

Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Technical Committee Meeting

February 2, 2022 9:00—12:00

Zoom Meeting

Attendees

Mike Rustay, Snohomish County
Matt Pouley, Tulalip Tribes
Emily Davis, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
Alexa Cummings, Snohomish County
Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish County
Lisa Tario, Snohomish County
Cory Zyla, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
Kyle Koch, Sound Salmon Solutions
Andrea Mojzak, King County
Amea Bahr, WA RCO
Denise Di Santo, King County
Brett Shattuck, Tulalip Tribes
Lindsey Desmul, WDFW
Matt Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe
Carson Moscoso, Snohomish CD
Doug Hennick, Wild Fish Conservancy
Elissa Ostergaard, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
Ryan Lewis, Snoqualmie Tribe
Darcey Hughes, Snohomish County
Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy
Marty Jacobson, WA ECY
Aaron Kopp, Snohomish County
Daniel Howe, Snohomish County
Denise Krownbell, Seattle City Light
John Klochak, King County
Josh Kubo, King County
Karen Chang, US Forest Service
Keith Binkley, SnoPUD
Kirk Lakey, WDFW
Mary Lou White, Wild Fish Conservancy
Natasha Coumou, WDFW
Pete Verhey, WDFW
Stephanie Cotton, Snohomish County
Todd Hurley, King County
Ryan Bartelheimer, Snohomish CD
Kevin Lee, WDFW
Morgan Ruff, Tulalip Tribes
Brett Gaddis, Snohomish County
Jim Shannon, City of Everett/Port of Everett
Kyle Legare, Snohomish PUD
Steve Hinton, Tulalip Tribes

Introductions and Agenda Review

Matt and Mike, co-chairs, opened the meeting with introductions. Matt gave an overview of the agenda.

Regional and Basin Updates

Gretchen shared that Alexa recently got promoted to a new role at the County and this will be her last meeting.

Gretchen shared that DNR is nearing the launch of the Watershed Resilience Action Plan (WRAP). Hilary Franz spoke to the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council (PSSRC) this past Thursday to share highlights of the WRAP. It's still going through some final review processes. There was quite a bit of interest from people in being the next watershed of focus, but other comments too from the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) Exec Director reminding folks that there isn't funding yet secured to implement this plan and the Partnership is still the regional lead agency on salmon recovery.

Gretchen added there will be a new Department of Natural Resources (DNR) staff member and full-time employee to support watershed implementation work; the Action Agenda is receiving increased National Estuary Program funding but is moving away from 'Near-Term Actions' (NTAs)... Alexa added that conversations are ongoing between the EPA, PSP, and Local Integrating Organizations (LIOs) but looks like money will be funneled through the Strategic Initiative Lead Teams (SILs) to fund regional implementation strategies work via a Request for Proposals process. Forum meeting on March 3 will have a presentation on the Salish Sea marine survival project.

Keith mentioned that Stephanie Celt is leaving DNR so there will be a new representative leading implementation of the WRAP in the basin. He encouraged folks to visit the PSSRC website to stay up to date on all the relevant legislative happenings. Also, the 2022-2026 Action Agenda draft is out for review and then public comment.

Elissa added that the Lorraine Loomis bill doesn't look like it will be proceeding.

Gretchen mentioned the upcoming Forum meeting which will include a presentation from Long Live the Kings on the Salish Sea Marine Survival Project.

Gretchen gave a funding update on this year's grant rounds of interest:





Watching –
CWM – \$1.99M – KingCo only
NOI 1/24/22
Final 3/21/22

NOAA – unknown
OTHER – ????

Likely requires LE involvement, review

FBRB - statewide, ~\$27M
due 1/13/21

Ecology Streamflow – statewide, \$30-\$40
due 2/1/22

Ecology FbD – statewide, ~\$58M
pre-proposal - 1/14/22
full app – 5/3/22

Snohomish SRFB/PSAR – Basin only, \$2.5
NOI due - 1/14/22
Final due - 2/28/22
targeted investment/large cap =

ESRP – ~\$20M
pre-proposal - 2/15/22
full app - 6/1/22

SRFB/PSAR

- 18 projects
- ~9.6M in total request
- Feasibility, acquisition, design, construction, riparian planting
- \$100K - \$2M
- Some new, some on 4YWP, some we're trying to figure out
- SRP entry updated/created; PRISM funding instrument created
- Some projects likely to seek additional funding via other grant sources (FBRB, FbD, Streamflow, ESRP, NOAA)

Gretchen reviewed highlights of recent letters of support for partners with projects in the basin going for various funding sources but aligned with our recovery plan. She asked for TC approval of the approach for submitting these letters for the Streamflow applications. These projects had been included in the draft Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee (WREC) plan that was not officially adopted. Morgan added we will be updating our 4-year work plan this spring. We can add these projects at that point as well. Gretchen explained that Floodplains by Design (FbD) requires a lead entity letter of support so that's why they are all here presenting today. Two projects in the basin going forward this year – CFS Phase 3 (Snohomish County and partners) and City of North Bend's resubmittal. Final applications are due beginning of May.

