

Snohomish-Stillaguamish Local Integrating Organization
Snohomish Implementation Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 1, 2018, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Snohomish County, Drewel Building, First Floor, Public Meeting Room

LIO-IC Members

Valerie Streeter, Tulalip Tribes

Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum

Terri Strandberg, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services

Elise Gronewald, Port of Everett

Ann Bylin, Snohomish County SWM

Julie Lewis, Snoqualmie Tribe

Participants

Elisa Dawson, Snohomish County SWM

Erin Murray, Puget Sound Partnership

David Trimbach, Oregon State University

Heather Khan, Dept. of Ecology

LIO Support Staff

Jessica Hamill, Snohomish County SWM, LIO Coordinator

Kit Crump, Snohomish County SWM, Stillaguamish LE Coordinator

Alexa Ramos-Cummings, Snohomish County SWM

1. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

Valerie, one of the Co-Chairs, opened the meeting. The LIO Coordinator reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to request changes to the 5/31 meeting notes. No changes were requested and the notes were approved by consensus.

2. Ongoing Business

Watershed Enhancement and Restoration Committee Update

Terri shared how the first Watershed Restoration and Enhancement (WRE) Committee meeting (for WRIA 7) went on October 25th. It was well attended. Ecology staff began by giving an overview of the context behind the new legislation. The goal of the WRE committee is to determine the 20-year growth projections, accompanied by a project list that would offset the impacts of new wells in order to achieve Net Ecological Benefit (NEB). A lot of assumptions will go into the 20-year projections and achieving consensus will be challenging. If consensus cannot be reached on the WRE Plan (due in 2021 for WRIA 7) elements, then the SRFB technical reviewers and Ecology will be charged with the final determination of offsets and WRE Plan approval. The committee may meet less frequently as the planning process gets underway. For the time being, the committee will continue to meet monthly.

There is a new [Snohomish \(WRIA 7\) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee \(WREC 7\)](#) website where meeting materials and other resources will be posted. If you would like to receive notices about WRIA 7 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee meetings, [subscribe to the email list](#).

The list of project proposals for this year's Streamflow Restoration Grants will be published November 5th and the ranked list will be released in early January. For the Snohomish Basin, the following were submitted:

- Snohomish Conservation District: *Community-based water storage restoration in the Snohomish River watershed*
- City of Monroe: *East Monroe Heritage Site – Land Acquisition*
- Adopt-a-Stream Foundation: *Jones Creek Stream Flow Enhancement Project*
- Snoqualmie Valley Watershed Improvement District: *Snoqualmie Natural Storage Enhancement and Comprehensive Storage Study*
- Stewardship Partners: *Snoqualmie River: Livestock Exclusion and Riparian Habitat Improvement*

It was noted that the 20-year timeframe for growth projections isn't in alignment with the 100-year lifetime of single family homes. **SWM Fee Increase Letter of Support**

The committee approved the letter with minor revisions. They agreed to send the letter now and then again if/when the proposal goes before council.

3. Regional Updates

The state agencies submitted their budgets to the Office of Financial Management. Orca recovery related budget items will be submitted in the coming weeks.

PSP is working with consultants to explore creating a non-profit to help fully fund NTAs.

The draft 2018 Action Agenda was released. The public comment period ended mid-October and responses are being prepared now. The draft has a "Vision" page now to show values and goals more broadly. There is also a section dedicated to defining the problem and more work is being done to highlight partner contributions to recovery. There was significant feedback received around the importance of aligning with salmon recovery and the need for more funding as well as a need for a call to action. Hopefully, the document will be finalized December 5th.

The Strategic Initiatives are determining their funding themes for the next 2 years. Hopefully, funding recommendations will be released in December/January.

4. Draft Legislative Priorities Document

The Committee reviewed the Snohomish Forum's draft legislative priorities document. The LIO Coordinator asked if the committee is interested in adapting it for their uses. The LIO Coordinator will revise the draft and then send around for approval from the Executive and Implementation Committees.

5. Draft LIO Work Plan

The LIO Coordinator presented the draft work plan. The Implementation Committee approved recommending it to the Executive Committee for approval. The LIO Coordinator also shared the Ecosystem Coordination Board for potential integration with the LIO and highlighted tasks of interest.

6. 2019 Draft Meeting Schedule

The LIO Coordinator presented the draft schedule. The dates chosen attempt to avoid conflict with Puget Sound Partnership boards and other watershed committee meetings. The Coordinator will send the draft schedule to both Committees in December for finalization.

