

**San Juan County Lead Entity
SRFB Grant Round 21
CAG/TAG Scoring Meeting**

Thursday, July 2nd, 8:30am – 12:30pm

Join Zoom Meeting at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87580131854?pwd=SWxqU3Q2UExYMUpydjZoNTArU3pTdz09>

Meeting ID: 875 8013 1854

Password: 671231

Attend by phone:

+1 253 215 8782

Meeting ID: 875 8013 1854

Password: 671231

Meeting Agenda

TIME	TOPIC
8:30am-8:35am	Welcome and Overview
8:35am-8:55am	MRC Business (<i>Christina Koons</i>) - Approval of June Meeting Minutes - MRC Volunteer Hours Reporting - False Bay Visitor Surveys CAG Business (<i>Sam Whitridge</i>) - Agate Beach Design Cost Increase Request (18-1776)
8:55am-10:15am	CAG Scoring of 2020 SRFB Proposals: - (20-1562) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point - (20-1508) Hunter Bay Acquisition - (20-1506) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration - (20-1505) Judd Cove Shoreline and Stream Enhancement Project - (20-1062) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration - (20-1043) MacKaye Harbor Beach Restoration - (20-1040) Jackson Beach Restoration Design
10:15am-10:20am	<i>Break</i>
10:20am-12:30pm	TAG Scoring of 2020 SRFB Proposals: - (20-1562) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point - (20-1508) Hunter Bay Acquisition - (20-1506) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration - (20-1505) Judd Cove Shoreline and Stream Enhancement Project - (20-1062) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration - (20-1043) MacKaye Harbor Beach Restoration - (20-1040) Jackson Beach Restoration Design
12:30pm	Adjourn Meeting

CAG Members in Attendance: Cathleen Burns, Carl Davis, Megan Dethier, Jeff Dyer, Phil Green, Kailey Genter, Christina Koons, Lovel Pratt, Karin Roemers-Kleven, Laura Jo Severson, Kendra Smith

TAG Members in Attendance: Jenny DeGroot, Ray Glaze, Gene Helfman, Judy Meyer, Mike Ramsey, Marcus Reaves, Melinda Rowse, Kimbal Sundberg, Tina Whitman, Todd Zackey, Cynthia Smith

Ex-officio and County support staff: Frances Robertson, Byron Rot, Jamie Stephens, Sam Whitridge

Public: Beth Tate, Emily Dexter

8:30 AM **MRC Business**

Christina Koons

- Approval of June Meeting Minutes, Phil moves to approve, Kailey seconds. All in favor.
- Frances requests that MRC members report Volunteer Hours as soon as possible
- False Bay Visitor Surveys, thanks Cathleen & Karen for help – seeking other volunteers, during low tides
- Plastic Free Salish Sea will be launching kits in July

8:35AM – No public comment. Adjourn MRC meeting, convene CAG meeting

8:36 AM **CAG Business**

Sam Whitridge

- Agate Beach Design Cost Increase Request (18-1776)

Lead entity request, Sam reviews total request and discussions with PS partnership to find out whether this money would be coming out of this year's allocation (if so we have extra funds to cover it)

Question re: project management amount, \$7500 – is that to supplement Environmental resource manager?

Byron: I don't have funding now to participate in this project, this would allow me to keep working on it.

Brief discussion regarding design for the stairs/ beach access. Project must be wrapped by end of September.

MOTION: Lovel moves to approve the cost increase, Cathleen seconds. All in favor. (Kendra abstains)

8:47 AM **CAG Scoring of 2020 SRFB Proposals**

Sam: CAG scores on socio-economic, TAG on technical. I sent materials for review and criteria for evaluation.

- When there's a conflict of interest on a proposal, Sam will put that individual in the Zoom 'waiting room'.

- ([20-1562](#)) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point

Friends of SJ on Shaw Island. Lovel is a conflict, Tina has jumped off the call until TAG portion at 10:20AM.

It's not addressing seawater rise, seems inevitable it will flood again (that affected one score negatively)

- ([20-1508](#)) Hunter Bay Acquisition (SJ County Land bank proposal)

Concerns: Funding request is most of property value, seems like it should be an acquisition not an easement. When the Land Bank owns easements with successive property owners over time can present challenges.