Gretchen asked for volunteers to review our SRFB/PSAR apps this year. Kevin Lee said he is a maybe and asked for more information on the time commitment/dates. Gretchen will follow up with interested people.

Project Update – Middle Pilchuck

Lisa gave an overview of the project's history and recent preferred design changes (two alternatives considered from consultant) to include an added side channel and address the landslide concerns. This will result in a cost increase of \$400,000. Lisa asked for input on the scope change and cost increase and TC approval to go with Alternative #2.

Summary		
2020 SRFB/PSAR proposal	2022 Alternative 1 Revised – one side channel	2022 Alternative 2 Revised – two side channels
<u>Design Updates requested</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove habitat boulder placements in main channel Address entrainment Evaluate landslide 	<u>Design Updates include</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 pile supported engineered log jams in the main channel Larger opening & outlet to the side channel Outlet location of the side channel adjusted away from riprap banks LWM placement in side channel Single side channel excavation 	<u>Design Updates include</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 pile supported engineered log jams in the main channel Larger opening & outlet to the side channel Outlet location of the side channel adjusted away from riprap banks LWM placement in side channel Two side channels with alternate alignments North side channel outlets onto low spot in floodplain
<u>Project metrics</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0.267 mile (1410 ft) (50 ft @ Pilchuck R; 1360 ft channel) 1.3 acres off channel habitat 36 pools/logs 	<u>Project metrics</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1475 ft - Length of side channel 4.82 ac - Inundated area 220' - LWM pieces 1050 ft - Main channel treated 9 - Mainstem habitat pools 	<u>Project metrics</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2550 ft - Length of side channel 7.13 ac - Inundated area 300' - LWM pieces 1050 ft - Main channel treated 9 - Mainstem habitat pools
<u>Funding received</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$495,862 	<u>Additional funding need</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$197,174 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$108,389 – basin return funds ~\$150K SWM (includes anticipated inflation costs) 	<u>Additional funding need</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$295,774 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$108,389 – basin return funds ~\$240K SWM (includes anticipated inflation costs)

Micah shared: WFC was concerned about the landslide potential previously due to their experience doing work in the area. But he feels good about the design changes and the ability to show a decrease in forces at the toe so that there is less liability risk.

Matt: asked about the changes in wood costs. Lisa explained that the new design incorporates much more wood than before and the cost estimate includes the fees for placement too.

Aaron Kopp asked: Did the consultant look into the change in sediment transport capacity in the mainstem after adding the additional side channels? The mainstem is a depositional area and if you divert more water you're likely to get more aggradation in the mainstem. Lisa said that was not presented in the analysis, but she can ask them. Brett said they did look at the upstream portion and upstream on the left bank there's a hardpan area with a large gravel bar trying to form but the river is incised and we'll need to build the roughness on that left side to push flows to the right bank. Downstream is really dynamic and the river is trying to reoccupy the left bank floodplain. It's more of a transport reach where it's straightened. Aaron followed up to say it seems like a matter of opinion whether sediment transport is an issue and suggests that it actually be determined. His comments to Kirt in the past were about whether the geotechnical stability of the landslide had been evaluated because it seems like an important factor for a project like this.

Ryan B asked: What are the reasons that the side channels don't connect the right bank floodplain farther north? Maybe property boundary or concerns about impacting homes along the street? Brett G explained the upstream floodplain is constrained by 28th Street and community. Ryan clarified his question is about connecting to remnant channels NW of what is proposed rather than moving the point of connection. Brett described that there is a lot of private property in the area and the river being incised has created a natural berm but when that is removed the connection will increase.

Denise asked about the community outreach and suggested a focus on getting people onboard as key to project success. Lisa said they have engaged with the landowners but haven't presented the latest ideas. There is no identified opposition to the project at this time. Brett added the next steps are to bring these alternatives to the community.

Gretchen added we have \$108K Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) return funds available to reallocate because some projects closed as incomplete. That money could go towards this, if approved by TC, and Snohomish County SWM will cover the remainder cost increase (~200K).

Comments from the Google Slide:

- Please do the outreach now and continue through the project at all phases.
- Possible next step: Snohomish County re-confirm landowner support for design alternative 2, acknowledging that previous communication with landowners indicated they were supportive of a design similar to alternative 1 - note that before construction begins, landowner will have to sign a landowner
- Possible next step (from Gretchen): Allow Tech com/local review committee time to review new designs and scope change memo before next month's tech com; Snohomish County can confirm landowner support for design 2; then we can have the project reviewers solidify their recommendation and bring it back to the full Tech Com so we all have confidence in offering a more concrete recommendation in March.

