

**WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council
Meeting Attendees
Bellevue City Hall
May 16, 2013
3:00 – 5:15 p.m.**

Members Present

#	Name	Affiliation
1.	Mayor Joan McBride, Vice-Chair	City of Kirkland
2.	Eileen Barber	Friends of the Issaquah Salmon Hatchery
3.	Councilmember Layne Barnes	City of Maple Valley
4.	Richard Bonewits	Cedar River Council
5.	Councilmember Susan Boundy-Sanders	City of Woodinville
6.	Councilmember Diane Buckshnis	City of Edmonds
7.	Councilmember Bruce Dodds	City of Clyde Hill
8.	Nancy Eklund	The Boeing Company
9.	Councilmember Don Fiene	City of Lake Forest Park
10.	Noel Gilbrough	Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group
11.	Brian Goodnight	Snohomish County
12.	Kirk Lakey	WA Department of Fish & Wildlife
13.	Mike Mactutis	City of Kent
14.	Councilmember Hank Myers	City of Redmond
15.	Joan Nolan	WA Department of Ecology
16.	Councilmember Mike O'Brien	City of Seattle
17.	Councilmember Larry Phillips	King County
18.	Keri Pravitz	Friends of the Cedar River Watershed
19.	Councilmember Andy Rheaume	City of Bothell
20.	Councilmember Jesse Salomon	City of Shoreline
21.	Frank Urabeck	Citizen
22.	Councilmember Tom Vance	City of Sammamish

Others Present

23.	Hans Berge	King County
24.	Diana Forman	Portage Bay Coalition for Clean Water
25.	Frank Leonetti	Snohomish County
26.	Kathy Minsch	City of Seattle
27.	Michael Murphy	King County
28.	Krista Mendelman	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
29.	Jerallyn Roetemeyer	City of Redmond
30.	Stacey Rush	City of Kirkland
31.	Ron Straka	City of Renton
32.	Mayor Bernie Talmas	City of Woodinville
33.	Jean White	King County
34.	Bruce Wulkan	Puget Sound Partnership
35.	Linda Grob	WRIA 8 Team
36.	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz	WRIA 8 Team
37.	Scott Stolnack	WRIA 8 Team
38.	Jason Wilkinson	WRIA 8 Team

1. Public Comment

Noel Gilbrough gave a brief update on projects Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group is working on in WRIA 8.

2. Approval of Meeting Notes for March 21, 2013

The Salmon Recovery Council unanimously approved the meeting notes for the March 21, 2013 meeting.

3. Updates & Announcements

General Announcements:

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, Acting Watershed Coordinator, elaborated on several items from the WRIA 8 Update handout:

- **Legislative Priorities Update:** The State Legislature has been in a special session since May 13. The current timeline for completing its budget work is June 2013.
 - **Watershed Investment District (WID):** The House Environment Committee requested a stakeholder group be convened in 2013 to develop consensus WID bill language by December 2013. Rep. Dave Upthegrove was the Committee Chair championing the WID, but the committee chairmanship has passed to Rep. John McCoy (38th District). All Lead Entities will be invited to a WID Stakeholder Group meeting. Don Fiene, Andy Rheame, and Jesse Salomon expressed interest in participating in the process for WRIA 8.
- **Grant Funding Update:** Seven project applications were received for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) grant programs. The amount of available funding is still unknown, pending final state and federal budgets. Sixteen applications have been received for the King County Flood Control District Cooperative Watershed Management (CWM) grant program, for which \$1.2 million is available for allocation.
- **Culvert Case Decision:** In 2001 twenty-one Indian tribes filed the “culvert case”, asking the federal court to rule that Washington State has a treaty-based obligation to preserve fish runs, which includes repairing culverts that impede fish passage. The court issued a permanent injunction on March 29, 2013 ordering the state to fix about 180 culverts owned by WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), WA Dept. of Natural Resources, and State Parks by October 31, 2016 (estimated cost \$55.3 million); and fix about 817 barrier culverts owned or operated by WA State. Dept. of Transportation by 2030 (estimated cost \$2.4 billion). Jesse Salomon asked if WRIA 8 should have a position if this ruling benefits salmon. Susan Boundy-Sanders inquired if this decision would eventually impact culverts owned and managed by local governments. Jason said it may eventually be interpreted to apply to local governments.
- **Smolt Flumes Installed:** The Army Corps of Engineers reported that all four smolt flumes at the Ballard Locks began operating on schedule on April 19. This year, installation of the smolt flumes was not the issue it was last year. They will be running 24 hours a day, seven days a week until mid-June.
- **Salmon Bay Natural Area Tree Cutting:** In early April BNSF Railway cleared trees as part of their track maintenance adjacent to the Salmon Bay Natural Area west of the Locks. After substantial concern from the community, BSNF indicated they would work with Seattle to replant the cleared area with native vegetation.

