

Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee (IC) Meeting Summary

Thursday, April 20, 2017

1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Drewel Building, Public Meeting Room

LIO-IC Members

Bill Blake, City of Arlington, Stillaguamish Watershed Council
Chrys Bertolotto, WSU Extension
Bob Landles, Stillaguamish Clean Water Advisory Board
Erik Gerking, Port of Everett
Paul Clampitt, Snohomish County Marine Resources Committee (MRC)
Gregg Farris, Snohomish County Surface Water Management (SWM)
Steve Rice, Snohomish Health District
Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District
Karen Stewart, City of Everett
Tamara Neuffer, Stillaguamish Tribe
Morgan Ruff, Tulalip Tribes

Participants

Derek Day, WA Department of Ecology
Julie Watson, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
Libby Gier, WA Department of Natural Resources
Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish County SWM
Lauren Tracy, Snohomish County SWM
Zach Brown, Snohomish County SWM
Kathleen Pozarycki, Snohomish County MRC
Elisa Dawson, Snohomish County SWM

LIO Support Staff

Kit Crump, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner II/Stillaguamish Basin Co-Lead Entity
Jessica Hamill, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner II/LIO Coordinator
Alexa Ramos, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Planner

1. Welcome, Introductions, Public Comment, Announcements

Bill opened the meeting and introductions followed. There were no public comments made.

2. On-going Business

Recommend Approval of the Final Ecosystem Recovery Plan

Jessica reviewed the changes made since the last draft. She noted that Monte's recent feedback will be incorporated regarding landowner involvement. Another committee member asked about the water quality results and what is driving low scores. Jessica explained that we only had some data for the water quality index (WQI) portion of the recovery target, that temperature has a big impact on those scores (i.e. may be driving them down), and the hope is that integrated monitoring will increase and enhance our understanding of WQI scores at a broader scale. Otherwise, the committee agreed with recommending approval to the EC.

Approval or changes to the IC meeting notes

Bill asked if anyone would like to request changes to the 1/5 meeting notes. No changes were requested and the notes were approved by consensus.

June 8th EC Meeting

Jessica informed the IC that the Gaps and Barriers table will be presented to the EC on June 8th. She also asked if there were any items the IC wanted to bring to the attention of the EC. Nothing specific was identified.

May 25th IC Meeting

Jessica recommended and the IC approve canceling the May 25th meeting. The next meeting will be July 27th.

3. LIO Restructure Update

Jessica gave an update on the restructure process. Since January, the subcommittee has met twice. Currently, they're working on the foundational elements of the implementation phase of the LIO (i.e. vision, goals, and objectives). Next, they will be coming up with criteria for a more effective LIO model. Jessica has been interviewing other LIOs and will be delving deeper with the Lead Entities too. Jessica also announced that she will be reaching out to other IC members, particularly ones she hasn't heard from yet, to get individual feedback about some of the primary structure alternatives (i.e. absorbing the LIO into the LE process, maintaining the status quo, and dissolving the LIO). Jessica also explained that she will be updating the IC on progress towards a recommendation at their regular meetings and that they will be involved throughout the process.

Bill announced that he will be leaving the City of Arlington to be the manager of the Skagit Conservation District. He starts there May 1st. He noted that 200 sq. mi. of the Stillaguamish basin is in the Skagit Conservation District. He is unsure yet as to whether he can remain the LIO co-chair in his new position. Jessica and Bill will connect with Valerie to see if she can serve as the sole Chair in the interim.

4. Draft Vision, Work Plan, and Goals

Jessica presented the draft Vision, Work Plan, and Goals document. The subcommittee has reviewed this already. Jessica noted that this is consistent with the PSP, 2018 Action Agenda, and the survey results gathered from the IC.

Vision feedback:

- Morgan suggested removing duplicative language. The IC was in favor of her revision.
- Monte noted a lack of "planning" called out in the document. Jessica mentioned the intention was to avoid negative feelings surrounding planning fatigue and instead focus on phrasing as "adaptive management". However, there are some areas where this could be called out more explicitly. The IC was in favor of this revision.
- Chrys suggested mentioning that this is consistent with the Ecosystem Recovery Plan which will be reevaluated periodically.
- Gretchen suggested adding the phrase "adaptive management" to the statement to capture the planning piece. Several IC members noted that adaptive management is implied in the statement.

