Meeting goals

• Brief review of commonly asked questions from the August meetings;
• Review next steps in the info-gathering phase;
• Address questions raised at the July 28th meeting - “The Report;”
• To share information about upcoming opportunities to participate
Meeting agenda

5:00 – 5:10 Welcome, introductions, goals/agenda
   Project timeline review for current planning phase
5:10 – 5:30 Engineer’s update - Common Questions from August Results
5:30 – 5:40 10 min Q & A with Blue Coast/Mid Sound/County
5:40 – 5:55 Guest Speaker: Doris Small, Fish & Wildlife Biologist (WDFW), 2010 Report co-author
5:55 – 6:15 Nearshore fish habitat Q & A
6:15 – 6:20 Thank you to National Estuary Week Participants!
Project timeline

Early Feasibility and outreach
2018 - June 2021

Geotech and groundwater studies Nov 2021 – Dec 2022

Community outreach Jan 2022 - ongoing

Preliminary groundwater data analysis & conceptual model

PARTNER REVIEW CHECK POINT - AUGUST 2022!

Surface water & groundwater model & prediction Feb - Dec 2022

PARTNER REVIEW CHECK POINT – EARLY 2023

Develop preliminary alternatives – Spring 2023

CO-DEVELOP WITH PARTNERS
[Q & A Review – switch to Jessica’s slides]
Project development

With predominantly larger Chinook juveniles in the catch, our study suggests that salmon recovery projects for marine habitat in North Kitsap focus on nearshore beaches and marine water quality rather than deltas or pocket estuaries. This would complement the watershed’s need to emphasize early marine life history for chum and pink salmon juvenile habitat. Pocket estuaries may still be important for salmon recovery in an indirect way along Kitsap shorelines (e.g. contribute organic material important to food webs) and are certainly important for nearshore ecosystem recovery.

When we began this study, we were interested in the 25+ acre former salt marsh at Point No Point that is disconnected from saltwater influence by a tidegate. To restore this site to saltwater influence would be a very complicated and expensive project due to potential for flooding of residences and a roadway connection to a popular county park. Engineering for this project would be difficult and biological information was needed to determine if it was worth pursuing.

Based on the results of this study, the cost of such a project would not be justified on the basis of juvenile salmon or marine fish at this time. It remains to be seen if juvenile salmon of smaller size (that might use such a pocket estuary) increase in abundance over time along North Kitsap shorelines as salmon recovery proceeds in other watersheds. Other wetland values (e.g. bird use) may contribute to development of some type of habitat restoration work to best meet the combination of human and natural resource values in the area.
Nearshore fish study 2007-09 included sites from Foulweather Bluff to Eglon

- Point No Point resort/boat ramp
- Point No Point by parking lot
- South Point No Point by tidegate outlet

Objective of study was to characterize nearshore fish use along North Kitsap shorelines

- Juvenile salmon
- Forage fish (e.g., surf smelt & sand lance)
- Other nearshore fish species

Point No Point habitat restoration was not the focus of the study
## “Top Ten” Total North Kitsap Catch 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Herring</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>8,067</td>
<td>94,286</td>
<td>107,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiner Perch</td>
<td>14,390</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>15,444</td>
<td>40,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Salmon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25,873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Sand Lance</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>18,296</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>21,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chum Salmon</td>
<td>10,857</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>16,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Smelt</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>7,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staghorn Sculpin</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Sole</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubesnout</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Perch</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coho Salmon</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Salmon</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the top ten species would be present in a restored Point No Point estuary
Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects have a specific focus:

- Salmon
- Federally listed salmon populations
  - Puget Sound Chinook
  - Hood Canal Summer Chum
  - Puget Sound Steelhead
  - Bull Trout

Our nearshore fish study collected data on all nearshore fish species, but the report emphasizes what we learned about salmon utilization, including listed species such as Chinook salmon.

Chinook salmon were tenth most abundant fish collected in the North Kitsap nearshore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish Species</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Herring</td>
<td>107,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiner Perch</td>
<td>40,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Salmon</td>
<td>25,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Sand Lance</td>
<td>21,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chum Salmon</td>
<td>16,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Smelt</td>
<td>7,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staghorn Sculpin</td>
<td>3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Sole</td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubesnout</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Perch</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coho Salmon</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Salmon</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary findings

- Chinook and coho salmon catch peaks in late May and June.

- Juvenile Chinook along North Kitsap shorelines are relatively large. We did not catch juvenile salmon in early spring months or less than 70 mm size. We caught many smaller fish & probably would have seen smaller Chinook if they were around in any numbers. These are larger fish and may not exclusively use the nearshore.

- While most of the Chinook were of hatchery origin, most of the coho were unclipped & untagged.

- Small chum salmon are present in the catch along the upper Kitsap Peninsula (near Skunk Bay) as early as we start fishing. Some of these small chum could be Hood Canal summer chum juveniles.

- Pink salmon juveniles are present along the North Kitsap shorelines in high numbers, although these fish rarely spawn in Kitsap streams.

- Some of the chum/pink salmon juveniles remain in nearshore waters (although perhaps not exclusively) until quite large.
Focusing on natural process restoration instead of species restoration will assure habitat conditions are sustainable & resilient

- Direct & indirect utilization by species
- Building habitat for future fish populations
With predominantly larger Chinook juveniles in the catch, our study suggests that salmon recovery projects for marine habitat in North Kitsap focus on nearshore beaches and marine water quality rather than deltas or pocket estuaries. This would complement the watershed’s need to emphasize early marine life history for chum and pink salmon juvenile habitat. Pocket estuaries may still be important for salmon recovery in an indirect way along Kitsap shorelines (e.g. contribute organic material important to food webs) and are certainly important for nearshore ecosystem recovery.

When we began this study, we were interested in the 25+ acre former salt marsh at Point No Point that is disconnected from saltwater influence by a tidetate. To restore this site to saltwater influence would be a very complicated and expensive project due to potential for flooding of residences and a roadway connection to a popular county park. Engineering for this project would be difficult and biological information was needed to determine if it was worth pursuing.

Based on the results of this study, the cost of such a project would not be justified on the basis of juvenile salmon or marine fish at this time. It remains to be seen if juvenile salmon of smaller size (that might use such a pocket estuary) increase in abundance over time along North Kitsap shorelines as salmon recovery proceeds in other watersheds. Other wetland values (e.g. bird use) may contribute to development of some type of habitat restoration work to best meet the combination of human and natural resource values in the area.

*From Small & Dorn, 2010, West Sound Nearshore Fish Utilization & Assessment*
SAVE THE DATE

Thursday, October 27\textsuperscript{th}
5:00 - 6:30pm
GHCC or Zoom

Follow up on any remaining Q & A from past meetings

Nam Siu, WDFW Area Habitat Biologist

Look for an email reminder to RSVP or visit Mid Sound Fisheries website!
Thank you for joining us!

Next meeting: Thursday, September 29th
[Extra slides – not used during meeting]
Regional significance

- Juvenile salmon rearing habitat
- Barrier embayments
West Sound Nearshore Prioritization

Confluence et. al. 2016
Location of groundwater monitoring wells
Visual Scope of Work

POINT NO POINT WETLAND RESTORATION Conceptual Plan