4. WRIA 8 2014 Budget & Workplan – Management Committee Recommendation

Joan McBride announced that the Management Committee (MC) had a robust discussion about the 2014 budget and workplan, and she said she supported the budget recommendation.

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz explained that for the 2014 budget the ILA cost share will no longer cover staff costs. For 2014 the estimated funding gap is \$36,839. The ILA cost share has not increased in 13 years, despite rising staffing costs. To develop the 2014 budget recommendation, the MC considered three 2014 budget alternatives:

- No ILA cost share increase. Apply Monitoring and Adaptive Management grant to technical support staffing costs and a portion of deferred ILA revenue to cover the remaining funding gap;
- Increase the ILA cost share 3% (an additional \$15,032) to help cover the gap in funding and use deferred revenue to cover the remaining funding gap; and
- Increase the ILA cost share 8% to completely cover the funding gap and apply additional revenues to identified priority program work.

Jason reported that a 10% ILA cost share increase is the amount it would take to cover the anticipated funding gap for staffing costs through 2015. The MC decided to consider the budgets for 2014 and 2015 together, in part because the current ILA ends at the end of 2015 and will need to be renegotiated. The MC's recommendation is to increase the cost share 3% in 2014, and up to 5% in 2015, depending on the amount of the funding gap.

Discussion:

- Joan McBride asked other MC members for their perspectives and comments.
- Mike O'Brien said Seattle's perspective is it has been a tough past few years as local governments have gone through the recession. It's been great we haven't had to cut staff while maintaining the ILA, and he feels we've gotten a bargain the last few years. He noted that Seattle has a big portion of the ILA, and the recommendation seems like a reasonable thing to do.
- Larry Phillips mentioned we had a robust discussion at the MC. We've held this budget steady for a number of years, and staff have been fabulous at not asking for more money as we are working out of a recession. We have a lot of work coming up, and this increase will help us focus our resources over the next two years. He said the MC recognizes we've gotten a lot of work done over the last decade while keeping the cost share whole, but not everything got done that what we need to do.
- Brian Goodnight reported that Snohomish County is supportive of the modest increase, and thinks it's a good deal given the level of service.

At this point in the meeting Bellevue City Hall was evacuated due to a building emergency. Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) members regrouped outside the building to continue the budget discussion.

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz reviewed the proposed 2014 workplan, which charts the major work items for WRIA 8 staff for the coming year.

Discussion

- Diane Buckshnis discussed the need to consider reaching out to non-member jurisdictions to try and get them to join the ILA, including Lynnwood, Brier, and Woodway. Jason suggested it will also be important to reach out to the councils of current ILA member jurisdictions to remind them of WRIA 8's work and the benefits and service provided by the effort. This is part of the 2014 workplan.
- Several SRC members emphasized the need to continue to tell the salmon recovery story. Jason noted there are several workplan tasks that support telling the salmon recovery story, which were organized into a distinct category.
- Kirk Lakey said that steelhead recovery is likely to be a major topic in Puget Sound watersheds in the coming year. He expressed a need to account for the possibility of steelhead recovery planning in the 2014 workplan. Jason noted that tracking the steelhead recovery effort is in the workplan, but more information is needed about the status of steelhead in WRIA 8 and how proposed recovery planning might impact WRIA 8.

The Salmon Recovery Council unanimously approved the WRIA 8 2014 Budget and Workplan, including a 3% increase to the 2014 ILA cost share.

Not long afterwards, the building emergency ended and the meeting reconvened.

