

Kitsap County Natural Resources Asset Management Program (KNRAMP)

Advisory Group Workshop Summary

Meeting Date: 11/19/2025

Attendees: Steve Todd (Suquamish Tribe), Chloe Donaldson (Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe), Marla Powers (Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe), Bruce Weiskotten (Skokomish Tribe), Brittany Gordon (Kitsap County), Jonathan Raine (Kitsap County), Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech (Kitsap County), Mindy Roberts (WA Conservation Action Education Fund), Robinson Low (WA Conservation Action Education Fund), Dana Stefan (Ross Strategic), Casey Hart (Ross Strategic).

Next Steps

- Advisory Group members were invited to provide additional feedback on the Draft State of Natural Assets Report following the meeting.
- The Facilitation Team will revise the Draft State of Natural Assets Report based on feedback and finalize and distribute the report in mid-December.
- The information and maps in the Streams section will be updated to account for the 2025 water quality data recently released.
- In 2026, the team will conduct further engagement with partners. Advisory Group members are encouraged to: a) use the State of the Assets Report in partner engagement, and; b) identify ways to advance actions in the four KNRAMP focus areas (Chico, Big Beef, Kinman, Curley).

Workshop Objectives

Casey Hart welcomed the Core Team and reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives. The meeting's goals were to review and gather feedback on the State of Assets Report and share relevant organizational updates.

KNRAMP State of the Natural Assets Report: Goals & Overview

The group was reminded of the purpose of the State of the Natural Assets Report:

- The report is intended for all partners engaged in protecting and restoring natural resources across Kitsap County.
- It provides an overview of the condition of natural assets (streams/forests/marine shorelines) throughout the County and highlights the actions and achievements under the four KNRAMP focus areas.
- The report will be publicly available and will serve as a communication and engagement tool for the County and the Advisory Group.
- A short story map with interactive maps will be created to complement the report.
- Starting early next year, it will help guide outreach to partners and inform annual County planning processes.

- The Advisory Group will meet annually to discuss the report so the content and analysis can be adaptively managed and improved over time.

KNRAMP State of the Natural Assets Report: Condition of Natural Assets Across the County

The Advisory Group reviewed the streams, forests, and shorelines sections of the State of the Natural Assets Report. These sections describe each asset’s level of service (LOS), attributes, and proposed management approaches, and include example areas for protection and restoration. The Advisory Group considered three questions:

- **General observations:** Is there any content that is missing or anything that should be clarified?
- **Management approaches:** Do you see anything that should be updated/clarified/or added in the management approaches for each asset?
- **Example focus areas:** Looking at the example focus areas maps for each asset, are there any other areas that you think should be added or anything that should be removed?

High-level clarifications and input:

- New water quality data has been released for 2025 and the information and maps in the Stream section will be updated.
- The report includes example areas for protection and restoration under each asset (streams/forests/marine shorelines) as guidance for partners. However, exclusion from these maps does not mean no action.
- For County-wide LOS maps, we should maintain management units within the County’s jurisdictional boundaries.
- Clearly communicate how KNRAMP uses data (including habitat proxies) and highlight that KNRAMP is adaptively managed and that LOS data will be updated annually as it becomes available.

STREAMS - Advisory Group observations and input:

- Clarify that some streams may have high LOS due to good B-IBI and water quality but still have fish passage barriers impairing salmon habitat.
- Note that “known” fish passage barriers are listed based on available data; some barriers on private land are unmapped.
- KNRAMP looks at water quality and B-IBI data and uses riparian metrics as a proxy for stream health. Water is cooler in protected areas than in restored areas, such as head waters. Deeper pools and habitat complexity help lower stream temperatures.

FORESTS - Advisory Group observations and input:

- Forests face ongoing development pressures and have a lower LOS than streams and marine shorelines because restoration efforts have historically focused on riparian and wetland areas under GMA, CAO, and riparian management.
- Organizations such as Great Peninsula Conservancy (GPC) have been responding to forest needs through acquisitions and creating working forests with healthy management practices. Public interest in complex forests and long-term protection is increasing.

- Protected medium-LOS forests will eventually grow into high or very high LOS.
- Add Bainbridge Island to the example area maps for restoration or protection.
- Emphasize continued management of agricultural land, acknowledging that the report does not suggest replacing agricultural land with forest.
- For future consideration or for inclusion in the story map:
 - Add a data layer to account for protected forests with high or very high LOS, e.g., managed by County Parks, GPC, or Keta lands (which includes about 80 acres of old growth from tree farm parcels).
 - Add a data layer to visualize urban, rural, and protected lands.
 - Use NRCS surveys to better understand agricultural zoning.

SHORELINES - Advisory Group observations and input:

- Emphasize that areas with a high or very high LOS should be preserved, despite the fact that some economic activities make preservation challenging.
- Some heavily armored areas can show high LOS (e.g., Bainbridge), but removing shoreline armor is still important in some areas for shoreline improvement.
- Non-armored healthy shorelines or refugia in the middle of armored areas are important to protect.
- Where armoring exists, consider adaptive management with mitigation, e.g., removing beach debris.
- Add Bainbridge Island and the Port of Kingston to the example area maps for restoration or protection.
- For future consideration: discuss a potential armoring percentage as part of the management approach.
- Add WHSPER as a future process to consider.
- Related preservation/restoration efforts led by other partners should be factored in such as the Nearshore Mitigation Bank, the umbrella mitigation bank wetland and aquatic resources between Hood Canal and Puget Sound, and the cleanup at the former mill site near Port Gamble.

