

Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee Meeting Summary

Tuesday, August 18, 2015

1:30– 4:00 p.m.

Snohomish County Campus, Drewel Building, 6th Floor, Conf. Room 6A02

LIO IC Members Attending

Andy Noone, Snohomish Camano ECO Net
Beth Ledoux for Joan Lee, King County
Bill Blake, City of Arlington, Stillaguamish Watershed Council
Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes
Elise Gronewald, Port of Everett (alternate)
Gregg Farris, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Jacqueline Reid, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
Kirk Lakey, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum
Kristin Kelly, Futurewise/Pilchuck Audubon
Mary Cunningham, City of Everett
Matt Baerwalde, Snoqualmie Tribe
Monte Marti, Snohomish Conservation District
Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum/King County

Participants

Ann Bylin, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Blair Scott, King County
Denise Di Santo, Snohomish County Surface Water Management/Snohomish Basin Lead Entity Coordinator
Heather Cole, ERC, Puget Sound Partnership
Janell Majewski, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Karen Stewart, LIO Coordinator
Kit Crump, Snohomish County Surface Water Management/ Stillaguamish Basin Co-Lead Entity
Mary Hurner, Snohomish County Surface Water Management
Senait Gebreyesus, Snohomish County Surface Water Management Intern

Introductions, Announcements and Public Comments

Bill Blake, Sno-Stilly Implementation Committee (IC) Chair, opened the meeting and introductions followed. Members approved the 8/03 meeting summary. There were no public comments.

Monte Marti, who represents the Conservation District on our LIO and was appointed to the Stormwater Strategic Initiative Transition Team (SITT), provided an update and a handout covering the August 5th SITT meeting. Monte stated that PSP established SITTs for overall process coordination, review, and to develop solicitation and criteria by which the NTAs will be evaluated. A question was raised as to whether or not the SITTs will be asked to weigh in on funding decisions. Heather Cole said that, at this point, it is not clear. Right now the SITTs are tasked to develop criteria for which the NTAs will be evaluated. Who will make the final funding decisions is not clear. Monte emphasized the importance of keeping the NTA solicitation broad so that we can capture the creativity in the LIOs. Heather noted that it would be helpful to know what kind of local review the SITTs expect, which will help bolster our chances to be funded.

Consensus Reached on Tier 1 Priority Pressures

Karen stated that the intent of this agenda item is to follow up on the discussion at the 8/3 meeting regarding the results of the small group exercise associated with the six priority vital signs. The handout in the 8/18 meeting packet is a summary table showing the Tier 1 (high-priority) pressures related to the 6 priority vital signs and agreed upon by Groups 1, 2, and 3. Results chains reflecting these pressures will be part of the September 30th deliverable.

The IC noted that the small groups followed slightly different processes in determining the top five pressures. Specifically, Group 1 had ranked stressors and not pressures so they used an email process to rank pressures. After all the small groups had reached consensus on the recommended Priority Pressures (Tier 1), the summary table was prepared. Suggestions were made to modify the summary as follows:

- For the summer stream flows vital sign: Include “Annual and Perennial Non-Timber Crops” in Tier 1, rather than “Livestock Farming and Ranching, which would then fall in Tier 2. The reason for the change was that livestock would be captured by the freshwater vital sign.
- For the freshwater quality vital sign: Add “Livestock Farming and Ranching” bringing the total number of priority pressures up to 5 in that category. The reason for this change was that the IC as a whole thought that the impact of hobby farms on freshwater quality is more significant than it had been rated.
- Adding asterisks to pressures the group discussed that did not end up in the top 5: Group 3 originally just submitted a list of the top 5 pressures for each of their vital signs. Groups 1 and 2 submitted both the top 5 pressures and other pressures that warranted consideration. Monte suggested that asterisks be added to show what pressures Group 3 acknowledged in association with the two vital signs considered. These additional pressures would be categorized as Tier 2 or Tier 3 pressures.

