

SNOHOMISH SUSTAINABLE LANDS STRATEGY (SLS) DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY



Thursday January 16, 2020 10:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.
Snohomish County Campus, East Building, 6th floor, Room 6A02

PARTICIPANTS (Executive Committee members in bold):

C. K. Eidem – Ducks Unlimited

Cindy Dittbrenner – Snohomish Conservation District
Carol MacIlroy - Carol MacIlroy Consulting
Dan Bartlheimer – Sno-Valley Farms
Dan Calvert – Puget Sound Partnership
Dave Lucas - Snohomish County SWM
David Roberts – Kulshan Services (Facilitator)
Getchen Glaub - Snohomish County SWM
Heather Cole – The Nature Conservancy
Jason Griffith – Stillaguamish Tribe
Jay Krienitz – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jessica Hamill - Snohomish County SWM
Kevin Hushagen – City of Stanwood
Kirk Lakey – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kit Crump - Snohomish County SWM
Lauren Tracey – Snohomish County
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
Pat Stevenson – Stillaguamish Tribe
Robin Fay – PCC Farmland Trust
Spencer Easton – ESA Consultants
Stephanie Celt – Department of Natural Resources

Actions

- Cindy will organize an Ag Caucus meeting to review the Stilly IT pre-proposal package.
- Cindy, Kit and Dave will get together to review project with the County actions.
- David will send out the version 4 of the attribute table with input from the notes.
- Kit will check in with Pat to see if he is able to make the Feb 13 SLS meeting.
- David will contact EC members who did not attend and share outcomes of the meeting. He will also discuss need for any input on the two IT preproposal packages.

Welcome, introductions and agenda review

David welcomed everyone and explained the circumstances leading to the video conference.

Approval of meeting summary

Skipped

Roundtable/Sharing

- Cindy Dittbrenner announced she is leaving the SCD and will be moving to Boston.
- Jay Krienitz: ESRP is preparing for the 2020 grant competition. There are a few primary sub-programs, one for large-scale restoration and protection, one for research and tool development that informs restoration projects, a small grants offering and an ongoing Shore Friendly program where Northwest Straits Foundation and Island County are your best local contacts.

Primary presentations or discussion topics

Stillaguamish IT Presentation (Carol MacIlroy)

Carol provided a presentation on the actions that have been identified by the Stilly IT that require funding. She provided a comprehensive list that will be narrowed down for their Floodplains by Design pre-proposal package. Carol's handouts and presentation are available on the website.

Questions asked of SLS Partners:

What are you excited about? What are your concerns?

- Concern that the Executive Committee (EC) is not part of this meeting. How do we get their input in a timely fashion? It was the main purpose of this meeting, to help meet the due date of the pre-proposal. Maybe the EC could watch the video or the recording and engage in the follow-up call next week. Would like EC buy-off before the end of the month. David will contact each of the members not present. *(Note: Unfortunately, the recording is too big to send out.)*
- Keeping agreement on the larger body of work keeps the pressure off on any specific project and allows for continued discussions.
- Appreciate the effort that it takes to get this work together, including the action list and attribute list.

Do the SLS attributes align with your concerns or things that excite you?

- Concerns about lack of participation from the EC
- Jason shared they are pretty excited about purchasing 571 acres of former tidal wetlands.
- Feels like a balanced package and covers the three F's. Good work from Carol
- Stanwood is good with it.
- Cindy will meet with Ag Caucus (Linda, Brian, Andy and Robin) to review with the whole package.
- Cindy will meet with Kit and Dave on the County nexus projects.
- Linda liked the idea of do a small ag group to go over them.
- Morgan asked if we can clarify whether all these conversations happen before the pre-app or can we move forward broadly and then clarify more as we develop that full application.
- Carol stated that the pre-app is short and needs to be at a conceptual level. The purpose of the pre-app to put together and integrated suite of actions. We don't need to detail the investment at this stage – only 300 words for each “F”.

Next steps, timeline and decisions

- Pat: SWC could be an active body to move this work forward. Tribal leadership and County leadership and could help move things forward. Leadership could be shared by other organizations and other political bodies.
- Linda asked to be counted in on the leadership.
- A good strategy would be to have a follow-up with the EC at the weekly check-in before the end of the month.

