

# SRFB Review Panel

## WRIA 2 Virtual Site Visits

Wednesday, May 6, 2020 | 9am – 1 pm

Thursday, May 7, 2020 | 9am – 1 pm

Join Zoom Meeting at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/97183910031?pwd=NVZPNmppeFVyRkNPdkhLa1ZzYlQyUT09>

Meeting ID: 971 8391 0031

Password: 474158

Attend by phone:

+1 253 215 8782

Meeting ID: 971 8391 0031

Password: 474158

### Meeting Agenda

#### Wednesday, May 6, 2020

TIME	TOPIC	DURATION	LEAD
9:00 am-9:20am	<b>Introductions and overview</b>	<i>20 min</i>	Sam Whitridge, San Juan County Public Works
9:20 am-10:00am	<b>Presentation: (20-1562) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Tina Whitman, Friends of the San Juans
10:05am-10:45am	<b>Presentation: (20-1508) Hunter Bay Acquisition</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Lincoln Bormann, San Juan County Land Bank
10:45-11am	<i>Break</i>	<i>15 min</i>	
11:00am-11:40am	<b>Presentation: (20-1506) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Peter Guillozet, San Juan County Land Bank
11:45am-12:25pm	<b>Presentation: (20-1505) Judd Cove Shoreline and Aquatic Habitat Project</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Peter Guillozet, San Juan County Land Bank
12:25pm-1:00pm	<b>Discussion, Additional Questions and Close</b>	<i>35 min</i>	Sam Whitridge

**Thursday, May 7, 2020**

TIME	TOPIC	DURATION	LEAD
9am-9:10am	<b>Welcome</b>	<i>10 min</i>	Sam Whitridge, San Juan County Public Works
9:10am-9:50am	<b>Presentation: (<a href="#">20-1214</a>) Buoy Bay Shoreline Protection Project</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Dean Dougherty, San Juan Preservation Trust
9:55am-10:35am	<b>Presentation: (<a href="#">20-1062</a>) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Byron Rot, San Juan County Public Works
10:35am-10:50am	<i>Break</i>	<i>15 min</i>	
10:50am-11:30am	<b>Presentation: (<a href="#">20-1043</a>) Mackaye Harbor Beach Restoration</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Byron Rot, San Juan County Public Works
11:35am-12:15am	<b>Presentation: (<a href="#">20-1040</a>) Jackson Beach Restoration Design</b>	<i>40 min</i>	Kendra Smith, San Juan County Public Works
12:15pm-1:00pm	<b>Discussion, Additional Questions and Close</b>	<i>45 min</i>	

Notes:

- Please use hyperlinks to access project applications in the PRISM database
- Project presentations will last a maximum of 30 minutes, which will allow for a 10 minute Q & A session at the end of each presentation.
- The agenda includes a 5 minute transition time in between presentations

**TAG Members:** Jenny DeGroot, Ray Glaze, Gene Helfmann, Judy Meyer, Marcus Reaves, Melinda Rowse, Kimbal Sundberg, Tina Whitman, Todd Zackey, Mike Ramsey

**CAG Members:** Cathleen Burns, Carl Davis, Jeffrey Dyer, Megan Dethier, Kailey Genther, Phil Green, Christina Koons, Lovel Pratt, Ivan Reiff, Karin Roemers-Kleven

**Non-TAG Members:** Lincoln Bormann, Shannon Davis, Peter Guillozet, Jim Johannessen,

**Ex-officio, State and County support staff:** Kathryn Moore, Marta Green, Jen O'Neal, Laura Rivas, Frances Robertson, Byron Rot, Tom Slocum, Kendra Smith, Sam Whitridge

9:05 AM **Introductions and Overview**

*Sam Whitridge*

Sam starts meeting with a recap of the process: Letters of intent were reviewed in early march. Reduced sponsors to 8. This is a big year because of an allocation trade made a few years ago. Logistics: two sessions with 4 presentations each day, max of 30 minutes with time for questions. Quick round of introductions.