There were no objections to endorsing the preferred alternative and supporting the project team moving forward.

Project Update – Beckler River

Micah gave an overview of the project which focuses on installing Engineered Log Jams (ELJs) along the river. He shared that the cobbling in the reach is not suitable spawning habitat. There also seems to be a major loss of large woody debris which has caused channel incision in this alluvial fan deposit. This

leaves a cobbled bed that constrains the river during floods and reduces connection to the floodplain. The project was designed to solve this.

Modelling results of ELJ locations are new. Transitioning new staff into the permit writing but not certain on the timeline. Originally hoped to go to construction this summer.

Comments from the Google Slide:

- Thanks Micah. Keep us posted if staff changes etc. cause a bigger project slowdown and we need to figure in things like an extension request. Also, curious about engagement with USFS as the USFS Forum reps reached out (like 2 years ago) about the project

Project Update – Tualco Valley

One big project that encompasses these subareas: Haskel Slough, Riley Slough, Confluence where there are existing projects being implemented. Main goals and objectives:

Project Goals

- I. Restore connectivity to over 10.5 miles (Haskel and Riley Sloughs) of priority habitat to ESA listed species
- II. Restore connectivity within the Skykomish River to increase watershed resilience to effects of climate change and other stressors
- III. Achieve a multibenefit outcome that will reduce flood risk, enhance fish habitat, and promote agricultural resilience



Objectives

- I. Conduct drainage assessment, alternatives analysis and design to determine a preferred restoration alternatives.
- II. Modify the Haskel Slough inlet dike to increase connectivity, reduce flood risk, and reduce County O&M costs.
- III. Conduct restoration activities in Riley Slough promoting streamflow and connectivity that promote multibenefit outcomes.
- IV. Conduct restoration activities at the Snohomish Confluence that promote long-term connectivity of the Riley Slough outlet.

Denise asked: Brett, how were sites for surface water and wells determined? Are wells for demonstrating recharge?

Cory added: Snoqualmie Tribe + King County are monitoring groundwater as part of the Fall City Floodplain Restoration project (construction begins summer 2022), might be another interesting data point if we can make any inferences about recharge

Brett asked if there is support for the project to move forward. The TC supported the project.

Gretchen asked Any sense if the existing funds in Acquisitions Phase 1 (\$616,877.00) would cover the Holy cross acquisition? Wondering too about the funding gap for Reiner.

Comment from Google Slide:

- Wondering if there would be some value in sharing the landowner outreach strategy in more detail with other sponsors who are (or are about to) endeavor on big projects that include lots of stakeholders/adjacent landowners

Project Update – Miller Confluence

Denise and Todd gave an overview of the project. Miller River alluvial fan is in a “primary restoration” subbasin (Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum 2005). High priority restoration targets for the King County portion of WRIA 7, including 80 acres of restored off channel habitat and 5.5 miles of restored edge habitat (King County 2011).

Gretchen asked: Are you guys going after other fund sources too? Denise said, yes, PSAR and CWM this year. FbD probably down the road. The project is scalable. Todd added there could be potential for infrastructure protection funding too.

Wrap up

Emily: I want to pitch the newly completed *Snoqualmie Chinook Salmon Conceptual Model* (by Josh Kubo). This compendium of knowledge about Snoqualmie Chinook covers what we know, what we *think* we know, and what still needs to be determined about life stages, limiting factors, and driving variables. Check it out here: <https://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/2022/kcr3333.pdf>

The Snoqualmie model is basically a zoomed in view on the Snoqualmie portion of Colin's model. Colin's model is extremely high level and more visual, plus it covers the whole basin and does not focus on parsing out assumptions. The Snoqualmie version dives deeper into the Snoqualmie-specific component and adds a lot more narrative text. The two products are complementary to one another and simply inform at different levels of detail and using different communication modes. Josh took Colin's work closely into account as he worked on this conceptual model specifically to make them as complementary as possible. I think several of his diagrams were derived from Colin's model. A similar model could be developed specific to the Sky in the future, if desired. The Snoqualmie specific model was developed to help us parse out what our assumptions are about Chinook in this subbasin and how those assumptions might be driving our recovery strategies, and where we may need to test or reexamine our assumptions (and where we don't need to do that).

I will also be sure that this goes out to the Tech Comm listserv. Please share widely and get in touch with Josh or any of us on the Snoqualmie Forum team if you have questions about it. Expect to see a presentation at some point.