

Snohomish-Stillaguamish Local Integrating Organization
Snohomish Implementation Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 29, 2018, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

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

LIO-IC Members

Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
Elise Gronewald, Port of Everett
Ann Bylin, Snohomish County SWM
Matt Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe
Julie Lewis, Snoqualmie Tribe (Alternate)
Paul Clampitt, Snohomish MRC
Kathleen Pozarycki, Snohomish MRC (Alternate)

Participants

Erin Murray, Puget Sound Partnership
Andrew Miller, King County
Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington
Kara Steward, Dept. of Ecology
Jamie Burrell, City of North Bend

LIO Support Staff

Jessica Hamill, Snohomish County SWM, LIO Coordinator
Alexa Ramos-Cummings, Snohomish County SWM

1. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

Co-chair, Perry, opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda, and purpose of the meeting.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to request changes to the 11/1/18 meeting notes. No changes were requested and the notes were approved by consensus.

There was no public comment.

2. Ongoing Business

Watershed Enhancement and Restoration Committee Update: Perry has been attending the WRIA 7 WREC meetings as the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum representative. He reported that the committee is navigating the decision on subbasin delineations, well and growth projections. The projections are inherently an imperfect science. Both counties have different processes for setting projection estimates as well. For the subbasins, the technical work group initially proposed using a modified version of the Snohomish Basin Protection Plan's subbasins. The final decision may end up being more or less subbasins than that framework outlines. Next steps are to develop a list of offset projects.

The committee is trying to avoid getting too into the weeds in light of the uncertainties we have to operate under. Instead, they're trying to focus on developing good projects beyond the minimum projected impacts of future exempt wells.

Human Wellbeing Integration Project Update: Alexa reminded the committee that the Puget Sound Partnership has contracted an Oregon State University (OSU) research team to explore the integration of HWB components into LIO decision-making. The project team is working with five LIOs in the Puget Sound to assess the factors that influenced group decisions to use existing data and integrate HWB and ecosystem services into action planning through participant-observation, survey, and interview research. The project is half way through Year 2 of its 4-year timeline. Some recent highlights include:

- The regional survey results have been analyzed to reflect individual LIO geographies. Sno-Stilly LIO residents made up 3.5% of the responses received. Overall, our LIO's results did not largely differ from the region at large. A regional report has been created to summarize the findings.
- Some maps for the 5 priority HWB indicators (Good Governance, Cultural Wellbeing, Sound Stewardship, Sense of Place, and Outdoor Activity) have been created and shared from the survey results too. Major findings show that demographics do not seem to have a significant influence on the responses.
- The OSU project team are also working to create a report stemming from last year's interviews with LIO coordinators/members and SI leads (which some of you participated in).
- Part of the team's strategy for enhancing HWB integration is to provide LIOs with decision-support tools that have the capacity to incorporate social science. The two tools we decided to explore were EPA's Decision Analysis for a Sustainable Environment, Economy, and Society (DASEES) and EnviroAtlas. Work has been done to translate Miradi into DASEES language. Essentially, Miradi is useful for understanding your system and DASEES can help with decision-making. EnviroAtlas offers ways to spatially represent HWB data. This tool integrates geographic data, analysis tools, fact sheets, and downloadable metadata into a user-friendly, web resource that facilitates understanding the implications of various decisions and their potential impacts on ecosystems.
- The OSU project team is continuing to host quarterly workshops around the tools.
- Island LIO has piloted some work in DASEES by inputting their LIO Plan's ecosystem recovery components and NTAs to run decision analyses. Sno-Stilly staff have met with Island LIO's coordinator and HWB project staff to learn more about their pilot and explore ways to collaborate on a Whidbey basin scale.
- Our LIO will be piloting a similar DASEES approach with the help of the OSU project team and P.J. Tillman with Cascadia Consulting. We hope to have all of our ecosystem recovery components and priority NTAs input by August to do some trial runs before our next meeting.

Regional Updates: Jessica mentioned that there was discussion about the LIOs at today's Ecosystem Recovery Board meeting. It will now be an agenda item for the upcoming August meeting. The goal is to provide the ECB with a better understanding of what LIOs are, what they do, and what they need.

Jessica reported that she has resigned from the Action Agenda Coordinators Group due to capacity constraints. The June meeting will be the last one she attends.

Erin provided a recap of this year's Puget Sound Day on the Hill. The efforts of our Puget Sound attendees have resulted in a proposed House budget increase to our region from \$28M to \$33M.

Erin reported that PSP director, Sheida Sahandy, resigned earlier in May. Laura Blackmore has been appointed Director and the PSP is working to hire a new deputy director.

There was discussion around the continued conversations related to giving LIOs more federal direct award funding. There is also a mobilizing funding initiative moving forward at PSP to explore tapping into other financial resources and the potential for creating a nonprofit. Others commented that the NW Straits Foundation operates with a similar model and has seen success. Jessica noted that Laura Blackmore is on the agenda for the LIO's October meeting to talk about this initiative as well.