9:20 AM **Presentation: (20-1562) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point**

*Tina Whitman*

Jim Johannessen is project manager. This is a collaboration between a private residential owner, Friends of San Juans, and Coastal Geologic Services. There is a larger project rebuilding some existing shore protection into a smaller footprint (private landowners are paying for that), but this portion is the restoration piece. Shows photo with low bulkhead, previous failed restoration. Map shown with herring, surf smelt and pacific sand lance spawning areas – this project location is in the middle, one of four areas in county with habitat suitable for multiple spawning species. The goal is to completely remove the creosote bulkhead, over 200' long with rock and fill behind it. The project will restore just over 400' of beach as well as some back-shore. Cleaning of intertidal habitat, approx. 13,000 square feet. Photo shows how low this is on the beach with forage fish spawning habitat. Shows old bulkhead which is failing, existing structure is preventing marine riparian vegetation, wrack line, blocking forage fish hab. The goal is to restore substrate, natural grade & vegetation. Tina started sampling there in December 2019 and found smelt & sand lance eggs. Sampling will continue seasonally. Some beach nourishment and planting will be required.

**QUESTION:** this is a low bank, what do you know about future beach profile?

Tina: we get significant width of additional beach and we're moving everything back. This is in a small drift cell and in the terminal end. Small feeder bluff to the south.

Jim: using established tide profiles from similar sites. Sea level rise will be a long-term issue. The only alternatives are to restore a beach now and let it progress naturally (some sediment will move up to a higher berm). How fast sea level happens will dictate the process. But we can't raise the entire landform

Tina: Shows table of costs. Emphasize complete commitment from the landowners. There is momentum and investment in the project, earlier phases of project have been completed. Need support for pre- and post-project surveys. This is fairly inexpensive due to landowners' contribution and cost efficiencies using workers on Shaw to get at more than 300' of shoreline. Permitting process has been started.

**Q:** what kind of vegetation are you planting,

Tina: vegetation design is focused on the back shore, and marine riparian behind it. Because of beach width grade blocking view won't be a concern, the problem will be lack of shade.

**Q:** projected lifespan of project? i.e. model of sea level rise?

Jim: the plans show elevations, we plan to bring this up to natural backshore heights. Predictions depend on what projections you use. We're allowing for natural processes – waves will push sediment up berm.

Tina: This is available forage fish habitat. Juvenile salmon have been observed in area but no site-specific info

Jim: about Army Corps permitting, the best estimates we're getting are that it's still taking 6-12 months.

Tina: Now we have a plan for construction in Fall 2021, over a year until then and permitting is already in process. This budget does include the match from the landowners and other sources

10:05 AM **Presentation: (20-1508) Hunter Bay Acquisition**

Lincoln Bormann

This is a proposed conservation easement on Lopez. The Land Bank has experience with this with 45 conservation easements on 7 islands. This parcel is approximately 4 acres, if tidelands are included more like 4.75 including 640' of shoreline. Shows photo taken at low tide. Note nearby protected area on south side - long stretch of shoreline protected by SJPT conservation easement including forage fish spawning habitat. The whole area between Hunter & Mud bay is critical for forage fish. This property has good amount of shoreline and tidelands relative to size of the parcel. One critical feature is the seasonal stream. Area upstream is forested heavily with alders but comes right out on the beach, seasonally some strong flow. There is an existing pumphouse on the property which may remain but no other building or development would be permitted at the site in future.

**QUESTION:** what provisions would be in place to ensure that?

Lincoln: it will be noted/recorded as a conservation easement. Land Bank should be copied on any permit that is submitted. No public access will be allowed.

**Q:** What's the difference between an easement value and an outright purchase?

Lincoln: The easement encumbers what can be done with the property. For a property like this for which the bulk of the value is in the residential building site, the easement deed will stay with it in perpetuity

**Q:** what's the current threat in terms of development? And what is the zoning?

Lincoln: R5, one house per 5 acres. Current owners are conservation-oriented, but multi-generational with different opinions among the family. No guarantees, property could be sold to someone else and developed.