7. 2018 NTA Prioritization Criteria for NEP Direct Award

The LIO Coordinator reviewed the selection criteria that was agreed upon in May: capital, programmatic support, and scalability. The LIO Coordinator presented the Stillaguamish Watershed Council's project selections and explained the thought process behind establishing 2018-2022 priorities to inform their funding recommendations for the direct award allocation. Additionally, the Island LIO had been interested in pooling funds to go towards Sound Horsekeeping NTA. However, that project didn't end up getting recommended by the Stillaguamish Watershed Council for this year's LIO direct allocation.

There was much discussion around the selection criteria for the next direct award and prioritization overall. The manual gap analysis was presented and will be sent around for review/comment. The committee agreed on selecting a sub set of the ~130 NTAs (top 10 or so projects) to then spend time assessing and aligning with other funding sources. The committee decided to proceed with the previously agreed upon selection criteria for setting the initial priorities, with the acknowledgement that these funds are best suited for work that doesn't have dedicated funding sources.

8. Human Well-Being (HWB) Integration

David Trimbach, with Oregon State University (OSU), gave an overview of the project to integrate human well-being (HWB) and ecosystem services valuations into project implementation/decision-making. Our participation includes evaluating our baseline level of HWB integration, creating and implementing tools to more effectively integrate, and monitoring progress toward how we integrate those aspects. The project will provide data that we can apply to decision-making criteria. David explained that OSU was contracted to administer the first HWB regional survey relating directly to the HW Vital Signs. PSP's social science committee gave much consideration to developing the survey questions. 9,000 mailers were sent out and there were 2,322 total responses received (9.6% (n=224; varies by question) represent Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO residents).

The OSU project team has done a high-level preliminary analysis to highlight responses from those respondents in the Sno-Stilly LIO boundaries (using zip codes). David walked the committee through the results which examined responses related to the 6 HWB components that were prioritized by the LIO in the Ecosystem Recovery Plan: Good Governance, Sound Stewardship, Sense of Place, Economic Vitality, Cultural Wellbeing, and Outdoor Activity. For Economic Vitality, OSU project staff included the "Nature Based Work" figures as a component of the vital sign even though that particular vital sign is actually under a different lead. The main difference between the actual vital sign and these is that these answers are self-reported. In general, our LIO's subset of responses to

these specific survey questions didn't largely differ from the overall region. So both residents in our LIO and the region at large reported high levels of perceived Good Governance and Sense of Place. A few key differences were that, locally, respondents self-reported higher levels of Cultural Wellbeing and Sound Stewardship. A more detailed analysis of the survey results, tailored to LIO geography, will be available in the spring of 2019.

A goal of engaging in this project is to create a baseline about which HWB components are important to us and then track their progress. To this end, the OSU project team is also exploring how to integrate Miradi and [DASEES](#) (Decision Analysis for a Sustainable Environment, Economy, and Society). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) describes the tool as "an open-source, web-based decision analysis framework, developed by an integrated trans-disciplinary research team of EPA, university, and private company researchers. It focuses on sustainable systems and communities. It is flexible but rigorous, transparent and auditable, and adapts to new information." The materials from the last HWB workshop will be sent out to the committee. Committee members are encouraged to review the HWB materials, including the other integration tools that can be utilized, and provide any thoughts/feedback/comments they may have to help steer the integration project.

9. Membership

The LIO Coordinator explained that at the last Executive Committee meeting, a seat was added for Monte Marti with the Snohomish Conservation District. The Executive Committee then showed a desire to develop a formal process for adding new members. The membership crosswalk analysis was reviewed. Members commented that there is currently no representative with shellfish expertise and stormwater representation is lacking too. The committee brainstormed potential shellfish expert organizations (Snohomish Health District, Tribes, County, WDFW, Trans-Ocean, Taylor Shellfish, etc).

There was also discussion about the lack of engagement with the smaller cities. Some suggested forming a small cities subcommittee which could elect a representative to attend the meetings and lessen the capacity burden across the smaller jurisdictions. Others suggested reaching out via Snohomish County Tomorrow to ask the cities what the barriers are for attendance. There was discussion about what the LIO has to offer the cities in terms of value. The LIO could be a forum for issues they care about. The LIO could provide letters of support on issues of concern to them. Committee members were asked to send the LIO Coordinator any other ideas they had or contacts to reach out to. The committee agreed to support adding state agencies to the membership in some way, developing a targeted solicitation, and sending an engagement survey to those members not regularly attending meetings. Staff will work with the Committee Co-Chairs to develop those products in the coming months.

10. Wrap-up

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.