

SNOHOMISH SUSTAINABLE LANDS STRATEGY (SLS) DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY



Thursday March 12, 2020 10:00 a.m. – 11:45 p.m.
Videoconference

PARTICIPANTS (Executive Committee members in bold):

Andy Werkhoven – Werkhoven Dairy

Brian Bookey - National Foods, SLS EC Co-chair (Ag)

C. K. Eidem – Ducks Unlimited

Cindy Dittbrenner – Snohomish Conservation District

Carol MacIroy - Carol MacIroy Consulting

Dan Calvert – Puget Sound Partnership

Dani Driscoll - Snohomish County SWM

Erik Stockdale - Snohomish County SWM

Jessica Hamill - Snohomish County SWM

Heather Cole – The Nature Conservancy

Kirk Lakey – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Larissa Lee - NOAA

Linda Lyshall – Snohomish Conservation District

Linda Neunzig - Snohomish County Exec

Lindsey Desmul – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Lisa Nelson – Washington Department of Ecology

Michele Anton - Snohomish County SWM

Morgan Ruff – Tulalip Tribes

Paul Cereghino - NOAA

Robin Fay – PCC Farmland Trust

Spencer Easton – ESA Consultants

Terry Williams – Tulalip Tribes

FACILITATOR

David Roberts – Kulshan Services

Actions

- The Planning Team will bring updated ground rules to the next meeting for approval.
- David will also make sure all presentations from January are posted to the SLS website
- TNC is looking for a letter of support from SLS for the Port Susan Bay NOAA grant application.

Welcome, introductions and agenda review

- Paul introduced Larissa Lee who is a new member of the NOAA Restoration Center.

Approval of meeting summary

Meeting notes from February 13, 2020 were approved without changes.

Community Comment

None

Roundtable/Sharing

- Lindsey noted that the Lifeblood event has been postponed and will be rescheduled after the Covid-19 situation has settled down. The Leque Island Celebration scheduled for April 30th will also be postponed.
- Jessica suggested future SLS agenda items. John Holdsworth with Snohomish County's Department of Emergency Management expressed interest in providing an overview of the County's Hazardous Mitigation Plan along with the county comprehensive plan update. Everyone agreed this sounded timely.
- Terry shared that the Tulalip Tribe is committed to providing sea level rise info to the County. They can potentially do a presentation of their data to SLS.
- Paul shared that a coordinated budget template has been completed which he expects the coordinated grant group will sign off on shortly. It can be distributed early with knowledge that it may change slightly but have a single budget structure for multiple grant applications.
- Terry would like to engage the Ag community to think about working on coordinated water management.

Primary presentations or discussion topics

Meeting Ground Rules

David introduced the idea of having meeting ground rules. They can be tools to have effective meetings and a place where people can have a positive conversation. David will use them for helping to assure that meetings are conducted in a manner that everyone feels that they can have safe and productive discussions. He shared draft ground rules prepared by the Planning team (Heather, Dani, Jessica and David) based on models used elsewhere in Snohomish County. Several suggestions were brought forward and added to the document during the meeting.

We had a question about how to address issues that are raised by visitors during the meeting, especially when they are outside the scope of the meeting agenda. We need to clearly know what the guest is asking for. David will do his best to keep the conversation focused on the agenda topic and if appropriate, will work with everyone to identify a time and setting for the concern to be addressed outside the regular meeting. He reminded everyone that there is a time for guests to comment at the beginning of the meeting.

On the topic of recusal in decisions as proposed in the ground rules, there was a suggestion that we focus on transparency. While it is important that those involved in an issue be part of the decision-making process, it is equally important that those parties be transparent if the decision results in a personal gain.

The draft ground rules shown below are what we came away with after the meeting including edits by those in attendance. David, Heather, Jessica and Dani will prepare a new version with the input provided for David to bring to the April 9 meeting for final review.