5. Role of Science in WRIA 8 Plan Implementation

Introduction & Context:

Scott Stolnack, Technical Coordinator, introduced the second part of the two-meeting science presentation, going over the questions monitoring will help us answer:

- Are we doing what we said we'd do?
- Is what we're doing, doing what we said it would?
- Are we on pace towards recovery?
- Where do we go from here?

Habitat Status & Trends Monitoring:

Hans Berge, King County (KC), said the county has been working on monitoring of aquatic and riparian habitats in WRIA since 2009. Besides Hans and Scott Stolnack, others involved with the monitoring are Dan Lantz and Curtis DeGasperi, KC Water & Land Resources, and Roger Tabor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Partnering with WRIA 8, KC, FWS, and City of Redmond on the project are Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), Region 10 EPA Sentinel Sites Project, Seattle Public Utilities, and City of Bellevue. We looked across Puget Sound at "sentinel" sites for reference conditions and effects of climate change, and in WRIA 8 for places with intact conditions. He said WRIA 8 is considered an innovator in our monitoring work, for which the SRC provided some seed money.

The purpose of the status and trends monitoring project is to:

- Establish baseline conditions in the watershed for monitoring the WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Plan;
- Investigate relationships between land cover and land use, and how that impacts hydrology, adjacent impacts to the stream, and biologic conditions;
- Evaluate methods and develop metrics to be used to assess the health of streams across Puget Sound; and
- Communicate results of this work to decision makers and the public.

Hypotheses being investigated are:

- H₁: If effective impervious cover influences hydrology, then urbanized systems will experience more high pulses than systems with less connected impervious area;
- H₂: If hydrology influences biological conditions in streams, the Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (BIBI) and Fish Index of Biotic Integrity (FIBI) metrics will be lower in streams that exhibit a flashy flow regime;
- H₃: If pools decrease in a stream the biotic integrity of that stream will also decrease; and
- H₄: If WRIA 8 Plan is successful, the indicators of biotic integrity will increase in basins where restoration activities are prescribed.

Hans reported that in 2010 we were awarded \$995,716 from EPA, with a match of \$335,934 from WRIA 8 and KC. This year the focus is on outreach, analysis and field sampling, and next year the project ends. He said our approach is to collect samples at 52 sites in WRIA 8, and collaborate on collecting data at five EPA sentinel sites across Puget Sound (Big Beef, Chuckanut, Glendale and Griffin Creeks, and the Dewatto River). We measure hydrology (magnitude, flashiness, high pulses); geomorphology (pools, wood, substrate, cover); biology (fish, bugs); and land use/land cover (% forest, road density, zoning).

Hans provided some preliminary results for the project. For percent pool habitat, >25% pool cover is considered a good standard and target. Most sentinel sites are in good shape except for Glendale on Whidbey Island due to logging. In WRIA 8 Lyons and Bear Creeks are not in good shape, and Kelsey and Issaquah Creeks are on the edge. For counts of large wood the target should be 100 pieces per study reach. He reported that the sentinel sites are on the edge, and almost all of our streams don't meet the target for wood, except for Perrinville Creek in Edmonds. Stream bugs are sampled in the water and scored from 10 (very poor) to 50 (excellent) to get the BIBI metric score. A macroinvertebrate score in

the upper 30's is considered healthy, but a lot of WRIA 8 sites get a score of poor (Juanita, Peters, Taylor Creeks) or very poor (Kelsey, Lyon, Perrinville Creeks). Little Bear and Issaquah Creeks rate fair to good.

Hans reported that due to our monitoring study the rare Olympic mud minnow was discovered in WRIA for the first time. Hans also worked on a paper on fish data in WRIA 8 five years ago, which helped create the FIBI metrics we are using that are similar to BIBI. All sentinel sites are scoring well for FIBI, except for Glendale. Bear and Issaquah FIBI scores are good, while Lyon and Perrinville are very poor. He said again, we need to consider all indicators. Results from high pulse counts show that if there are few high pulses, bug and fish scores go up, so flow does affect this. Our land use/land cover analysis includes the report already presented to the SRC.

Hans said the final report is due to EPA in 2014, which will report on the status and trends of 50 stream reaches across WRIA 8. We are in year four of a five year study, sampling 57 sites annually. One third of our WRIA 8 sites have good % pools scores, but our sites are low in large wood. BIBI and FIBI scores are much higher in Tier 1 streams, but range widely across watershed and sentinel sites. He acknowledged the funding support (EPA, WRIA 8, KC), field crews (KC, FWS), partners (for access, logistics, pooling resources), Ecology (database support), and the sentinel site team (EPA, Ecology).