**Q:** doesn't look like much fine sediment in the upper beach area, what is the potential for forage fish? Are there any data regarding use of Hunter bay by juvenile chinook?

Lincoln: I don't have a good photo of the gravel side but there is some.

Tina: samples taken most recently in 2003 in northern part of beach. There was suitable substrate.

**ACTION ITEM:** Tina will send Lincoln information about survey at that property

**Q:** Can you clarify the acres of upland on the property?

A: 3.81 acres is probably most accurate, with the remaining being shoreline/riparian

Byron: the stream is type F, fish bearing with "Habitat 100% riffle and contains gravel suitable for spawning."

**Q:** Can you identify a likely development site where riparian would likely be thinned or cut for views?

A: the development site is near pumphouse, grassy site on aerial photo.

**Q:** So the well is not being used currently, but if it were, would it influence that stream's flow?

A: would need to look at volume and low rate. it's not likely to have a big influence since it is a drilled well.

Majority of stream flow is coming from off-property, a lot of elevation coming down to the property

**Q:** who gets to decide whether to turn the well on?

A: owners want the HOA to move the well to another site off their property. Looking into drilling another site

10:45 AM break

11 AM **Presentation: (20-1506) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration**

*Peter Guillozet*

Map shows Cascade Creek with flow diversions (Olga, Doe Bay, Cascade lake). In 2016 the Land Bank bought the 24-acre preserve, aware of flow issues in the creek and collaborated with Jenny DeGroot to monitor.

Shows photos of stream (showing sandbags, trying to keep as much water as possible), downstream diversion pipe directs flow to the lake. At lower end of stream there's a natural barrier so only lower 2/10ths of a mile are available. Other than the diversions, the upstream is protected, good shading, good water quality. Graph shows flows are now at their lowest, the point of this project is to increase flow during critical periods. In 2009 WA Water Trust (WT) bought some flow from Orcas Water Holdings (OWH), but it wasn't enough. OWH are in support of this project – need to review final offer but committed to selling flow to the WT to improve flow. Want a minimum of 1 cfs in the stream at all times. In July and August the combined rights of the WT

and OWH only represent 0.5 cfs, need more during those months in particular, pursuing that separately.  
Main elements of this project:- buy and/or lease from OWH, show amounts cfs over months June - Dec.  
- media/marketing. Resort wants hydro to offset power costs, but agree this is a great story for Resort guests  
- Renewable energy incentives. In discussions with Bonneville, OPALCO

Real time flow monitoring equipment: This proposed system would be just below the Olga diversion, about \$4K. May need to look at alternative power sources/batteries. This would give real time data. This stream has been completely dewatered several times recently, then a detrimental lag time between discovery and remedy. OWH capability to operate hydropower depends on levels in the lake. Reduction in cfs in creek doesn't necessarily affect them adversely. They'd be selling off ability to operate plant at lower levels.

**Question:** Do we know average flow of creek for most years?

Peter: shows a table with water flows over parts of the system. These are the best data we have so far but real-time monitoring will give us a good picture. Highlighted cells show negative numbers.

**ACTION ITEM:** for Peter, - make sure this table is in PRISM - provide Land Bank flow data from coho preserve

**Q:** what makes this stream so important in SJI's? what do we know about the population of fish?

Peter: returns are low. The de-waterings in 2017, construction of bridge probably had some impacts. Recent numbers are low. Sandy Taylor has seen regular returns over time but they've dropped over last 3 years

**Q:** could we include a photo of the road before that bridge opened access?

**Q:** who actually holds the water right?

Peter: the State, the WA Water Trust. The Land Bank wouldn't be involved, it'll be held in trust.

**Q:** ok then what did they do to enforce their 0.5 cfs right when the creek dried up?

Peter: there has been no real time flow monitoring, slow chain of communication and remedying violations

**Q:** I'd like to see that in the proposal, what will WA Water trust do to protect/defend against violations?

Byron: and how will Moran state park manage water released from Mountain Lake? (Gary Sales has retired)

**ACTION ITEM:** Kat Moore and Peter will discuss eligibility issues and timing

**Q:** climate change predictions for rainfall and water availability into the future?

Peter: we can expect higher winter events, and lower base flows in the summer. Trends aren't good.

