

IC Homework from May 5 Meeting

Compiled Responses #2

Identifying “Very High” and “High” Priority Pressures

Instructions: Please review the spreadsheet that relates pressure stressors (symptoms of degradation) and their sources (human activities) to the components and Vital Signs that were preliminarily ranked highly. This information comes from Scott Redman’s regional pressure assessment, and is just a first draft for your input. Provide any comments related to: 1) interactions that should be revised for the local context, or 2) any additional pressures that you think are very high or high priorities for these components and Vital Signs (additional pressure stressor/source pairs are provided on the second tab of the spreadsheet for reference, if needed).

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
General Comments			
1	Bob Landles, Stillaguamish Clean Water District Advisory Board	The pressure assessment provides a well considered assessment of pressures on vital signs.	Comment noted.
2	Snohomish County	No changes to the ratings for the new Vital Signs proposed by Scott Redman's regional pressure assessment and no new pressures suggested.	Comment noted.
Marine Shorelines and Nearshore			
3	Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum	Is there a way to call out or separate the physical from chemical pressures, a sub-heading. This is a similar comment for all Vital Signs that have both. I don't have a good handle on the seriousness of derelict fishing gear in the Snohomish/Stillaguamish marine shores and nearshore.	The pressure taxonomy was developed at the regional level, and the order/terms were retained for the timebeing to maintain consistency with the Partnership’s regional Ecosystem Recovery Plan development guidance. We can discuss these pressures separately when conducting conceptual modeling or other work as a group, though.
4	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Shoreline armoring, transportation, aquaculture infrastructure, armoring.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Do A3, C, and M2 encompass the pressures you are concerned with related to shoreline armoring, transportation, and armoring? A2 could also be added as “high” or “very high” for aquaculture infrastructure, if desired.
5	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Due to the railroad, A3 should be listed as VH.	Incorporated into revised draft table.

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
6	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	D, H, S2, V1, Y, BB, and CC: Rank as H	Incorporated change of BB to high, added CC into revised draft table. For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should D, H, S2, V1, and Y be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressor H would you like incorporated?
Shoreline Armoring			
7	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Residential housing, docks, picnic and camping areas.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Does A1 encompass the pressures you are concerned with, or should other stressor/source pairs be brought forward?
8	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Due to development pressure, A1 should be VH.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
9	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Consider adding D, H, Rank as H	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should D and H be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressor H would you like incorporated?
Freshwater Wetlands			
10	Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum	Why no chemical pressures in the freshwater wetlands similar to the marine shorelines and nearshore? S1, U2, V2 and X2, are potential and could be rated as High.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
11	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Lenient building permit process.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Does A1 encompass the pressures you are concerned with, or should other stressor/source pairs be brought forward?
12	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Remove the net from no net loss of wetlands.	Unclear what this comment is referring to related to the pressure assessment.
13	Bill Blake, Stillaguamish Watershed Council	X.2 Consider high pressure from the listed stressors on Wetlands. Sediment is one example.	See response to Item No. 10.
14	Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District	Should also include these pressures (since they impact the quality/function of the wetland): U2. Non-point source, persistent toxic chemicals in aquatic systems V2. Non-point source, non-persistent toxic chemicals in aquatic systems X2. Non-point source conventional water pollutants BB. Sea level rise	See response to Item No. 10. BB also incorporated into revised draft table.

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
15	Chrys Bertolotto, Snohomish Camano ECO Net	I think we need to add conventional non-source pollutants due to adjacent landowner dumping, homeless dwellings garbage / waste issues, domestic pet waste.	See response to Item No. 10.
16	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Due to development pressure, A1 should be VH.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
17	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	B, G1 and G2, J1-L, P1, P2, R2, U1-V2, X1-X2; Z, AA and BB. Rank as H	BB incorporated into revised draft table. For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should B, G1, G2, J1 – L, P1, P2, R2, U1 – V2, X1 – X2, Z, and AA be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressors B, G1, G2, J1, K1, R2, and Z would you like incorporated?
Marine Water Quality			
18	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Roadway, industrial and residential runoff entering the marine environment.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Do U1, U2, V2, W, X1, and X2 encompass the pressures you are concerned with, or should other stressor/source pairs be brought forward?
19	Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District	Same as both Shellfish beds & Toxins in fish.	Incorporated S1 as high into revised draft table.
20	Matthew Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe	Consider adding A1, A3. Increased impervious area, add'l traffic = toxic runoff, the biggest, toughest challenge to Marine Water Quality.	Incorporated A1 and A3 as high into revised draft table.
21	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	T1 and T2, Y, BB, CC; Rank these as H;	BB and CC incorporated into revised draft table. For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should T1, T2, and Y be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressor T2 would you like incorporated?
22	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	V1 Rank as VH	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should V1 be brought forward as an additional high priority pressures for focus?
Good Governance			
23	Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum	Pressures are absent form this Vital Sign, unless someone comes up with some it might not be a good Vital sign to keep. Or is this one we developed pressures for during out meeting.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should Good Governance remain in our high priority components category?
24	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Stakeholders with different values and concerns. Difficult to get a consensus.	Comment noted. These issues will be incorporated in the conceptual modeling and results chains.