3. Partner Actions

SnoSCAT: Matt Baerwalde with the Snoqualmie Tribe presented on the SnoSCAT effort. This effort came about in response to the warm temperatures and TMDL in the Snoqualmie. The middle fork appears to be driving the temperature and flow patterns. There was a recent USGS paper released on this and it got people talking. Partners realized that they should get together and coordinate on all of the work being done in the area. The group has helped secure two grants. The Snoqualmie Tribe received one for their BIA Tribal Resilience Program. The project will focus on data mining and modeling. They're working with the FFF buffer task force to run climate change scenarios looking at discharge and temperature. A guidance protocol is also being developed. The Tulalip Tribes and USGS received funding for a high resolution temperature mapping through helicopter thermal survey. Overall, SnoSCAT is useful for peer-to-peer information transfer and sharing and leveraging resources.

Water Quality Monitoring in WRIA 7: Andrew Miller with King County presented on the monitoring work being done by King County in WRIA 7. He described their ambient monitoring focused on water quality and quantity as well as special projects. There are 73 sites with monthly sampling. Some have been being sampled since 1971 and others are more recent since 2011. The sites range along the Skykomish, Snoqualmie and tributaries. Ecology's water quality index shows that some sites are lagging (although none are categorized as "poor"), and other sites are doing well. The monitoring team also looks at biological health too via macroinvertebrates and BIBI scores for 39 sites. There are 17 temperature loggers tracking temperature to try to understand why the middle fork Snoqualmie is so warm. There are some ideas that the Raging River could be an influence since it's heavily leveed/simplified in the lower reach where it gets warm.

City of North Bend Proposed Water Conservation Code: Jamie Burrell spoke about the city's proposed water code. The code was put forth in response to water quantity mitigation requirements and a conservation ordinance. The city sits on one of the largest aquifers and has to mitigate for low water levels. Typically, they pay to the utility company annually. Last year it cost water payers \$156 each. Landscape watering has been linked to the low flows and the conservation code would help to address this. The city also just purchased the golf course and their water rights which could be good for meeting mitigation needs. An assessment is in progress now.

Stage #1 - #3 of the water conservation response would limit water usage and times. The public hearing occurred on April 2nd and continued May 7th. Some people feel that the code is too heavy-handed, enforcement costs are prohibitive for a small city, and unnecessary. But it is estimated to cost \$5M to install pumps at the Tolt River if mitigation is not implemented. It seems like more studies to show that a code is needed would be helpful for communication. The city council would like to use it as an education tool rather than to enforce punitive measures like fines. Incentives and rebates are another potential tool to explore.

Jamie requested a letter of support and the LIO approved drafting a letter for committee review.

4. Micro/macro Plastics

Heather Trim presented on the growing issue of micro/macroplastics pollution. The problem is significant. By 2025 there will be 1lb of plastic for every 3lbs of fish in our oceans. She explained the work that Zero Waste Washington does and their focus areas. Heather described some of the key driving factors associated with the production and subsequent pollution of plastics. Plastics don't decompose. Instead, they just break down into smaller pieces. These pieces then are consumed by organisms and make their way up the food chain. One way to address the problem is through policies like plastic bag bans.

PFAS Chemical Action Plan

Kara Steward presented on Dept. of Ecology's work developing a Chemical Action Plan for Per and Polyfluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFAS). She explained what PFAS are and why they are an environmental and human health concern. PFAS are persistent, toxic, bioaccumulative, and mobile. They are found in common products like electronics, nonstick cookware, food packaging, and firefighting foams. Ecology is working with an advisory committee to develop a CAP which should be out for public comment later summer of 2019.

5. 2018 NTA Prioritization Criteria for NEP Direct Award

Jessica presented an explanation of the NTA prioritization status and next steps. At the last meeting the committee agreed to an initial set of criteria: measurable on-the-ground actions, programmatic actions, and scalability. A subset of 25 of the 66 total Snohomish and combined basin NTAs were presented to the committee. Three scenarios were explored. These three lists of top-10 NTAs were created by filtering using the proxy of site-specific for dirt moving actions, nonsite-specific for programmatic actions, and behavior change as the activity type. The idea was to agree to a subset of 25 or so projects to request further information on scalability potential from the respective NTA owners. This information would then be sent out to the committee with the assignment of determining each member's top-10 recommended projects. Staff would then roll-up the responses in preparation for the next meeting where the committee will finalize its funding priorities for the remainder of the 2018-2022 Action Agenda.

The committee agreed to the proposed process. Members were asked to take a week to review the subset of NTAs and send any comments to staff by June 7th. The NTA owners will be contacted for more information.

6. Wrap-up

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.