Discussion:

- Mike O'Brien commented that Perrinville Creek has lots of wood, but is bad for benthic invertebrates. Diane Buckshnis responded that Edmonds is working on studying the creek with Lynnwood.
- Hank Myers inquired whether more consistent streamflows result in fewer pulses for a particular stream. Hans Berge said that was correct.
- Susan Boundy-Sanders asked how sentinel sites were used. Hans explained that they had been selected by the EPA to reflect stream catchments in which land cover/land use was not expected to change much over time, therefore any changes would likely reflect changes in climate rather than changes to the catchment.
- Carl Scandella remarked this is very important work, and it is good to see the science being applied. He asked if WRIA 8 is using the latest and greatest tools. Hans explained that we are. Unlike previous studies that were not able to use concurrent data from separate fields (hydrology, geomorphology, biology, land use), our data will be concurrent.

Project Effectiveness Monitoring:

Frank Leonetti, Snohomish County, said his presentation narrows down the scope of Hans' presentation to a case study on North Creek. Chapter 6 of the WRIA 8 Plan identifies project effectiveness as part of the toolbox for monitoring in our watershed. For salmon recovery, habitat recovery = protection + restoration – future degradation. Frank went over the monitoring types and their different timelines for developing results; project effectiveness is done at five, ten, and 30 year-intervals. He said in the short term it gives us some good feedback on our projects.

Frank said we need to learn if: projects are effectively treating habitat limiting factors and causes of degradation; projects are effective relative to habitat and design objectives; and actions are effective by project category (instream habitat and wood placement, vegetation restoration, invasive species control, etc.). We don't have to do all of this by ourselves; people across the region and western U.S. are monitoring similar things to address salmon recovery. Effectiveness monitoring examples include TetraTech's Wood Catalog Report (2011), Annual Progress Reports (2004-2012), Puget Sound Report (2012, SRFB funded), and locally, the Twin Creeks project on North Creek (WRIA 8). He said we are just getting to the point where we have synthesized information as a region.

Frank explained that the Twin Creeks project is in the northern part of WRIA 8, between Bothell and Mill Creek. The project was implemented in 2003 with KC Water Works and NOAA funding after purchase of an eight-mile conservation easement. Limiting factors the project is trying to address are insufficient

quantities of wood and pools, streambank erosion, and insufficient riparian vegetation. Project objectives included:

- Control erosion at a hazardous location with a mobile park;
- Increase wood to properly functioning conditions;
- Enhance pool habitat quality and quantity;
- Increase side channel connections; and
- Increase native vegetation cover.

The project placed 170 pieces of wood in 950 feet of stream, controlled invasive weeds on two acres, and replanted with native vegetation.

Frank explained that “effectiveness” involves identifying what the metrics are to define success. He gave an example from the Twin Creeks project:

- Action: place wood in the stream;
- Objectives: wood stability and pool formation;
- Monitoring metrics: wood count, pool count, and pool area cover; and
- Outcome: retain 50% of wood after ten years, increase pool count, increase pool area, and increase overhead cover.

Frank reported that since the project was constructed in August 2003 several floods have occurred, including a large one in October 2003. An overflow side channel developed, and five years later the mainstem moved into the side channel. The streambank habitat quantity and quality was related to the proximity of the mobile home park, and there were low level levels of wood in the creek.

Frank said five years after we implemented the project, wood numbers were above our target. 80% of wood was stable, and 92% was still in the survey area. Half of the wood was anchored, half was unanchored, and the wood that moved was mostly the smallest pieces. Wood-created pools increased 6% to 80% pre- and post-project, pool area increased 30% to 46%, and pool cover went from 3% to 19% of total pool area. After five years, no wood is coming into the system whole, and 13 wood pieces moved out of the reach. Before the project there was one pool, after the project “natural” wood was associated with 12 pools, and placed wood with seven pools.

Frank said this summer is the tenth year since we implemented this project, so we will be monitoring again. He commented that changes over time are part of project trajectory and understanding effectiveness.