**Q:** so are we trying to purchase water that isn't going to be there?

Peter: manipulation of lake levels opens opportunities. Uncertain future but this helps in ensuring flow

**Q:** as long as your water right is senior to Olga and Doe Bay. In hot & dry summers that system is under stress. If junior then the fish won't get the water. how does it work when human needs are put against fish's?

**Q:** Mountain Lake is dammed. There might be options in the future for diverting water. It's a big lake, 3.5 miles to walk around it. There shouldn't be a problem with capacity, just with getting it downstream

Byron: but water rights are being fed by dammed portion, that's only about 15' depth

11:45 AM **Presentation: (20-1505) Judd Cove Shoreline and Aquatic Habitat Project** *Peter Guillozet*

In Eastsound, 11-acre preserve purchased over several years up to 2008. Stream and graveled French drain system that was implemented to dewater that system. Map shows armor removal, documented forage fish spawn habitat nearby. Photo shows stream at high flows, also split rail fence with neighboring property. Newly installed deer fence on left where planting done as a precursor to this project to establish native buffer between preserve and neighbor. They're building a house fairly close to property line. Therefore, shifting the channel over would allow to buffer it on both sides. Now the flow spreads around site through wetlands and terminates in the grass. Delta/eluvial fan developing over time, sediment being carried down to wetland. Diverted slope with perched culvert, degrading over time. Upstream of culvert, stream running through wooded area. That whole wetland area has been degraded, plus addition of rock and turf prevents natural vegetation. Plans to remove that material, take out steep edge to better adapt the site to sea level rise, benefit salmon. The culvert increases cost of the project, we can do further analysis on its size but we want a fish-runnable passage. The channel work can be scaled down. Concrete removed would go off-site. drawings by Chinook engineering with large culvert, 14' by 40'. Land Bank contributes match in Peter's time, planting.

**QUESTION:** What fish use of restored stream do you envision? other streams on property with fish in them?

Peter: second stream spills over waterfall on edge of preserve, impassible by fish and perennial. For the stream in question, it may not flow all summer. don't know what's happening with the drainage, may route underground. Coastal cutthroats might use it, some shaded pools. The stream is small but deserves better.

**Q:** when was drainage put in that removed the outlet? And how do the neighbors feel?

Peter: the neighbors get agitated in winter when the flows sweep across their property. They are willing to have a channel on their property and to have it enhance, but not excited about all the vegetation

Not too long before land bank acquired the property, there was a nonpermitted action around 2000.

Tina: was a log-handling business, the source of rock and fill. Land Bank purchased, removed creosote pier.

Peter: there has been a history of manipulating this channel. Needs to be addressed and managed correctly & we can squeeze some good habitat out of the process. Aside from the culvert, design component can be minimal. It'll be a small channel, won't require hardening. Plan to ensure culvert will be fish-passable.

Tina: part of our design work is going toward this project. There is just a short stretch to get to the next culvert. That culvert is a big budget item. That wetland component is straightforward.

Peter: thanks to Tina for adding all this freshwater component to what was otherwise straightforward

**Q:** is there room in the area to put in rock step-pools to allow coastal cutthroat to ascend to the channel?

Peter: conceptionally, there would be enough of a cut in the bank that step-pools may not be necessary.

Byron: is freshwater portion of project SRFB fundable? let's discuss with Laura and Sam, eligible for PSAR?

Tina: all these issues of connectivity vs. creating a salmon stream. Improving water quality, wetland health all benefits salmon. This site made it to higher tier for its nearshore focus, beach elements are in line

Laura: I'll think about it, Byron says it's not one of the 8 watersheds in the freshwater strategy, but if it's in line with other elements in your local freshwater strategy that's what we would check for PSAR funding.

Gene: does lime kiln tell us anything about underlying rock? porous limestone, that's why water disappears?

