

Final Notes, Skagit Watershed Council Technical Work Group (TWG)

April 25, 2019, 1:00 – 4:00PM, SWC Office, Mount Vernon

decisions underlined, **action items bold**

Convened 1:10pm

Attendees: Alison Studley (SFEG, Chair), Bob Warinner (WDFW), Devin Smith (Skagit River System Cooperative), Rick Hartson (Upper Skagit Indian Tribe), Emily Derenne (Skagit County), Aundrea McBride (SWC), Kari Odden (Skagit Land Trust), Tom Slocum (Skagit Conservation District)

Absent: Erik Anderson (Aspect Consulting), Jeremy Gilman (USFS), Erin Lowery (Seattle City Light), Doug Bruland (PSE),

Guests: Erin Murray (ex-officio member PSP), Catey Ritchie (SRSC), Richard Brocksmith (SWC), Sue Madsen (SFEG), Jennifer Holderman (DOE), Consultants from Anchor on behalf of Skagit County

Beginning Business

Bob moves to approve March notes as written, TWG agrees

Committee Reports

Board of Directors (Richard)

- Board met April 11th
- Steelhead recovery plans, working on comments
- Lead entity program update
- Wiley Slough Letter of Intent
 - WDFW decided to pull project to continue alternatives assessment
 - M&AM discussion about Wiley: Projects have no mechanism to do adaptive management depending on future site conditions
- Upper Skagit Copper Mine: Wrote a letter opposing mine
- Marblemount Quarry
 - Draft in review
 - Asking for an EIS

M&AM Subcommittee (Richard)

- Current M and AM project (SRSC) working on relative elevation models and hydro model
- Aundrea working with updating riparian actions database
- Discussed “How can we pick up monitoring report”

Protection Subcommittee (Bob)

- Discussed process for passing properties to the TWIG when they need restoration.
- Green lighted (2 properties)
 - Finney Creek
 - Corkindale “Johnson Property”. Has some hydromodification mapped (old riprap) therefore sent to TWG for final review.

Corkindale Property (This needed to be its own agenda item)

Background: Total purchase = 5 parcels totaling 64.5 acres on the mainstem with 2,830 feet of river bank. The 3 parcels near the water scored green (together scored 1.901). SCL will need to acquire the other 2 parcels using other means because they have no habitat on them (They will and then sell them with development rights.). Size of eligible parcels is approx. 54.7 acres. About 13% of shoreline has derelict riprap (370ft). Rock is 2-4 ft diameter, riprap slope is less than 45 degrees, the bank is 100% mature trees. The whole lot is vegetated. The property will go on the market May 15th.

Discussion: This raised again the issue of what is the process for reviewing purchases with restoration needs. The following comments were made:

- The way Corkindale property came to the TWiG was not workable for a quorum of members to greenlight it today.
- The tracking form was not filled out accurately or with enough detail to enable TWiG to make a decision. **Aundrea will update form.**
- People were not willing to make a decision on zero notice. It was suggested 2 weeks notice would be ideal, but may not always be possible.
- Issues need to be address before it comes to the TWiG and in advance of the meeting so TWiG members have a chance to review, discuss, etc. the information.
- SLT needs a decision ASAP because the seller is anxious to be done with it.
- What is the plan with these parcels, and who pays for the work to restore once it's purchased?
- Would it do more harm to remove the hydromod or leave it in place?
- It is not the prevue of the protection committee to make a determination about the significance of riprap. That's why it goes to the TWiG for >0% hydromods.
- There must be increased engagement between sponsor and restoration practitioners if a proposed purchase will require (or has the potential to require) restoration.
- The Land Trust and SCL must initiate this contact when they start an acquisition project since they are the project sponsors. They must present the proposal at TWiG. It doesn't make sense for someone else to do it (Bob, Aundrea)
- Need to have a spelled-out procedure that someone with restoration expertise goes into field to look at site before TWG review.
- We need a secure way to share information about these sites prior to the TWiG meeting so that owner info is not released, but TWiG can be informed. Ideas:
 - Give the hydromod # to look at it, instead of parcel #
 - Use Box read-only files
 - Redact info on forms
- Proposals must come to the TWiG with due diligence completed by sponsors, with the help of restoration practitioners, on the rough scope and cost of and responsibility for implementing any restoration the site requires or justification for why restoration isn't necessary at this time.
- The TWiG must have more notice (2 weeks?) from sponsors about the proposals and proposals must include sufficient information (one pager filled out completely).
- Feedback on forms:
 - More detail on site descriptions (ex: accurate length of shoreline)
 - More detail on acreage, what qualifies and what doesn't

We ran out of time at this meeting to reach any resolution on this topic.

