilmember, asked if an analysis of awarded grants and their effectiveness has been done. Beth replied that we haven't done that formally, but we are preparing a failure-mode analysis, to help sponsors predict where the project might fail or break down. This helps evaluate projects before they get funded or submit a proposal. Perry Falcone, Forum Project Coordinator, added that some of older, larger capital projects have had effectiveness monitoring done over a 5-10 year basis, such as channel migration rates and wood recruitment. Cindy Spiry agreed that effectiveness monitoring is a great idea. Beth added that we are always looking to make less effective projects more effective with adaptive management. Henry Sladek, Forum Vice-Chair, inquired about the timing of projects and funding. Beth explained that it depends on the project- NatureVision likes doing it on a school year cycle, but some wait until the next summer for data collection. In 2017, all contracts were in place by October.

ACTION: The Forum moved to approve the timeline and the funding priorities.

V. 2018 Legislative Priorities

Elissa Ostergaard led a discussion on the creation of legislative priority sheets. Elissa explained that WRIAs 8 and 9 use similar documents and she thought it was a helpful way to highlight talking points for

anyone who wanted to lobby on a state or federal level, especially as the State Legislature is in session right now. Doug Osterman of WRIA 9 has gone to Olympia with city council members for meetings with legislators to show how important state funding is for our work.

Discussion

Matt Baerwalde, Water Quality Manager for the Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, shared that he heard there might be something moving forward on the Hirst decision, which might move the state capital budget forward.

Brian Bodenbach commented that the Governor is going to be pushing through a carbon tax and it is only a matter of time before Western Washington experiences a major wildfire with much needed forest restoration assistance. Brian suggested pushing for the carbon tax to go towards that need, to offset climate change impacts of wildfires and floods. Elissa agreed we could add that as a legislative priority and that she would draft something and discuss it further with Brian and others.

Becky Chaney, Citizen Representative, expressed concern around the 2nd bullet on page 14 of the meeting packet: “Support legislation that seeks to provide immunity from liability for entities that implement habitat restoration projects involving the placement of large wood.” Becky thought the language on liability might bring up questions from the public. Elissa agreed that people could read it that way. Henry Sladek asked if there is movement by other organizations or counties to support this legislation. Elissa replied that yes, she got this language from WRIA 8 and she’ll talk to them about it. Trevor Kostanich suggested that it could be re-worded to alleviate the concern. Cindy Spiry asked if the issue is that there are lawsuits from the wood coming loose or people getting tangled up? Elissa replied that it is more of the latter. Perry Falcone added that there can be lawsuits. He also noted that anyone who is placing wood in the river has to be a licensed engineer and has to follow design standards. Elissa concluded that we’ll research it, add in more clarifying language if need be, and send around an updated version.

Trevor noted that the federal funding level is better than we expected a year ago; it is less than we’ve seen in the past, but better than expected.

Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Lead Entity Coordinator, stated she’ll work with Elissa to stay aware of bills that are in flux. Gretchen added the Governor will likely release an Executive Order in mid-February around orca recovery, which could lead to interesting opportunities as orcas rely on Chinook for food.

Regarding the 3rd bullet point on page 11, “Support proposed federal legislation that seeks to increase funding and incentives for green stormwater infrastructure...,” Brian Bodenbach asked if there was a baseline criteria that green stormwater would be based on, such as the Department of Ecology manual. The consensus from the Forum and audience was that the baseline is implemented at the lowest level of adoption of an equivalent manual and that the Washington State standard is higher than the federal standard.

VI. Funding alternatives for Outreach/communications staff

Elissa Ostergaard outlined three ways to fund an Outreach/Communications staff member for WRIA 7, which the Forum decided was a priority. Polly Freeman filled this position previously, but her term-limited position ended in August. Ideally this would be a permanent position to avoid creating a new

scope of work every few years. Elissa ran three scenarios for 2019-2021 with increases for step increases and cost of living adjustments, based on a 1/3 time person, but we can shift to 1/4 or 1/2 if there is interest. Elissa noted that we are waiting to get the final numbers on available cost savings from 2017, and if we applied these, the Forum wouldn't see the full effect of the cost until 2021. We would be looking to hire someone to start in January 2019 to correspond with the King County budget cycle. Elissa walked through the 3 options (A, B, C). Option A: cost savings and increased CWM grant. Option B: cost savings plus increased ILA cost shares offset by CWM grant increase. Option C: cost savings and increased cost shares without offset by CWM grant. Elissa noted that the Forum could also apply to grants for different outreach projects to try to offset funding, but these aren't guaranteed.