Peter: I assume bedrock there where the kiln is built. Water pools in areas but not right next to the lime kiln.

**ACTION ITEM:** Peter will look more into the geology there.

12:25 PM **Discussion, Additional Questions and Close**

Sam Whitridge

**QUESTION,** two proposals have water flow onto beaches with beach restoration to promote forage fish spawning. What percentage of beaches where you find spawn also have freshwater inputs?

Todd: I don't think it's an issue. I've seen herring spawn on enteromorpha associated with freshwater seeps. This amount of water shouldn't be a big impact. We also find post-larval smolt in the Snohomish estuary.

Tina: extra benefit of detritus connection between upland riparian and the nearshore

Kendra: want more clarity around the dynamic of how we're funding different segments of the work. I thought that SRFB \$ was supposed to be chinook focused but PSAR \$ for all salmonids?

Kat: some SRFB \$ is federal in origin from NOAA but we use those funds for projects that don't always have a chinook focus, it's allowed as long as the projects benefit salmon. We don't subdivide fund pots in that way

Tina: but in practice getting upstream work done in the SJ's with SRFB has been difficult.

Kim: for the past 15 years it was driven by our recovery strategy. Since SJ's is not a spawning area for salmon (other than cascade creek) our focus has been on protecting nearshore habitat for juveniles and forage fish.

Kat: that's the key – it needs to be consistent with your local strategy

Sam: we're starting the process to update our strategy next week so this is a timely discussion

Kat: the review panel is not looking at the project through the lens of the fund source, they're looking mainly at the technical nature of the project. And then fit to strategy

Kendra: if the process of going through recovery plan update would include coastal cutthroats, is that a possibility that freshwater components could be eligible for some funding?

Kat: we'll need to discuss that with the Partnership in terms of updating local recovery plan

12:40

Meeting wrap-up. Plan to reconvene tomorrow at 9am

**TAG Members:** Jenny DeGroot, Ray Glaze, Gene Helfmann, Judy Meyer, Melinda Rowse, Kimbal Sundberg, Tina Whitman, Todd Zackey, Mike Ramsey

**CAG Members:** Cathleen Burns, Carl Davis, Jeffrey Dyer, Megan Dethier, Kailey Genther, Phil Green, Christina Koons, Lovel Pratt, Ivan Reiff

**Non-TAG Members:** Shannon Davis, Emily Dexter, Dean Dougherty, Jim Johannessen

**Ex-officio, State and County support staff:** Kathryn Moore, Marta Green, Jen O'Neal, Laura Rivas, Frances Robertson, Byron Rot, Tom Slocum, Kendra Smith, Sam Whitridge

9:03 AM **Welcome**

*Sam Whitridge*

Sam opens meeting and reviews process: Next is May 19<sup>th</sup> TAG proposal evaluation meeting. Comments go out by June 5, at that time sponsors are notified of status and have 2 weeks to speak with the panel (not to add to presentations, just to answer questions). SRFB review panel members are Jen and Tom, not the whole TAG. June 19<sup>th</sup> is final deadline, 2 weeks before July 2 scoring meeting. July 29<sup>th</sup> final review panel comment forms sent out and final status to sponsor. August 14<sup>th</sup> ranked list due and then final decision in September. Question: will Covid19 affect the money that's available?

Kat: we will have our board meeting in June (virtually), at which we set the grant round. There has been no indication that state salmon money will be reduced. The PSAR amount is dependent on the next budget and that's where we might see a reduction, as well as in next year's SRFB amount

Laura: The grant round we are evaluating now pulls funds from two sources, the state source SRFB is set except for the internal allocation that Sam explained. The other is the PSAR which depends on future legislative process, we don't know what that will look like in January when it's discussed.