There's liability for the costs the public would need to spend to defend future disputes, and the fact that the Land Bank could (hypothetically) treat infractions with a fine and let the infraction itself stand detracting from conservation value. Surprised to see no endowment associated with the easement, that's standard for maintaining conditions and defending the property if necessary

Benefits: good direct effects for herring spawn. But conservation easement on the land seems like a very indirect effect because the property only owns down to MLLW and the herring habitat is about 5' below that.

- ([20-1506](#)) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration (Land Bank)

Kendra recused because SJC matches funding. Jenny DeGroot also recused with a conflict.

Question: why wasn't climate change incorporated, is this an attempt to purchase water that won't be there? If there's a question about whether humans or fish get water that's an ongoing debate.

-If there's public access to this site there should be some signage - public benefit, understanding about restoration, etc. That's where the socioeconomic benefit is
- As a preserve this has a lot of socio-economic benefits

- ([20-1505](#)) Judd Cove Shoreline and Stream Enhancement Project

This was indicated by the review panel as a project of concern and then reworked. No recusals.

- No culvert in the budget but it's in the text. It seems that it was removed from the proposal
- Good proposal but no socioeconomic impacts mentioned

- ([20-1062](#)) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration

Last 3 are all Public Works so Byron is recused in the waiting room, Kendra is departing the meeting. We talked earlier about the design cost increase, this is the Restoration proposal we were discussing.
- if there's a plan to add informational/ interpretive signage it would meet with high scores

- ([20-1043](#)) MacKaye Harbor Beach Restoration, (no discussion just scores)

- ([20-1040](#)) Jackson Beach Restoration Design, (no discussion just scores)

Sam shares screen and reviews current ranking based on CAG scores. TAG scores are weighed more heavily.

9:38 AM Adjourn CAG meeting, break

10:23 AM **Reconvene meeting**

Sam Whitridge

Process question: does CAG need to stay silent during TAG discussion?

Answer: no, this is an open, public meeting. Comments welcome. Emily Dexter is here, landowner

Jamie: public meeting means they have access to the record, not necessarily the right to participate

Sam: since majority of non-TAG here are CAG members who have reviewed the proposals comment is fine.

Conflicts of interest: let's declare them now and Sam will put them into the 'waiting room' as needed:

Cascade Creek – Jenny DeGroot will be recused, Shaw Island and also Judd Cove – Tina, Last three - Byron

10:30 AM **TAG Scoring of 2020 SRFB Proposals:**

- ([20-1562](#)) Armor Removal at Shaw Island's Broken Point (Tina goes into the waiting room)

Nice design, removes rock and creosote from a large area that forage fish use in a high priority region.

Landowner is on board and aware of future flooding issues.

- ([20-1508](#)) Hunter Bay Acquisition

Benefits: herring spawn nearby but no evidence of salmonids. High priority area for conservation. Good confluence of freshwater stream and shoreline riparian habitat, good freshwater component.

herring spawn nearby - sites positive for forage fish nearby to south, high priority spawning area

Good acquisition project that fits in well with Hunter Bay being embedded in larger area. Owner is willing to extinguish development right and we get the property for less than title fee.

Concerns: can the Land Bank enforce a conservation easement? Wish we had better data on the beach, but at least part of the area is good for forage fish and herring just offshore

- ([20-1506](#)) Cascade Creek Flow Restoration (Land Bank project, Jenny goes into the waiting room)

Benefits: Where else in the county do we have salmon spawning? Good demonstration area, educate public about water issues and how they affect spawning fish, we look good defending this site. It's so important to protect flow in Cascade Creek and impressed with work Land Bank has done. This is the best chance to get the water and the purchase of inflow monitoring.

Concerns: Score depends on whether it's purchase or lease. That wasn't cleared up between presentation and now. Not certain Orcas Water holding will sell right. Several reviewers said they would *only* be in favor of a purchase and not of a lease, with the condition that we're purchasing a portion of the senior water right. Land Bank said they would just pursue communication with other water rights holders, no commitment toward further purchases doesn't guarantee flow in low flow years. There's a lot of uncertainty around water rights issues. There was no MOU or landowner awareness agreement. Needs discussion of drought/climate change. Travesty that we need to buy water rights to maintain enough flow in a stream for fish. But we're not maintaining sufficient flows for fish unless we buy it

Question: if we make it a condition that it must be a purchase, will that give Land Bank more leverage?