Proposed SLS Ground Rules

- Ensure a balance of voices; be aware of the amount of time and space you use to weigh in and create space for other voices to be heard.
- Be willing to work through, rather than avoid, conflict
- Acknowledge that all partners bring legitimate purposes, goals, concerns and interests, whether or not there is agreement
- Stay in a place of asking questions and learning—to understand, to clarify and to introduce alternative perspectives
- Proactively share perspectives: Be “THINK” – True, Helpful, Important Necessary and Kind
- Acknowledge that different organizations or agencies have different business models, decision-making requirements and obligations
- Be transparent when a project directly or indirectly benefits you or your organization and recuse yourself from decision making if appropriate or requested by others.
- Ensure respectful meeting participation (i.e. turn phones off, arrive on time, speak one at a time, avoid sarcasm)
- Volunteer for tasks at hand
- Have fun and bring a sense of humor!
- Create the proper forum and process for addressing community issues.
- When issues arise be clear on the ask and the approach to following up on the concern.

Floodplains by Design Grant Program – Lisa Nelson

Lisa provided an overview of the nuts and bolts of the FbD program for everyone. She covered the goals of the program, the need for tribal support, ag criteria, eligibility, project ranking and selection, and the 2021-2023 timeline. The presentation will be posted on the website with the notes. Afterward she answered our questions.

Do project packages need to be "self-mitigating?"

LN - If anything has a negative impact with key stakeholders then that would be a red flag for the reviewers.

How does a community craft an “balanced” approach when there are inherent impacts? This is a larger policy question: How do communities find a balanced approach if they are negatively impacting one interest group? How do we solve complicated problems that preclude creative problem solving? How do we help communities come up with creative solutions and talk about some of the constraints?

LN - This discussion should happen early in the process, so Ecology is aware of how the local community is viewing these issues and the process is transparent.

What is the scoring and evaluation process as it relates to ag?

LN - If a project you are proposing will affect ag in some way, that counts as part of the score of the application. If you are in an area where there is no ag, then those points are taken off. Someone who doesn't have ag- won't be scored on ag. If ag is present it will be scored for up to 30 pts.

[Please note a correction sent from Lisa Nelson](#): Ecosystem points are (as high as) 60 and flood points are (as high as) 60. This is because ecosystem and flood are a required benefit for FbD. Ag is considered part of multi-benefit so has lower total points. Same with collaboration (30), Integration (30), and "other" (30) such as public access, recreation, water quality. (In Lisa's talk she stated that Ag, Fish and Flood all received 30 points.)

If there are negative impacts to ag then this will lower the score overall. There is a lot of competition. If a project shows multiple benefits and there are wins for everyone, it will rise to the top. The more you can show collaboration and multiple benefits the higher you rank.

How does the 30 points for ag compare with habitat benefit and flood reduction?

LN - The amount is equal for flood and fish.

How do we address conflicts with tribal interests?

LN – There is specific language in the grant program that states tribes have to engage and be on the board.

If a tribe does not support preserving areas for farmland, would the project go forward?

LN - The language is in there due to the US obligation for the tribes' continued culture. Terry shared that tribes could raise issues that would cause harm to their culture, but this process is to work through this. The program is designed around a process that works for the ag and tribal community to achieve our goals so there is a win-win at the end.

Does this create a "veto" power by the tribe if the actions are in conflict with the recovery plan?

LN – Tribes and ag need to work together in developing plans that are compatible with each other. Yes. If a tribe does not support a project, they have veto power in the courts. But we need find ways to work together on the landscape.

How do we set up a process that allows different uses and determine what is appropriate and not appropriate across the landscape?

LN - FbD funds are required to be used for flood reduction and ecosystem improvements but must not be in strong opposition from other interests such as farm. Projects won't move forward if there is opposition from any of these interests. There must be agreement from all of these communities. You need strong partnerships and strategies. There is a point quality for a "happy family." You need to deal with issues across the landscape scale that allows you to get to agreement and find actions that you can agree on.

Funding updates

- Lindsey has been addressing questions regarding a communication NTA for SLS that is being considered for funding. She is responding to the questions in coordination with the Conservation District so she can get a response back by the Tuesday deadline.
- Paul just completed pre-proposal review for PSAR funding. They have invited 10 projects in PS to complete full proposals. Many are large valley projects.
- Heather noted that TNC is also applying for one of the grants Paul mentioned for habitat improvements at their Port Susan Bay 160 ac reserve. They are looking for a letter of support from SLS in support for their application which is due April 9th.
- Paul shared he is formally staffing a grant coordination group with around 10 grant programs in WA, both State and Federal. One of the key aspects is that the budget request form has been streamlined. He also has a summary of available grants and their status which he will share with everyone.
- Jessica Hamill talked about the Habitat Strategic Advisory Team that allocates \$4M in estuary funds. They are in the process of coming up with recommendations for funding now and hope to have NTAs out by May.
- Jessica also shared that the County has signed the agreement with Ecology for the 2019-2021 FbD grant. A kick-off meeting with project managers to discuss key elements of grant, timelines, etc. will probably happen in May.
- Finally, Jessica noted that some county folks are also being pulled into efforts by the Department of Emergency Management to prep for covid-19 challenges.

