

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Preliminary Nearshore Action Recommendations and Prioritization Criteria**

(Note: A preliminary list of nearshore conservation and restoration areas for Bainbridge Island is included but the list has not been scored with the criteria yet. The nearshore working group will update this list as we gain more knowledge)

## APPENDIX B

**PRELIMINARY NEARSHORE ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS:** The following criteria, which was adapted from Correa 2002, was used to prioritize **preliminary** nearshore actions identified in East Kitsap WRIA 15. The actions were identified using the KGI<sup>3</sup> Watershed Nearshore Salmon Habitat Assessment, Draft Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment, Limiting Factors Analysis for East WRIA 15 and by professional local knowledge<sup>4</sup>. This list is intended to be a starting place and as we gain more knowledge the criteria and list will be updated based on the findings. If additional actions are identified, the criteria can be used to prioritize them relative to the actions in this list. Therefore, these criteria and list of action recommendations should be considered as “**interim**” until more and better data is developed.

In addition to the list of nearshore actions, the following general nearshore actions should be considered when identifying nearshore protection and restoration projects or implementing policy and/or regulatory decisions.

- Protection of naturally eroding bluffs
- Removal of intertidal fill
- Removal of shoreline armoring or replacement with alternatives such as large woody debris and/or riparian plantings
- Protection of estuaries
- Proper treatment of stormwater and wastewater
- Protection and/or restoration of salt marsh habitat
- Removal of unused creosoted pilings

### **Prioritization Method**

#### Proximity to priority watersheds, maximum 3 points

The proximity to priority watersheds, as determined by the Watershed Geographic Prioritization Method (Appendix A) was evaluated as follows:

- If the nearshore project action was within 0.0 to 1.0 miles from a Tier 1 estuary, the action received 3 points.
- If the nearshore project action was within 0.0 to 1.0 miles from a Tier 2 estuary, the action received 2 points.
- If the nearshore project action was within 0.0 to 1.0 miles from a Tier 3 estuary, the action received 1 point.

---

<sup>3</sup> KGI refers to the Key Peninsula, Gig Harbor, and Island Watershed in Pierce County.

<sup>4</sup> Our knowledge of nearshore habitat use by salmonids is relatively basic but is expanding and the database on nearshore salmonid habitat conditions is also sparse. The KGI and Bainbridge Island Nearshore assessments will help fill those gaps. However, an assessment is required for the remainder of East Kitsap before a comprehensive list of actions can be developed.

### Spatial Scale, maximum 5 points

The size of the benefit was evaluated as follows:

- The action received 5 points if the project protected and/or restored greater than 10 acres of habitat.
- The action received 4 points if the project protected and/or restored 5 to 10 acres of habitat.
- The action received 3 points if the project protected and/or restored 2 to 5 acres of habitat.
- The action received 2 points if the project protected and/or restored 1/2 to 2 acres of habitat.
- The action received one point if the project protected and/or restored less than 1/2 acre of habitat.

### Ecological Scale, maximum 5 points

Ecological scale was designed to evaluate impacts to nearshore processes. If the action addressed multiple processes, species and life histories, it received a higher value. For example, if an action recommendation involved estuary restoration that would affect both nearshore and riverine processes, such as dike removal in the lower floodplain, it received a higher score than one that involved a single process, such as the removal of individual creosoted pilings, which systematically received one point.

### Temporal Scale, maximum 3 points

Temporal scale was designed to evaluate the longevity of a benefit(s) gained through implementation of a recommendation. For example, if the action recommendation restored a nearshore process that provided long-term benefits, it received a higher score than a project that provided short-term benefits and required considerable maintenance.