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
25	Matthew Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe	Consider adding A1, A3. We are still losing habitat (quantity and quality) faster than we restore it; Is GMA effective? Enforcement? Mitigation adequate and effective?	Incorporated A1 and A3 as high into revised draft table.
26	Chrys Bertolotto, Snohomish Camano ECO Net	The pressure available don't fit. I think we're looking at a lack of education, sustained resources, focus on short-term economic gain, cultural norms.	Comment noted. The human wellbeing components will be linked to a number of ecosystem components in the Ecosystem Recovery Plan.
27	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	I recommend moving this to Medium Priority	See response to Item No. 23.
28	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Sources include necessary enforce existing regulations, providing the necessary funding, modifying the existing institutional process, economic and social pressures and resistance to change, and commitment to make changes.	See responses to Item Nos. 24 and 26.
Shellfish Beds			
29	Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum	The focus in this vital sign is on chemical pressures, what about physical pressures from land conversions and shoreline armoring disrupting processes. Those could include A1, C, and M2 all could be rated as Very High.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
30	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Runoff entering the marine environment. Old septic systems.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Do U1, U2, V2, X1, and X2 encompass the pressures you are concerned with, or should other stressor/source pairs be brought forward?
31	Bill Blake, Stillaguamish Watershed Council	X.1 Proximity to point source effluents is one of the criteria for closures. Consider Very High.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
32	Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District	Same as Toxins in fish	Comment noted. No change recommended in comment, correct?
33	Matthew Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe	Consider adding A1, A2, A3. Increased impervious area, add'l traffic = toxic runoff, the biggest, toughest challenge to Marine Water Quality (and therefore, shellfish beds). Also, direct evidence of Ag-related water quality impacts to shellfish.	Incorporated A1 as very high and A2 and A3 as high into revised draft table.
34	Chrys Bertolotto, Snohomish Camano ECO Net	Climate Change / Sea Level Rise – tidal changes will affect shellfish population viability in some way, as will ocean acidification. Not sure where this fits, but I continue to fret about the lack of climate change pressures in the grab bag we can use.	BB and CC incorporated into revised draft table as high.
35	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Is Sea level rise an important pressure for shellfish?	See response to Item No. 34.

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
36	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	C, Y, N, R2, BB, CC ; Rank these as H	BB, CC: see response to Item No. 34. For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should C, Y, N, and R2 be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressor R2 would you like incorporated?
Toxins in Fish			
37	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	Runoff needs to be treated before entering the marine environment. Update municipal sewage systems to handle household chemicals, and pharmaceuticals.	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Do U1, U2, V2, X1, and X2 encompass the pressures you are concerned with, or should other stressor/source pairs be brought forward?
38	Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District	Same as Shellfish beds	Comment noted. No change recommended in comment, correct?
39	Matthew Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe	Consider adding A1, A3. Increased impervious area, add'l traffic = toxic runoff. See O'Neill work on juvenile fish in freshwater.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
40	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Due to the possibility of flame retardants coming from wastewater systems, U1 should be VH.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
41	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	T1 and T2, Y, BB, CC: Rank these as H,	BB and CC incorporated into revised draft table. For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should T1, T2, and Y be brought forward as additional high priority pressures for focus? If so, which sources of stressor T2 would you like incorporated?
42	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Add V1 and Rank as VH	For discussion in June 16 IC meeting: Should V1 be brought forward as an additional very high priority pressure for focus?
Comments on 2015 Vital Sign pressures			
43	Snohomish County Marine Resources Advisory Committee	In order to make real progress removing or ameliorating vital sign pressures it is necessary to tighten the permit process for industrial and residential building. We must take the net out of "no net loss of wetlands." Culvert blockages of fish passage must be removed and runoff needs to be treated with bioswales, raingardens or treatment facilities.	Comment noted. These issues can be incorporated in the conceptual modeling, strategies, and Ecosystem Recovery Plan text.
44	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Under Chinook vital sign, change pressure X2 as High due to pH, temp and nutrient issues.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
45	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Under Land Dev & Land Cover, change pressure A1 to VH due to residential/urban development.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
46	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Under Floodplains vital sign, change pressure A1 to VH due to potential floodplain development.	Incorporated into revised draft table.

Item No.	Commenter	Review Comment	Response/Recommended Action
47	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Staff	Under the Summer Stream Flows vital sign, I would add pressure C as High due to levees/revetments' impact on temperature and change pressure A1 to VH.	Incorporated into revised draft table.
48	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Land development – U2, V2, X2, J1, K1, X3, Z, AA	The range of high and very high priority pressures for the 2015 components/Vital Signs will be retained at this time. These pressures were vetted with the LIO, and we are not looking for a major revisiting of this set of Vital Signs due to the timing and capacity needed for the Ecosystem Recovery Plan draft.
49	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Chinook – W, X2, AA, D, E1, E2, J1-L, M1, N, O, R1, R2, S1, Z, CC	See response to Item No. 48.
50	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Estuaries (I -?) Z BB, CC, R2, J1-K2	See response to Item No. 48.
51	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Floodplain B, D, E2, G1 G2, J1-K3, P1, R2, AA, BB	See response to Item No. 48.
52	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Summer Stream Flows AA, Z, X3, P1, M1, J1-L, D	See response to Item No. 48.
53	Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes	Freshwater Quality D, E2, G1, G2, J1 – L, M1, S2, T1, T2, X3, Z, AA Rank these as High.	See response to Item No. 48.