There's a lot of support for this on Orcas, just worry that it still wouldn't give enough water at the right time

Sam: I'm hearing that the majority of you would switch to green if this was a purchase

RESPONSES: ...and more positive feedback from water rights owner, and some competent legal work done

Q: What would happen to this money if we don't use it for this?

Sam & Byron: it comes back to our pot to be redistributed, there's a certain time window in which to use it

- (20-1505) Judd Cove Shoreline and Stream Enhancement Project

(Let Jenny back in to the room, send Tina to the waiting room)

Benefits: good project, fixes an historical error. Cost benefit is good, at minimum armor removed and bonus if stream mouth goes in and then you get a micro-estuary in there. More justification for the marine aspect.

One reviewer said, 'Like the shoreline, I view the freshwater part as an extension of nearshore restoration.

They're doing wetland restoration by putting the stream back. First, this is fairly inexpensive – high bang for buck. I don't think it's a good use of public funds to do more design work.'

Concerns: Design not thorough, not defined enough. Poorly presented, especially the freshwater aspect.

culvert replacement? Hard to understand without being there on site. Proposal said they were scaling back, costs reduced because they're moving to a non-fish-passable culvert. Smaller culvert without as much engineering. I appreciate that they scaled project back but it should be entirely shoreline for this project.

Hard to believe that stream is passable to anadromous fish. Too much of a vertical bank up to stream unless we get more information to support idea that fish can access/use that stream, more costs for that than for the shoreline portion. This doesn't look like a cutthroat stream even though they say it could be.

Sam: Do we want conditions?

Most reviewers want to take the stream part/freshwater component out. If it is included, do they need a feasibility study for the stream and is there a potential to use part of the money to do that feasibility study and fund the marine part? Must determine if the stream part is SRFB fundable before encouraging sponsor to go through with that. Could consider the lower stream work as part of the nearshore habitat -that's not how it's presented, but that's the only way we could fund a stream like this

11:49am short break

11:57am reconvene

- (20-1062) Agate Beach County Park Shoreline Restoration

Project is well-vetted, straightforward, long-term benefits etc. County/parks/highway/private landowner all in it together. Great that there's money in the budget for signage. This is a good example of taking an action in response to projected climate change and sea level rise.

A lot of concern about the stairs given high-energy environment. But any change would be an improvement.

Review panel wanted more information on the planting aspect, should be resolved - the area provided for planting was an issue, now it's wider. water will be trucked in for first couple of summers for irrigation.

- (20-1043) MacKaye Harbor Beach Restoration

Benefits: Improves habitat for one of the few known sand lance spawning beaches, great landowner involvement, great redressing of past bad acts against landowners. Armor removal is a great improvement to the site. They addressed concerns we brought up last round

Concerns: A few reviewers said they wish the project would take out the whole groin.

Needs interpretative signage here because it's a public boat launch.

Beach nourishment material seems more suitable for smelt than for sand lance.

- (20-1040) Jackson Beach Restoration Design

Benefits: good interconnection with county park, nearby nature trail, high visibility - lots of visitors. important project, adjacent to sand lance spawning, cleaning up old debris will be a big improvement. There's a huge creosote dock structure out there, LIO has some extra money so it's possible they can combine the piling removal with some of that funding which comes from EPA.

Concerns: not convinced this will have a lot of benefit for salmon. Some questions about what's possible in terms of being able to move big rocks out of intertidal. questions about the temporary barge use

12:30 Sam shows spreadsheet and reviews initial ranking based on all scores. Cascade creek and Judd Cove were yellow so Sam will communicate that to Land Bank and follow-up.

ACTION ITEM: when scores are finalized Sam will send them out to CAG and TAG

Rankings are due August 14th, we'll finalize list at August meeting. More work required on at least three of these over the next month.

Kim: thank you Sam! You made this process easier

12:36 ADJOURN