9:13AM **Presentation: (20-1214) Buoy Bay Shoreline Protection Project** *Dean Dougherty*

From SJPT, this is a conservation easement purchase. Buoy Bay is on Orcas. No adjacent protected lands but Obstruction State park nearby. The Willis family homesteaded this property. Used over time for sawmills and ranching, currently approx. 20 head of cattle. Nearby land use is low impact residential development, most houses set back from shoreline. Sand lance spawning found in recent survey at the Obstruction pass county dock. Pocket beaches and tombolo. Family operates a wedding business (low key, usually 6 per year) and want to maintain lawn and views. Still some question of ownership (family or State) but plan all tidelands to be part of the easement. PIAT II TIER II Protection priority. Willis family reports observing spawning on these beaches in past decades. The easement would prevent any structure, shoreline manipulation like armoring/docks, and changes in topography. No vegetation removal except for noxious species. Some native planting will be added to improve shading to the beach. Some vegetation on the tombolo (native trees/shrubs). Northern pocket beach is more cobbly. Lots of drift and natural processes in the winter time. Easement permits view maintenance. Removes one residential development on the northern parcel, no septic (bring in porta-potties for weddings) nor any other future development.

Drone link: [https://youtu.be/COnuoDG\\_5eU](https://youtu.be/COnuoDG_5eU)

**Question:** what is width of the easement and does it include the entire tombolo? Two tax parcels?

Dean: entire tombolo included, goes back 200' from shoreline. These are two parcels, the entire northern is included and part of southern. Northern parcel development right entirely extinguished. The risk is that in future part of family could sell off this property. Owners are multiple generations.

**Q:** will there be a provision if there's a future violation to the easement, will they be required to remove it and pay a fine? Or will retention of the violation be allowed? And will there be potential for a future owner to beef up that grandfathered business provision, make it more commercial?

Dean: they wouldn't be able to add infrastructure. The only existing structure is un-plumbed shed. The Trust has the power to get involved with lawsuits, for example, when tree-cutting happened recently on an easement the SJPT has enforced, was not satisfied with a fine but pushed for restoration

**Q:** could we include language in the easement about mooring buoys? landing craft on the beaches?

Dean: we seldom have tidelands as part of our easements but we can include language in this one. We wouldn't need to prohibit a dinghy but motorized landing craft

Tina: A buoy should be encouraged if it's alternative to a dock or marine rail, or anchoring.

Dean: we have a map in prism showing an eelgrass layer just offshore

9:53 AM **Presentation: (20-1062) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration** *Byron Rot*

Drone footage provided by Coastal Geologic, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qfR3YImRqOs>

State park is on other side of stairway down to beach. Two areas of armor removal with nice habitat in between. Troyer family home to the south. The bank is holding a vertical form, fairly resistant to erosion, eroding at a slow rate (.21' per year). There is some sediment moving from South to north, armor is occupying surf smelt spawn habitat. Barlow Bay beach is around corner. Troyer family, SJ Parks and SJ public works are partners in the project. Map shows 530' and 1000' of shoreline road removal/relocation. Road project plans to have 30% design by this summer. Basic plan is to move road to the back of the park and convert current road to a gravel trail. Our project is independent from that. Federal Highway will remove chip seal and barriers. Agate Beach shoreline armor removal and Mackaye Harbor Rd relocation are both Tier 1 restoration priorities, this is a high priority fish use shoreform and highest priority region. It's great that Troyer family is involved, all the rock is on their property. Improving forage fish habitat will benefit salmon

**Question:** If there's a trail and a fence, how much room are the top of the bank and the beach going to get?

Byron: first the fence is just an idea, not part of the project. The removed ship seal is what will go to make the trail. Then some planting and vegetation to provide cover. The unvegetated parts will likely erode over time

**Q:** you're limiting the opportunity for shoreline vegetation if you leave that surface unplanted

Byron: we'll have a chance this summer when the road design comes out and they're very flexible and open

Tina: for county parks it seems like that planting was their intent all along. This is a great project, taking sea level rise into account, private and public elements, well timed with the road project, big bang for our buck.

**Q:** will there be beach access? parking for visitors? will stairs be replaced and will there be ADA compliance?

Byron: bottom of existing stairs is eroded and dangerous. There will be a corner of armor retained right around location of existing stairs that will be reshaped to create new public access. Still needs to be decided.