A revised Tier 1 Priority Pressures table will be sent to IC members and available on the LIO IC webpage <http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2232/LIO---Implementation-Committee>. Karen noted that the Tier 2 and 3 pressures will be addressed in the Ecosystem Recovery Planning process in 2016. Heather emphasized that identifying Tier 2 and 3 pressures now will provide more depth for the 5-year plan

Review Prototype Results Chains

Karen and Kit distributed several handouts:

- Diagram naming the elements of a typical results chain
- Approved sub-strategies (dated 8/6/15) for the 2016 Action Agenda
- Draft prototype results chains for freshwater and terrestrial, marine and nearshore, and pollution
- Cross-cutting sub-strategy partial results chain with existing NTA

The first handout shows a diagram of a generic results chain, with its components labeled. Kit stated that results chains are tools to communicate the steps between the **strategy or sub-strategy** (action or intervention plan; shown as a yellow hexagon) to reduce the impact of a **pressure** (shown as a purple rectangle) on a **target or goal**, (shown as a green ellipse) and the steps to implement it (**outcomes**, or intermediate results; shown as blue rectangles). **NTAs** (shown as yellow tube shapes) are components of the sub-strategy, and represent necessary actions (projects) to achieve the desired outcomes (also known as intermediate results) toward the overall goal.

Results chains are sometimes referred to as “theory of change” models. They are useful to show the logic behind ecosystem recovery plans, such as the Action Agenda which is a recovery plan for Puget Sound. For the 2016 Action Agenda update, we need to show our progress on the vital signs and identify the steps that we – the individual entities, who have come together as the Local Integrating Organization covering the Snohomish and

Stillaguamish watersheds – will take to contribute our share toward this recovery. To make sure our LIO's actions lead to improvements for Puget Sound and to be eligible for EPA funding, NTAs must be associated with one of PSP's 3 Strategic Initiatives, connected to one of PSP's updated sub-strategies (handout), and address a LIO priority pressure.

The IC discussed the need for coordination between existing watershed technical and policy development committees and other entities that were doing related planning work and their related information needs. The group agreed that coordination was important, and the effort will be made through regular updates to key committees. LIO members are encouraged to bring information back to the groups they participate in and encourage their feedback as we work through the process of developing the deliverables PSP requests.

Kit went over the prototype results chains PSP provided, showing how he modified them to address the priority pressures the IC identified. The group noted that some additional updating was in order per the IC's earlier discussion and consensus on changing some of the pressures related to the summer stream flow and freshwater quality vital sign. Kit stated that he will revise the results chains accordingly.

Beth Ledoux asked how the prototype RC's are being coordinated with the M&AM salmon recovery work? Kit, said they he was tracking how to integrate this information and they both agreed that Kit should come to the LIO-Technical Committee meeting on Sept 1st to present the prototype result chains and get their input.

The IC considered the updated strategic initiative sub-strategies handout, which had a section on the back for sub-strategies that were considered "cross-cutting," or applicable to more than one or all of the three Strategic Initiatives. Karen noted that PSP has not generated prototype results chains for these new cross-cutting sub-strategies, so the LIO should instead link to the relevant sub-strategy, pressure and vital sign. Andy Noone expressed support for including many of the cross-cutting sub-strategies addressing education and public outreach.

Kit noted that we have 5 NTAs that do not appear on results chains, and asked the group if they considered them still useful. The 5 NTAs are:

- SNST4 - Local habitat protection and restoration
- SNST6- Water quality monitoring for ocean acidification
- SNST7 – Floodplain management for farm-fish-flood
- SNST9 – Fisheries/watershed ecology education for officials and decision-makers
- SNST16 - Groundwater study

Kit noted that results chains put NTAs in context. No decisions were made by the IC at this point. Kit clarified that we can add any approved sub-strategies that support local recovery in our LIO.

Kit and Karen requested that IC members email their comments on the draft prototype results chains presented today by September 1st.