Discussion

Henry Sladek voiced appreciation to Elissa for presenting this information and restated that it is a priority of the Forum. Henry agreed that some of the Forum members might have to go back to their councils to discuss further. Henry wasn't immediately sure which option he'd prefer.

Elissa added that the outreach person helps keep the message alive. In the past, this position has helped advertise projects, manage stakeholder outreach, plan events like tours, organize celebrations when projects are finished, lead outreach campaigns like Puget Sound Starts Here, lead social media campaigns to show people how they're behavior affects salmon, reach out to businesses about salmon-friendly practices, and could potentially interface with King County Executive's Clean Water & Healthy Habitat initiative this coming year.

Peggy Shepard asked if Elissa could come to a city council meeting to walk through the options.

Cindy Spiry noted that in the past when the cost share went up, the Forum helped outline all the benefits for the cities to show how it benefits their programs, including input for grant writing, technical support, outreach for volunteer events, etc.

Trevor Kostanich expressed hesitation on option C and asked how others felt. Others agreed a higher increase like that might be hard to swallow. Elissa stated that spreading the cost between the cost shares and the CWM might be a good option, but reminded the Forum that CWM funding goes to projects on the ground, so that option would take away funding from those projects and we would need to re-shift our funding priority percentages. Jason Walker, City of Duvall Councilmember, agreed that option C would be a heavy lift and expressed a preference for option B. Jason states that outreach is a really important part of the Forum, and a good way to reach constituents and their legislators. He also suggested that the Forum re-work the messaging of the increase to simplify it, present it as a lump sum increase, and highlight the benefits, noting that the City of Duvall has really valued the technical assistance provided by the Forum, which was instrumental in advising on city code updates as well as assisting in CWM projects. Henry Sladek agreed a lump sum approach might work, adding an emphasis on outreach and noting increased staffing costs to 3.0 FTE.

Elissa concluded that she will put together a simple one page document that only has one option, with some customization for each jurisdiction about benefits, and could present at the different council meetings if needed.

VII. Representation on Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum

Elissa led a discussion on Forum representation at the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, noting that all Forum jurisdictions are invited, but most don't usually attend. Currently, a representative from

King County Council attends, as does Elissa. She asked the Forum if they want to request that the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum give us a new voting seat at the table, and if we should designate someone to attend (staff or Forum member).

Cindy Spiry said she thinks it would be good to have a representative from the Forum and asked if there is anyone willing to do it. Cindy thinks the Snoqualmie Tribe has staff that attend. Jamie Burrell, Senior Planner for the City of North Bend said she sometimes attends, but it is far away. Elissa stated it would be nice to have an elected official there because there aren't a lot of elected officials at the meetings, but since she attends anyways, she could be the representative. Gretchen Glaub reminded the Forum that this question has come up in previous years, but a decision had never been reached.

Henry Sladek volunteered himself, but noted he would have to look at the schedule. Jason Walker also volunteered, but is only available for the August meeting due to scheduling conflicts. The Forum decided to table the discussion for now until everyone can check their schedules. The Forum will make a decision at the March meeting, and meanwhile, anyone can attend, and jurisdictions already have voting seats.

VIII. Public comment:

Jon Velimesis brought up a Washington State water bill that he had heard discussed by a legislator about a year ago, regarding water supply, restoration, and CSO cleanup, for about \$138M. He asked if anyone had heard a recent status on this bill and suggested that it be part of our legislative priorities. Perry replied that advocacy groups are still meeting about it and he heard the McCleary decision is a big reason why it didn't go through in 2017, but he'll look into it.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 21, 2018, Snoqualmie Tribal Administrative Building, 6:30-8:30p.m.