**Q:** the stairs is a high-energy area. They are steep and bottom gets washed out regularly.

Byron: this will be designed by engineers. Coastal Geologic is the project manager and they're already looking at this. there will be a timing lag between the two projects but there will be improved public access. I don't know about ADA compliance, this is a county park so that may not be required.

Kendra: It's a grey area, it may be enough to provide a 'comparable' site in terms of view at top

Byron: there will be ADA parking, near new road. Asking kayaks to use the Mackaye harbor road launch

**Q:** will there be educational signs in the park explaining the project?

Byron: great idea, can this be fundable from this grant? *Kat: yes*

**ACTION ITEM:** Byron will add that in

Jen: SRFB has funded issues of access, removed roads replaced driveways in the past. Depends on the cost

Byron: I would appreciate recommendations about access and whether that should be included

Kendra: we want to pursue ADA compliant access through this grant because County won't be able to cover

Byron: first we should find out if it needs to be ADA compliant. That could have a much bigger footprint

Tina: ADA compliance would be difficult. Better to have a viewing platform at the top of the bank.

Kat: we have a grant manager who deals with these types of issues, we can connect you with them. It's about equal opportunity for experiences. And make sure educational signs are accessible.

Jen: once we know where trail is going to be we would like to see a planting plan.

10:38 AM break

10:57 AM **Presentation: (20-1043) Mackaye Harbor Beach Restoration**

*Byron Rot*

Jim Johannessen is here and Emily Dexter, landowner and project supporter. This is a public works facility, boat launch and county barge landing. The rock here is more scattered than the beach at Agate – the armor has been here a lot longer (almost 60 years, half that at Agate), more complicated for that reason. The only part of the beach that's armored is the project area. Bluff is 40' high at one end, 20' at the other.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hu5qEHSgdKw>

Work to date: Jim has been doing work around Lopez for 20 years. Drone flight + county lidar creates a 3-D layer which is the basis for design. We created a design feasibility study in December 2019. Secret Cove is privately owned, smaller pocket beach just to the north. 1967-1977 some mining, historic access road removal is a PIAT II Tier I priority. One of the longest stretches of beach roads in the SJI's. Shoreline armor removal is a Tier II priority. Boulders we can't move will be retained. Project elements: remove beach armor, road armor, and nourish. Dexter and Strain properties and the support of those owners as partners adds a lot of value. A feature of pocket beaches is minimal coastal drift processes. We see some sediment movement, in order to release sediment we'd need to remove seaward portion of the jetty. But need some jetty present to preserve the boat launch. input/material will come from upland sandy bluff.

Fit to strategy, this is a high priority public works project. This will benefit salmon by uncovering forage fish habitat. Public works was never permitted for that road in the 60's, a positive element to this project is correcting that historical wrong. Beach is public below MHHW, people may walk the beach at low tide. In a study of pocket beaches by WDFW this one was given one of the highest priorities for restoration

**Question:** what happens when we take out the road, get more space? Parking area?

Byron: If needed in the future due to bank erosion, there is space to move Norman Rd to the North by removing a sandy knob there. Moving Norman Rd is not part of this ask, and is unnecessary at this time.

**Q:** Beach nourishment will be substantial, is there monitoring to ensure stays available for spawning/rearing?

Byron: because it's a pocket beach it'll mostly stay

Jim: we have been monitoring for 20 years on this topic at 50 sites. This is a lower/moderate energy site, not part of a drift cell. Retention should be very high. Gravel gets pushed upslope a bit and sand moves around a bit but what we're adding is mostly forage fish suitable material. Using Tina's grain size and elevation data

**Q:** Jim, do you have a report from that?

ACTION ITEM: multiple reports, some summaries/some peer-reviewed, Jim will provide a few to Sam & Jen.