Decision:

- **TWG convenes on May 8th after site visit to make a decision** about the Corkindale property.
(We need 7 members present for a quorum.)
- **This topic of process is tabled until our next regular meeting.**

Carey's Slough Culvert Design Review

Background: **Members of the TWiG are invited to review and provide feedback to the sponsor on this project by May 22nd.** TWG does not have a formal decision to make about this project. Comment opportunity was written into grant process. **Sponsor asked that individuals focus on technical comments and not too much on cost. Sue will send out 'cartoon' diagrams.**

- Goal: design culverts/bridges that meet NOAA standards
 - Recently did assessments (boring, modelling) determined it will not be easy
 - Need to do piling 28 feet from existing roadway
 - Preferred Alternative: Sheet Pile – concrete slab bridge on sheet pile used by driving in pilings, w/out dewatering. Still 19 ft. in length clear opening to avoid bridge classification
 - Looked at different opening sizes w/ scour analysis and hydraulics and needed a 12 foot opening. Striving to stay below 19 feet to avoid counting it as a bridge
 - Found not much gain from 19ft versus 12ft opening
 - Maximum free board with concrete slab. Ended up with **a 13.9 ft opening.**
 - Definitions of bridge differ between what is needed for highway inspection versus permit reviewers
- Cost Estimate:
 - Total: \$1,200,000 for 1 site (30% contingency)
 - Doesn't include sales tax, etc.

Comments:

- talk to Erin L. about fish #s
- What about costs for temporarily removing utility lines? Power, water, etc. and who pays?
- Ideally won't want to get SRFB \$ for both bridges
- What happens when you don't do both bridges? Will impact people in the center?

South Fork Dike Setback Design Review

Background: TWG does not have a formal decision to make about this. **Comment opportunity** was written into grant process. Can provide comments to Emily within next few days (**before May 1**). Talking to landowner on the 1st. 18month contract scheduled to be extended for 2 months.

- Goals:
 - Increase tidal exchange and floodplain connection through the site to re-establish to the degree possible, natural hydrological processes
 - Maximize juvenile rearing.
 - Aim to increase residence time of water
 - Concerns about downstream instability
 - With river flow from the above – down stream can we create stability within the side channel
- Opportunities and Constraints:
 - Concerns from DD#3 about how the project may affect flooding or flow velocities near the existing levee

- Landowners expressed interest in maintaining the ability to access the gravel bar adjacent to the site
- Individual landowner is not part of DD3
- Site improvements have potential to provide significant rearing habitat
- All life histories types are present to colonize restored habitats
- Upstream segment of levee that remained after prior levee setback effort must remain in place
- No rock along the left bank of the channel shall be removed
- Avoiding stream gauge
- Avoiding hawks nest
- Identified wetlands in the area – CORPS wanted a wetland assessment

Looked at three alternatives--discussion and comments:

- Pond looks close to levee, not a lot of vegetation to cover pond
A: make it narrower and longer than more rounded (keep predators out)
- What about the dead ends? Will they fill in?
A: some ponds part of 2003 construction, one is pretty deep and has survived 16 years
- Why not make Alt 3 with 2 fingers a pond?
- Disturbance/Construction Impacts--Comments: not so much of a big deal
- Budget
 - 1 off site haul: 1,300,00
 - Excav disturbance: 3/2
 - 2 off site haul: 1,400,000
 - 3 off site haul: 2,000,000
- Preferred Alternative Selection
 - Not much more expensive to make bigger option (#3)
 - Sounds like excavation wetlands will not be an issue?
 - Sensitive of water at base of dikes
 - Could you have more than 1 inlet at top end?
 - Which would fish prefer? Constant channel or backwater?
A: depends on life history stage
 - Comment: use HDM model/climate change effects on flows and SLR

Next steps post land-owner approval:

- Develop 60% Design package for Stakeholder Review – May 17
- Receive Stakeholder Comments – May 31
- Develop 100% Design Package for Stakeholder Review – July 19
 - Comment: If no construction must wait for funding, then don't stamp as final designs
- Receive Stakeholder Comments – Aug 2
- Develop and Deliver Final Design – Aug 16

Skagit Water Supply Task Force Habitat SOW Review

Background: Developing 5 different scopes. New draft is out for formal comment with Joint Legislative Taskforce to address water supply in the valley. The proposed project will designate low/medium/high categories for areas that have capacity to contribute to alluvial storage. Are certain geomorphic areas that may alter designations. **No formal decision was asked of TWG. DOE is asking members of TWG**

for technical comments and feedback related to if the study outcomes will be useful/synergistic for SWC members. Comments due May 5th.

Comments:

- Hoping work plan would include storage capacity (quantitative)
- Is next step to do geo testing?
- Where did you get 34 tributaries from?
A: from a previous list
- Replace “quantitative” with “relative” potential for recharge
- Appreciate one of the outcomes (reference list) can be used to educate across the state
- Have GIS references for resolution, scale of data, comparability

Lead Entity Update

- 4 projects submitted draft applications and will be part of site visits.
- The site visit schedule is set. Britt Slough will be on Tuesday afternoon, Barnaby Slough and Riparian Maintenance sites on Wednesday morning, and the Corkindale acquisition site Wednesday afternoon.

Adjourned: 3:59pm