Discussion:

- Larry Phillips asked what effectiveness means for fish. Frank Leonetti responded that we weren't monitoring for fish, which is a tricky thing to do. Chinook are not in the North Creek system in the summer in low flows, so it's difficult to judge how they are using this site. He said from his standpoint, we want to focus on how the project we designed is responding to flows, etc., for improved habitat. At the project scale it's difficult to get the benefit to fish. We've seen Chinook and coho spawning, steelhead, and lots of juveniles.
- Larry Phillips commented that we are going to need some help with this question and what it means for our salmon goals. There has to be a linkage for going back to our citizens. He said he thinks we have to do that at the WRIA level. Frank replied that he thought we can get there with our monitoring information on the Cedar, and implementation of a number of projects.
- Scott Stolnack explained that on a single project it's hard to determine if there is a statistically valid fish response to the work. Right now, have to make sure our projects are effective in getting the habitat. Once we have that information we will use it with information from other places, and use them as proxies for fish use. He said soon we will have some information from Rainbow Bend that will directly speak to the question of fish use of an important restoration project.

- Frank Urabeck noted that Chinook recovery is our priority, and he asked if we are confident there is a Chinook benefit to all these projects. Scott responded that our approach is “don’t put all our eggs in one basket”. We need projects distributed geographically throughout Tier 1 and Tier 2 areas in order to achieve recovery. But it is prohibitively expensive to monitor for fish in each and every project, so we rely on science collected elsewhere to supplement our knowledge.
- Hans Berge reported that Chinook do use North Creek, which is a Tier 2 stream. He said we hope we might be able to put more money into Tier 2 projects. Frank Urabeck said lots of folks ask why we are putting money into Chinook recovery in an urban watershed. Hans said we will have some empirical information to share with other watersheds.

6. King County In-Lieu Fee Mitigation Reserves Program

Michael Murphy, King County, said the county has a lot of natural resources, but also lot of population growth and development. The Mitigation Reserves Program (MRP), which complies with national legislation, is a way for developers to pay a fee to KC in-lieu of doing their own mitigation. The county then does the mitigation. There are cases when offsite mitigation is a great way to go. Participants in the MRP are KC Department of Permitting & Environmental Review (regulatory), KC Department of Natural Resources and Park (DNRP, implementation) and an Interagency Review Team (Army Corps, EPA, US Forest Services, NOAA, Ecology, WDFW, Muckleshoot and Tulalip Tribes, and applicable local jurisdictions). He said after first making sure any impacts are minimized, DNRP receives the money and figures out how to spend it, and the Interagency Review Team reviews their proposal.

Michael explained the MRP process. For a proposed environmental impact, regulatory agencies work with a permit applicant to: avoid and minimize impacts; identify onsite mitigation options; and review offsite mitigation options (mitigation bank, own offsite program, permittee-responsible). Regulatory agencies quantify the wetland impact functional loss, which is difficult to do. The applicant buys credits and satisfies mitigation options. The MRP selects the best mitigation site, constructs and maintains project, determines credits, and satisfies the mitigation options.

Michael said KC has been divided into service areas, not political boundaries. KC’s roster includes 81 sites, 503 parcels, and 5,900 acres. A lot of the sites are on major rivers like the Cedar. The WRIA 8 portion has 38 sites, 200 parcels, and 1,700+ acres. He said he wants to go where we can benefit salmon. WRIA 8 in-lieu mitigation examples are the Middle Issaquah Creek Restoration Project and the Elliott Bridge Reach Floodplain Restoration Project on the Cedar. In 2009 Elliott Bridge Reach had homes on both sides of the river, which have since been removed. The project will create a side channel, off-channel habitat, and restore the wetland. He said expected benefits of the MRP are multiple, including:

- For the regulated community, predictability of cost and schedule;
- For the regulators: monitoring/enforcement of a single entity for mitigation actions from multiple impacts;
- For the environment: mitigation managed with a long-term interest in successful restoration, projects address greatest needs first, and fewer larger projects benefiting from economy and ecology of scale.

Don Fiene inquired how the MRP will tie site selection to the WRIA 8 Plan. Michael replied that WRIA 8 folks are involved with the process to identify potential sites.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is July 18, 2013, 3:00 to 5:15 p.m., Bellevue City Hall.