**Q:** a few trees shading potential forage fish spawn habitat, were there more trees there historically?

Byron: this is a very dry area, some efforts to remove scotch broom. We would like to do some planting but need some drought tolerant stuff. We may need to amend soil with some mulch

**Q:** is there any future use planned for the sand resource, planning to use that material in this project?

Byron: it's mined out except for one piece that may come into play in future for moving road. If we had to remove that we'd use it to nourish the beach. Our main aim is to restore natural processes

Tina: would be good to include some interpretive and private/use signage

Byron: Emily & I have discussed that, apparently there is some now which is ignored. We'll work to improve it

11:37AM **Presentation: (20-1040) Jackson Beach Restoration Design**

*Kendra Smith*

On SJI, this is north bay which is part of Griffin Bay. In this case, the county didn't put armor in – it was part of a historic mining site. We want to restore processes at this site. 500' of bank armor to the north, creosote pilings, forage fish spawning area to the west and south. Bluff-backed beach was mined starting in 1930's, 1990 photo showing damage where mining happened. Chip seal rock has been stored on site to maintain the road. 2019 photo shows high power transmission line cutting through site. Close-up of boulders and concrete that make up the bank. creosote piling removal is not part of this project but we're looking at ways to do that. This is the main transmission line for all of SJI but OPALCO is committed to working with us to move it.

Goals: restore geomorphic process and function. Restore sand lance and surf smelt spawning which has been identified in area. Restore floodplain complexity and function. This is 10 acres of prime waterfront, adjacent to property owned by the Port, shouldn't be industrial. Want to avoid wider parking areas. Eventually want to remove creosote pilings. Tier II armor removal priority in PIAT II. This will benefit salmon by restoring forage fish habitat. Certainty of success: We will be uncovering the sandy beach that was buried below. Public works knows how to move rocks. Engineers and construction managers think some of this material is really huge. Will need to consider what type of equipment will be optimal for removing, challenge to pick up. There is concrete and other material mixed in that will be easier removal, but shuffling in between these huge boulders. Potential integration with piling removal if the same equipment can be used. This is a visible site, we'll improve view, educational opportunities from signage etc. Support for local contractors.

### Questions

Jen: clarify in objectives, what's included in this effort vs. what's included in others? are creosote pilings part of scope of this budget? Other specific water quality impacts or just associated with creosote piling removal?

Kendra: we do plan to remove those but the focus is how to get the armor off the shore, the pilings may be in the way. We want to make it clear we're not ignoring the issue of piling removal, considering it in design

Jen: will there be planting effort and/or nourishment as part of this project?

Kendra: this is the design phase. We will consult an expert regarding what would be optimal to plant there. It's flat there and ships have used it for storage, need to negotiate for that to stop. Part of design will be biological plant designation once we know the elevation after re-grading the beach

**Q:** will this removal be done from land and not water?

Kendra: consulting with engineers, it sounds like we don't have equipment on island capable of lifting granite boulders. We asked, could we barge in equipment and crane? This will be part of design.

**Q:** will this site be managed by Port or Public works in the future?

Kendra: owned by Public Works and they will retain it. Needs to be an emergency barge landing until we get a new one established at Jensens. Hope to work with Parks to get a trail in there and improve existing trails

**Q:** and this would all be open to the public even though it's public works?

Kendra: yes because our aim is to move away from the industrial site as it exists now and make it more natural and useful. Now public works brings in a barge with chip seal and bring trucks down ramp to load. Then they take the material to storage area in Beaverton Cove. Need an interim storage area, but we are planning one nearby (next to gravel pit) and not on beach/floodplain. This doesn't happen too often.

**Q:** if you're doing a BA, should consolidate aspects and include creosote pilings, consider impacts together

Tina: good opportunity for public outreach. Especially since this is smelt and sand lance forage fish area

12:19 PM **Discussion**, Sam thanks everyone for participation.

ACTION ITEM: Sam will send links to recordings of both days to reviewers as requested.

TAG will convene in a couple weeks, get comments to sponsors in early June

ACTION ITEM: project sponsors please put their full presentations in prism

Kim: thanks Sam and all the presenters! This showed we can accomplish a complicated meeting via zoom

12:23 PM close meeting