Karen distributed a NTA packet of handouts that included steps for mapping LIO NTAs to prototype results chains, a chart showing how to sort NTAs (existing/carry over; existing/not carried over; new) and the list of 2014 NTAs. She stated that she has been reporting on the status of the 2014 NTAs but it has been difficult, as on the whole, they were not discrete projects sponsored by one entity. For the 2016 Action Agenda, NTAs will be more specific with identification of one owner and an estimated budget with clearly identified performance measures.

Karen announced the IC's upcoming day long workshop to draft our 2016 NTAs on Tuesday, October 27th at Edmonds City Hall, in the Brackett Room. The workshop will be held from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Lunch will be

provided. To be ready to participate in the workshop, Karen asked that the IC members take a look at the 2014 NTAs and place each in one of three categories: existing/carry over; existing/not carried over; new. Please bring your ideas for new NTAs as well.

During the workshop we will be doing a gap analysis to determine where we need new NTAs and will be looking for projects that are the best fit. The question came up about how to incorporate a big project, and Karen noted that a big project can be broken into pieces, such as phase 1 for 2016-2017 and phase 2 for 2018-2019, etc.

2014 NTA Status Discussion

Next, Karen led a discussion of the status of 2014 NTAs. She described progress on the first two tasks identified in the performance measures for SNST1-Improving regulatory effectiveness. Mary Cunningham requested copies of the compiled documents addressing regulatory effectiveness. Jacqueline Reid noted that the assessment of Snohomish County's CAR is available on the web. Kristin Kelly noted that Pilchuck Audubon has been working on the critical areas regulations update with Snohomish County by making recommendations for better water quality.

In regard to SNST2-Identify existing data and prioritize needs, Beth Ledoux stated that King County is collecting new water quality data now, and will have a report by the end of this year. Gregg Farris noted that the NTA is intended to focus on identifying data gaps after an analysis of existing data.

Karen mentioned that the Tulalip Tribes' shellfish manager, Mike McHugh, reported that SNST6-Water quality monitoring for ocean acidification will not be completed due to capacity issues (lack of staff and funding for on-going monitoring). SNST16-Groundwater study is not included in the Snohomish County work program for next year; however, it was mentioned as an important issue for agriculture, especially with the current drought and evaluating in-stream flows.

Karen explained that the LIO-IC will continue discussing the status of the 2014 NTAs and determining which ones should be brought forward to the SITTs for inclusion in the 2016 Action Agenda. It was mentioned that many of the NTAs will need to be written to describe a more specific, actionable activity with a single sponsor and an identified budget estimate. Because this will take some time, a day-long workshop has been scheduled to allow time for members to drill-down and identify key NTAs to move the dial on targets for the Priority Vital Signs and reduce priority pressures in the two watersheds.

Bill summarized by asking IC members to be ready for the October 27th workshop by going back through the NTAs on their own, and see what can be continued, as well as what new NTAs can be put forward for 2016. Karen asked the group if they would like to schedule a follow-up meeting or just rely on email. The IC discussed two potential dates in early Sept. before the Sept. 22 LIO-Executive Committee meeting. The group decided that meeting on Sept. 8 would work best (see Next Steps below for details). An email with more details about the October workshop will be sent out to the IC after the Partnership distributes a guidance document with more specific instructions for the Sept. 30 deliverable.

Review Schematic for Freshwater Quality

Due to the lack of time, this agenda topic was not discussed. The group agreed to meet again on Tuesday, September 8th, to discuss draft schematics and the revised results chains drafts that will incorporate IC input.

Next Steps

The next meeting of the IC will be held on Tuesday, September 8th, from 9:30 -11:30 a.m. in Conference Room 6A04.

Please review the new results chains that will have their comments incorporated and will have the added pressure and the new D cross cutting strategies added, and then email your comments to Karen and Kit by September 1st, so that the revised draft prototype results chains discussed at the September 8th meeting will reflect your input.