Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 5, 2016
1:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Drewel Building, Public Meeting Room

LIO-IC Members
Bill Blake, City of Arlington, Stillaguamish Watershed Council
Bob Landles, Stillaguamish Clean Water Advisory Board
Chrys Bertolotto, Snohomish Camano ECOnet
Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes
David Steiner, (Alternate) Snoqualmie Tribe
Elise Gronewald, Port of Everett
Gregg Farris, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Karen Stewart, City of Everett
Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum
Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District
Paul Clampitt, Snohomish County Marine Resources Committee
Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Forum
Steve Rice, Snohomish Health District
Tamara Neuffer, Stillaguamish Tribe
Terri Strandberg, Snohomish County Planning & Development Services
Valerie Streeter, Tulalip Tribes Planning

Participants
Julia Gold, Tulalip Tribes
Kathleen Herrmann, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Lindsey Desmul, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Ryan Williams, Snohomish Conservation District
Sean Edwards, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Pat Stevenson, Stillaguamish Tribe
Terry Williams, Tulalip Tribes

LIO Support Staff and Anchor QEA
Ann Bylin, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Kit Crump, Snohomish County Surface Water Management/ Stillaguamish Basin Co-Lead Entity
Mary Hurner, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner/Interim Coordinator
Beth Liddell, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Abby Hook, Hook Environmental
Lynn Turner, Anchor QEA

Welcome, Introductions, Public Comment, Announcements
Bill Blake opened the meeting, and introductions followed. There were no members of the public present.

Ecosystem Recovery Plan Development Roadmap
Abby Hook stated that the LIO team has received feedback from Implementation Committee (IC) members that it would be valuable to take a step back and explain what we are trying to accomplish within this Ecosystem

Recovery planning process – specifying what needs to be in the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan, what the different steps are and how they relate to each other, what we have done so far and why, and our next steps and their value to the final product. Her discussion aligned with a PowerPoint presentation, which is posted on the LIO webpage for reference.

Understanding the reasoning behind this planning process is also helpful. The Ecosystem Recovery planning process the LIOs are undertaking is being driven by the EPA's grant performance management system to see if NEP funds are being spent effectively within the local watersheds.

Abby summarized the LIO's work so far as:

- Focusing on the elements that are consistent with the Puget Sound area (what PSP calls the "Vital Signs"), selecting what we want to protect and restore
- Identifying the symptoms of degradation
- Identifying the human activities that are causing these problems

What the LIO needs to begin focusing on now is defining relationships and developing hypotheses. What is causing the worst problems? Why are these problems continuing? From this point, we move into situational analysis to describe the technical, political, legal, and social context of these problems. What is the recovery context? Where are there strategy intervention points? How do we, or how can we, work with those that already have efforts in place? Looking for these opportunities can help the LIO develop mutually beneficial approaches.

Abby noted that a performance management and adaptive management process will be used to know if we are on the right track. We need to identify indicators and measure them to see if we are making progress. Adaptive management is the process of course correction as conditions change or if results require reassessing the hypotheses.

Abby stated that we will use results chains in our Ecosystem Recovery Plan. Results chains are helpful as a facilitation tool for linking the actions needed to implement strategies and reach a defined goal or target. However, they are often complex and should be seen as a management and planning tool, rather than a communication tool.

Today, we will introduce conceptual models as strategic planning tools. Conceptual modeling begins with a brainstorming exercise, where systems and relationships are identified to develop strategies that can be later examined in terms of their feasibility.

The draft Ecosystem Recovery Plan, due in September, will include:

- What we want to protect
- What is degraded
- Why it is degraded
- Ways to address it: priority strategies with indicators

Abby reminded everyone that the ecosystem recovery planning process is an iterative process. The LIO will be revisiting the plan every year or two, like the 4-year work plans for salmon recovery in our watersheds. She noted the plan provides an opportunity for the LIO to communicate to the region what can and cannot be accomplished within the specified timeframe.

Lynn Turner followed up with the work plan timeline and schedule, stating that we have been working on prioritizing the remaining Vital Signs/components and will be working over the next few months on developing goals, problem statements, and conceptual models related to these priorities. We are also beginning a conversation today on prioritizing pressures that act on the Vital Signs/components. For the development of the

goal statements and results chains, the project team will be tapping into the subcommittees using Web-Ex, for their expertise in specific technical topics. The project team is aware of everyone's busy schedule, and will be using surveys and Web-Ex meetings to provide some flexibility yet still be able to get members' input to draft products.