Advisory Group suggestions for upcoming engagement

Throughout the meeting, the Advisory Group offered suggestions for future engagement and use of the State of the Assets Report to advance proposed preservation and restoration actions:

- Coordinate KNRAMP work with actions in the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan.
- Coordinate with the Health Department on annual stream data changes.
- Consult DNR next year to identify forest areas for protection and understand timber cycles.
- Integrate KNRAMP into the County's rural lands analysis to inform land use planning.
- Engage conservation districts to manage agricultural lands, many of which were historically wetlands unlikely to become large forests.
- Continue collaboration with Shore Friendly Kitsap and other agencies to protect and restore shorelines. Emphasize the importance of protecting shellfish growing areas and securing funding to support armoring removal with partner organizations.

KNRAMP State of Assets Report: KNRAMP Focus Areas

Robinson Low reviewed the KNRAMP Focus Areas, highlighting the actions and achievements in the four watersheds: Big Beef, Chico, Kinman, and Curley Creeks. Additional updates and observations shared by the Advisory Group include:

Considerations across focus areas to advance actions

- Identify the county owned fish passage barriers and the publicly owned shoreline armoring, to facilitate coordination with the right entities about potential improvements.
- Coordinate with Shore Friendly Kitsap about natural armoring options, post-armoring management, mitigation strategies, permit renewal with private landowners, adaptive management, bulkhead mitigation in nearshore environments, and debris and riprap removal. These will all become more complex with sea level rise.
- Coordinate with the Great Peninsula Conservancy and Kitsap Conservation District on additional actions that can be taken across the four focus areas.
- Coordinate with conservation districts that have fish passage barrier removal programs.

Big Beef and Chico Creeks

- The Suquamish Tribe and Shore Friendly Kitsap are working on removing a wharf north of Chico Creek.
- Funding is available for the Earlan's Park Preserve restoration design in the lower region of Chico Creek between the bridge and the golf course on a publicly held entity. These actions will improve long-term riparian conditions and should include a protection element.
- Kitsap County is planning four Chico Creek fish passage barrier removals, including Dickerson Creek. Alison Osullivan (Suquamish Tribe) has more details.
- One third of armoring along Seabeck highway is Kitsap County owned road and marina. A bulkhead was recently rebuilt, so armor removal will not likely occur along this stretch.

Kinman and Curley Creeks

- Previous restoration occurred at Kinman Creek's mouth and lower estuary and included landowner involvement.
- Kinman Creek has 11 "known" fish barriers.
- Most Kinman Creek restoration focuses on riparian areas. Not a lot of restoration is needed on the agricultural valley behind Morning Mist, but more downstream restoration is needed.
- Restoration may be needed in the Big Valley area, which shares headwaters with Dogfish Creek and could benefit from riparian and wetland restoration.
- Salmonberry Creek has high temperatures that lowers its riparian LOS score.
- Armor removal may be possible at Kitsap Memorial State Park.

Updates from Partners

Advisory Group members provided updates on recent work including:

Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe:

- A federal grant for Middle Creek fish passage is moving forward.
- Biological work for restoration has begun, including ground truthing on smaller streams and wetlands to know where they are and to interface with planning projects. Continuous monitoring will look at monitoring use and restoration over time.
- A Point Julia Substantial Biological Assessment is ongoing to monitor salt marshes and understand juvenile salmon use over time. This correlates with the Shoreline Management Plan.

Suquamish Tribe:

- The Tribe is working with:
 - GPC on a Clear Creek restoration project to improve riparian habitat through invasive removal and native plantings. A design is anticipated in a year and a half.
 - The City of Bremerton in Gorst Creek to improve the floodplain and fish passage.
 - Shore Friendly Kitsap and a private landowner on Tribal tidelands regarding Chico Bay armoring and wharf removal, as well as a smaller armor removal and restoration design project near Liberty Bay.
 - Western Washington University and Kitsap County on a floodplain and riparian assessment to model shade and look at the east side of Kitsap County.
- Fish passage prioritization is ongoing.

Skokomish Tribe:

- Most Skokomish Tribal work is in Mason County. The Tribe is working with GPC in lower Dewatto and Tihula to improve riparian and forest conditions.

Kitsap County:

- The six-year Transportation Improvement Plan is going to a commissioner hearing for adoption. The plan does not include many new projects.
- The County applied for Department of Commerce funding to implement salmon recovery planning into a Rural Lands Analysis. They hope to integrate salmon recovery, WHSPR plans, and a comprehensive plan for rural lands.
- The Harper restoration project is on schedule for construction next spring.
- In early 2026, the County will plan to talk to partners about the State of Assets Report, identify connections, and receive feedback. They will emphasize that the County’s planning process is in the first quarter of the year. A full report for the County will be helpful in increasing KNRAMP process understanding.