Objectives feedback:

- Morgan and Lauren suggested removing "existing" and leaving as simply "funding opportunities"
- Chrys suggested rephrasing to "...want to bring more resources to LIO members (or LIO priorities)". She also noted that "planning" was missing from the objectives too.
- Bill noted that "improving ecological function/ecosystem health of the Snohomish-Stillaguamish" basins is missing. Although it is implied in other documents, Jessica will work to incorporate that feedback.

Goals feedback:

- Bill noted a lack of elected officials involvement called out. Jessica suggested rolling it into the communication piece.
- Chrys asked about the timeline. Jessica said it was a 2 year timeline.

Overall feedback:

- Monte noted that documents the LIO has produced are very salmon-centric which underemphasizes the other important issues. Morgan explained the effects by commenting that a salmon-lens doesn't prioritize fecal coliform whereas a shellfish-lens does. So how do we grapple with these differing priorities in the LIO?
- Kit mentioned that he and Jessica are working on evaluating the Vital Signs and what one would gain/lose by focusing on each one.
- Jessica commented that our 10 priority Vital Signs were the same ones adopted by the region.
- Chrys and Monte commented on the disconnect between us caring about salmon, but the public is more concerned about a sense of place and clean water than salmon (i.e. salmon fatigue). Morgan noted that that is a communication issue. The plans were created for *us* not the public.
- Lauren commented that if people are willing to invest in something it will drive priorities.

5. Implementation Strategies (Floodplains and B-IBI)

The SI leads presented the steps that Implementation Strategies go through before becoming finalized:

1. Shared understanding of the problem
2. Intervention points
3. Strategies
4. Needs
5. Recommend action
6. Review plan
7. Implement actions
8. Assess effectiveness

Floodplains:

1. Restore 15% of degraded floodplain area
2. No net loss of floodplain function

Next steps:

1. Identify – actions, gaps, LIO ideas
2. Integrate – federal, ag/forestry, developers
3. Incorporate feedback – science panel public, PSI
4. Update the strategy & best available science
5. Develop communication materials

Bill asked about how this related to the Common Indicators. Libby said that PSP and Ecology are working on this.

B-IBI:

1. Restore 30 Puget Sound lowland streams from “fair” to “good”
2. Protect 100% of Puget Sound lowland streams with “excellent” scores

Strategies: incentivizing, regulations/guidance, integrated planning, etc.

Approaches: riparian buffers in agricultural areas, social marketing for retrofits, new implementation tools, watershed-based planning

Implementation Strategies to set Action Agenda priorities:

Morgan asked for clarification on what a priority in the Action Agenda means. Julie said that it's a hybrid of and "approach" and narrow/focused strategically.

LIO v. Implementation Strategy Interface:

Implementation strategies identify barriers and strategies to address barriers, sequence actions, support successful programs.

Floodplains example:

- Current alignment: integrated planning strategy
- Natural alignment: freshwater & estuarine protection/restoration
- Opportunity for alignment: improve funding for restoration, implementation of GMA for Puget Sound recovery, stream flow protection

The SI leads provided an activity to solicit feedback from the IC on the Implementation Strategies.

The SI leads informed the IC that there will be a Shoreline Armoring workshop in Edmonds on May 16th.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next IC meeting is scheduled for July 27, 2017.

Action Items

1. Jessica will circulate the revised work plan via email for IC review and then present it to the EC on June 8th.
2. Jessica will draft up a document covering the crosscutting actions, local priority approaches, and issues that aren't easily addressed at the local level etc. Jessica will circulate this for very quick review by the IC and then send to the SI leads.

Key Recommendations/Decisions

1. Recommended approval of the 5-year Ecosystem Recovery Plan, with revisions.
2. Agreed to cancel the May 25th meeting.
3. Approved the January IC meeting summary.