Still IT update

Carol provided an update on the Stilly IT. C.K. and Robin Fay recently joined the team. Carol was not at the last SLS meeting but is aware of the conversation and issues. She noted there will be an SLS Ag Caucus meeting 3/12 that will include Brian, Linda Lyshall, Dan Bartelheimer., Linda Neunzig, Robin Faye, Cindy Dittbrenner, and Andy Werkhoven. There will also be a Stilly Ag community meeting 3/19. The Stilly IT will hold a conference call to determine next steps.

Documents distributed at the January SLS meeting will be forwarded again. They include the Stilly IT working strategy document, Stilly project proponent considerations, FbD grant proponent, the partner roles/responsibilities, and the Stilly SLS-EC project list. They are looking to build from a more collaborative and inclusive process. The Stilly IT commitment is that no project will move forward in the FbD grant process if there is significant community resistant or concern.

Snohomish IT Update

Spencer Easton shared background and status of the Snohomish IT. The Snohomish Launch Team started by determining how to structure an integration team. Their objective was to advance three related efforts in the Snohomish watershed and to identify an approach for ongoing integration team efforts. They plan on meeting 3-4 times between November and February. They held 3.5 launch team meetings during which they agreed on a structure for the IT moving forward. They don't have an update on FbD proposal or near-term project list at this time.

The Snohomish IT structure includes a broad Integration Team, a smaller Core Team, and Disappearing Task Groups (DTG). The Core Team meets monthly to coordinate efforts across the watershed, provides updates to the IT, is responsible for communication with

EC, and coordinates community engagement and outreach. Core team members include Morgan Ruff, Jessica Hamill, Lindsey Desmul and Spencer Easton(?).

The DTGs are focused on subject based meetings that have clear objective and process. One is focused on the Sultan Reach and the other on WDFW's upper estuary and Ebby Island projects. The DTGs have the same membership as launch team – a broad group of practitioners working to increase integration in the Snohomish watershed. They do not meet regularly as full group but keep in communication with the Integration Team and provide an opportunity for any IT members to participate.

Next steps. The DTG will meet on near-term project list and FbD grant proposal in early April followed by a meeting of the Core Team. The Core Team will provide an update to the EC and gather input on the near-term project list and FbD grant proposal in May or June.

Comments: Great to see small groups that are action based, encourage clear definition of the role of the DTG to the core team so the responsibility between the two is really clear, and who is supposed to represent the two connecting very clearly to help with consistent communication. The IT has created tools for the DTG for effective meetings, consistent communications and how to report back to the rest of the group.

Non-IT Project Updates

None

Decisions, next steps and future agendas

Future meetings: Videoconferences will be our primary mode of holding SLS meetings for the foreseeable future to minimize unnecessary risk associated with the COVID-19 outbreak.

The next SLS Partner meeting will be April 9, 10:00-11:30 via videoconference. David will send a link in your calendar invitation along with a tentative agenda. All are encouraged to participate. We are trying to have everyone participate via a computer or cell phone that includes a camera and microphone. Call or email David if you need technical assistance with Zoom and he will find someone to help you.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45AM

See future meeting topics below

Upcoming meetings and proposed topics:

April 9, 2020

Presentations:

- Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update (Part 1) – Ikuno and staff from Planning and Development
- Snohomish County Hazard Mitigation Plan - John Holdsworth of Department of Emergency Management

Discussion topics:

- Review of revised meeting Ground Rules
- SLS Work Plan –
- Input from Executive Committee

Updates:

- Caucus reports
- Monthly workgroup and project updates

May 14, 2020

- Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update (Part 2) – Ikuno and staff

June 11, 2020

- IT grant proposal reviews