



*Citizen Advisory Group Meeting  
 May 20, 2015  
 9:00 am – 12:00 pm  
 NOAA NW Fisheries Science Center  
 Manchester Research Station  
 7305 Beach Drive East  
 Port Orchard, WA*

**Meeting Summary**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Paul Dorn	<i>Suquamish Tribe</i>	Tom Ostrom	<i>Suquamish Tribe</i>
Barry Berejikian	<i>NOAA - NMFS</i>	Marian Berejikian	<i>WSWC</i>
Barbara Ann Smolko	<i>Pierce County</i>	Renee Scherdnik	<i>Kitsap Co. Public Works</i>
Glen Jurgens	<i>Poggie Club</i>	Matt Brincka	<i>WSU</i>
Renee Johnson	<i>WSU</i>		

**1. Introductions**

Members introduced themselves and approved the February 2015 meeting summary.

**2. Call For Vice Chair** – Chris Waldbillig (WDFW) is moving on to another position. A new Vice Chair will be needed. Marian asked if anyone was interested or if they might have a nominee. This issue will be discussed again at the June CAG meeting when more attendees are present.

**3. Factors Affecting the Marine Survival of Puget Sound Steelhead** – Barry Berejikian gave a presentation of what factors might be causing the decline of steelhead in Puget Sound. His study was based on implanting tags in fish and detecting the tags through receiver arrays from Strait of Juan De Fuca (SJF) to Nisqually. Harbor seals were fitted with receivers to detect fish as well.

On the Washington Coast, steelhead have declined about 30%; and within Puget Sound it is even worse. Nisqually is now 10% of what it once was. It gets worse the further south you go in Puget Sound. There is lower abundance, survival and productivity. Steelhead smolts are leaving Puget Sound within 10 days to two weeks. Survival rates are higher on the smolts journey to the river mouth. Mouth of Green River to SJF survival = 17%; Nisqually River mouth to SJF = 10%. There have not been any hatchery releases in the Nisqually for 30 years. Marine migration shows the highest mortality for steelhead smolts. The less time the fish spend in the estuary the higher the survival. Also, fish out migrating in April vs. mid May, survive better. They avoid nearshore areas, don't school and use about 1/3 of the center of channel (Puget Sound). What is causing mortality? The Harbor seal population is increasing and they eat smolts. An infection from a flatworm can also cause poorer survival rates by impacting swimming behavior. The NMFS would like to expand the study into south Puget Sound (Gertrude Island) looking at:

- Retrieving tags
- Considering state harbor seal census data

*NOTE- The data is still being analyzed and thus not final. The presentation cannot be sent out at this time.*

**4. Project discussion** – Marian provided CAG members with information on the nine current grant round projects, funding request along with comments given to project sponsors from the Salmon Recovery Board Funding Review Panel members. **See table below for summary.**

Project Name	Comments
Schoolhouse Creek (15-1077)	Include historic channel condition and include LIDAR information to inform project design. Restore mowed area in Phase 1 to see more complete restoration benefits. Due to wetlands on site, a light touch will be needed during restoration. Is it premature to restore site before culverts are opened?
Crescent Creek culvert feasibility (15-1079)	A sediment transport and deposition analysis would strengthen proposal with each evaluated alternative. How was the estuary channel sediment deposition above historic level determined? Have adjacent land owners been contacted and will they be included in the process? There may be a need for a higher level of public involvement due to the project impacts to owners downstream. Cost effectiveness of the alternatives should be evaluated and considered. It is a potentially expensive project depending on alternatives selected and benefits to fish and habitat.
West Oakland Bay (14-1403)	No ranking for this project. TAG will decide if they wish to give funding to this project. If yes, they will determine how much. This project ranked high in its own Lead Entity and is a regional priority. No site visit.
Cowling Creek culverts replacement design (15-1074)	The County will need to be more involved in this project to define road width, and identify issues with utilities, construction and road closures. This project is listed as a Tier 5 classification in the Chinook Recovery Chapter. It appears to be a low priority for the watershed. Additional justification is needed for working in this creek. Please provide a map of the watersheds that shows other fish passage barriers in the system and include information on the river miles of these barriers. There should be some discussion about the left bank tributary (grade controls were placed in the past).
Harper Estuary Restoration Design (15-1075)	A conceptual design should be available to understand what size bridge span is needed to meet project objectives. The design costs seem high. A breakdown of sub tasks would be helpful. More clarity is needed on how the County and bridge design team will coordinate to the WDFW restoration design work. The restoration work should move with the alternative analysis process. Clarify design criteria. The RCO funded boat ramp will be relocated and appears to directly affect the bridge design because it will change the amount of fill remaining in the estuary. The relocation of the ramp to another site would provide a more complete restoration. Clarify the funding source and timing limitations and land ownership in the estuary. Provide the County's traffic study that was used to inform about the decision to not abandon the road.
Port Orchard Passage Phase 1: Feasibility and Design (15-1076)	Restoration should focus on fill, armoring and non-native vegetation. Removal of the house may not be commensurate with the benefits for fish. Clarify the funding request for wetland delineation. If a purchase agreement cannot be reached before final SRFB application, no final application will be submitted.
Grovers Creek Acquisition Phase 2 (15-1080)	A County of floodway map of the area could be valuable. More justification of the benefit vs. cost is needed. It appears the \$380,000 is only buying one development right and there is 300 feet of buffer from this potential development area. Some information from the County on the status of the culvert between the properties would be helpful.
Purdy Creek Feasibility (14-2176)	No site visit this year. Was ranked last year. Will be re-ranked with all of the above projects for 2015 grant round.
Evergreen Park nearshore restoration design (14-1949)	No site visit this year. Was ranked last year. Will be re-ranked with all of the above projects for 2015 grant round.

**5. Ranking questions for TAG were presented to the group.** See below for the questions TAG will use to rank each project:

**Q1.** Budget appears reasonable relative to what should be achieved.

**Q2.** Budget appears reasonable relative to like projects.

**Q3.** Project design and scale are appropriate, adequate and sufficient to accomplish the Project Sponsor's intent.

**Q4.** The Project's sequencing is appropriate for watershed condition.

**Q5.** Project sponsor and partners have adequate experience and capabilities.

**Q6.** Project has landowner(s) who are supportive and committed.

**Q7.** Project reduces at least one of the key pressures identified in the nearshore or freshwater areas of the West Sound Monitoring & Adaptive Management Framework results chains listed below:

- Marine levees, tidegates, floodgates
- Nearshore shoreline infrastructure
- Culverts, roads and railroads
- Housing and urban areas
- Commercial and industrial areas, and ports
- Tourism and recreation areas

**Q8.** Project protects or restores natural functions and processes.

**Q9.** Project is integrated or associated with other salmon recovery projects and assessments.

**Q10.** Project provides future biological benefits.

**Q11.** Does the project proposal include a plan for maintenance to ensure project longevity?

**Q12.** Is the project listed as a Near Term Action identified by a Local Integrating Organization?

**6. Adjourn** – The Meeting adjourned around 11:15 a.m. so attendees could attend a tour of the Manchester Research Station on site.