Results of Survey to Prioritize Vital Signs and Components

Referring to the "Results of IC Feedback" handout in the meeting packet, Lynn Turner updated the Implementation Committee on the results of the survey to prioritize the remaining list of components and Vital Signs. In 2015, the LIO prioritized six components (Chinook salmon, floodplains, estuaries, land development and cover, summer stream flow and freshwater quality). These six components were referred to as "very high" priority, and were the focus of the Implementation Plan, which included near-term actions that addressed them.

The objective of the survey was to get input on the remaining Vital Signs/components to determine the focus for the Ecosystem Recovery Plan. Twelve individuals completed the survey, with the results reflected in this handout. Lynn also called attention to an 11" x 17" spreadsheet developed by the Tulalip Tribes in the meeting packet. This spreadsheet was the result of a group of Tulalip Tribes staff members reflecting on what was important to the Tribes, given their land base, treaty trust rights, and perspective. Val Streeter, Tulalip Tribes, explained that the color-coded spreadsheet they submitted worked better for them to capture their discussion compared with participating in the survey.

Lynn noted that the key difference between the survey results and the Tribes' document was that "toxins in fish" was elevated to "high" importance by the Tribes although it was considered as "medium" by the other survey respondents. The Tribes identified shoreline armoring, freshwater wetlands, and shellfish beds as "high" priority, in alignment with the survey results. The survey results also identified marine shorelines and nearshore, marine water quality, and good governance as "high" priority.

During group discussion, members noted that "toxins in fish" could also be addressed through marine water quality and marine sediment quality. Abby stated that we will be bundling some related components and looking at them as systems. Julia Gold, Tulalip Tribes, stated that when we look at the threatening factors we will be looking at land and water issues.

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes, noted that the Washington State Department of Ecology was taking the lead on toxics, which are coming from discharges into the Sound. Terry Williams, Tulalip Tribes, stated that the list will eventually be public and the public would not understand if "toxins in fish" was rated anything but high.

Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Forum, noted that he liked the survey, and believes that the results are just people's thoughts at the time. He stated that he had no objection to upgrading "toxins in fish" to a higher priority.

Abby reiterated the dynamic nature of ecosystem recovery planning, stating that the LIO's priorities are fluid. Lynn stated that part of the homework would be to review the survey results, along with this meeting's changes.

After additional discussion, the IC indicated their desire to consider an expanded list of high priorities at the next IC meeting, and reach consensus at that time.

Pressure Prioritization

Kit Crump referred to a handout in the packet, "Highly-rated Stressors for the Snohomish and Stillaguamish Watersheds," which reflects what the IC determined to be highly rated pressures associated with the priority six Vital Signs last year. He stated that the LIO used regional materials (Scott Redman's pressure assessment for the Whidbey Basin) and LIO boundaries to rate pressures as very high and high within the Snohomish and Stillaguamish watersheds. Natural system modification sources of structural barriers to water, sediment, and

debris flows was a cross-cutting pressure, determined to be "very high" for all six of our LIO's priority six Vital Signs.

Lynn stated that we would be re-examining the pressure prioritization we did last year along with pressures for the next batch of highly ranked Vital Signs/components within the homework assigned prior to the next IC meeting, which is scheduled for June 16th. She said that the LIO team will send out a version of the chart to IC members for them to initiate a discussion within their organizations to determine if this still makes sense. The feedback received through the homework will guide the presentation on June 16th. Abby stated that we want to look for things the region has identified that don't look right for the Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO. Bill reiterated that we want to be sure that our biggest issues are covered.

Situation Analysis/Conceptual Modeling

Using large sticky notes posted on a wall, Abby led the IC in an exercise to identify all the reasons shoreline hardening continues to exist in the watersheds, both along marine coastlines and freshwater shorelines. At the conclusion of the discussion, Lynn agreed to clean up the conceptual modeling results and present them to the LIO at the next meeting. Additional conceptual modeling of other priority topics will be conducted at the June 16 meeting, based on the problem statements submitted by IC members in the post-meeting homework.

On-going Business

Bill asked if IC members would like to request any changes to the 4/11 Implementation Committee meeting notes. After hearing no concerns, Bill reiterated that IC members could send any such requests to Mary Hurner within the next week. Barring that, the meeting notes are approved as presented.

Next Steps

- Homework due by May 31 via email to Lynn Turner: lturner@anchorqea.com; CC Mary Hurner: mary.hurner@co.snohomish.wa.us

Attachments: Results of Initial IC Feedback and Discussion: Prioritizing Components and Vital Signs
Interaction of Pressure Stressors and Sources with Highly Ranked Components and Vital Signs
Form for IC Homework Input