Snohomish IT presentation (Morgan and Spencer)

Morgan and Spencer provided a presentation on the status and actions being proposed for the Snohomish IT. They are a little behind the Stilly team, so did not have as much specificity. Their handouts and presentation are available on the website.

Questions asked of SLS Partners:

What are you excited about? What are your concerns?

- Project pipeline is robust and easy to follow. The way it is broken out is helpful.
- For DNR helpful starting point to lead to other conversations offline.
- Linda N: It's a very good mix of ag and other elements.
- Feels like a balanced approach with how the different pots are filled
- C.K: SLS could help with what specific buckets should be focused on for FbD. Example- if it is easier to get funding elsewhere, demonstrate the balanced nature and rely on FbD to fund for other resources.
- Need to have more conversations on what funding sources to go after.
- Carol: Project list is a container of work and we can see how all the actions are working together. Unsure how all the pieces will be funded but goes beyond just FbD funding.
- Exciting to see the Snoh IT is starting. Great for lessons learned and learning from the Stilly IT. Helped to build from the Stilly IT.

Do the SLS attributes align with your concerns and the things that excite you? Should anything be clarified or deleted?

- Feels like the attribute list is hitting mark.

How can SLS (SLS EC and partners) provide leadership to move the discussion forward on specific projects or the FbD package? What type of leadership is needed, by whom and when? Who at the table can provide leadership?

- Kit: We need tribal leadership, CD board, and leadership from the EC to engage with these broader groups.
- Being able to advocate internally and externally is important as a group.
- We need to be more specific on leadership, advocacy and problem solving and fixing things in the system that are not working. It would be helpful to discuss these down the road.
- Certain actions will need certain types of help and support. As the work moves forward, there may be county-wide regulations and policies that inhibit this work.
- The Stilly IT and Snoh IT are moving synergistically to resolve barriers.

Attribute table discussion

Is this list helpful. Does it represent the values and expectations SLS looking for when someone is seeking support?

- Feels consistent with the SLS EC.
- The attribute Explainable to local community buy-in” may not be needed. Should be more clear. What is expected here? Is the intent for the different interests to go back to their interests to explain why this are these actions occurring?
- A significant attribute is “consistent with SLS mission...” and language around net gain. This attribute needs work.
- Add something in the attributes table that addresses participation.
- How does the whole system move this work forward - responsibilities on different fronts?
- We are seeking support from the EC but the current people are not engaged. How do we get support if we don’t have the right people?
- This is a process that we are going to be using and need to communicate to the right people at the right time.
- Working on the membership of SLS EC makes it hard to have the quorum needed. Symptom of the larger problem and the effect is that expectations for support are not being met.
- Have a closer look at the attributes list during the conference calls in the future.
- Participation was needed at this important meeting. What are the roles and responsibilities to the whole group?

Is there anything on the list that are left out?

- Dan B: Are the benefits justifiable?
- Jay: Are the benefits verifiable - ie scientific benefits?
- Linda: Maybe being able to document the success of projects that are for ag.

Outreach and engagement updates

- Lindsey: WDFW is hoping to release their new SLS video. Anticipated release date Jan. 27th.
- Jay: ESRP program will have grant RFP out this spring and summer for process based restoration. If there are questions or SLS priorities as it relates to ESRP please follow-up with Jay K.

Funding updates

- none

Policy updates

- none

Decisions, next steps and future agendas

Jessica, David and Heather have formed a planning team to align efforts between the SLS and IT and work planning.

Questions:

- Where is there a discussion on how to engage different partners who have more regional programs that want to support SLS (like ESRP). How can they best participate?

- Are you thinking about policy issues or communication products?
- Thinking more on the policy and funding issues, like Stephanie, Jay and others that have broader programmatic programs.
- Do we want to set up a field trip in the future? Should it be a separate day or part of a SLS meeting?
- Not sure if there is a need for IT discussion for April, May and June. Need clear guidance on what the ITs have presented thus far.

David reviewed the proposed agenda for the February meeting. Kit offered to check with Pat to see if he will be able to attend the Feb 13 meeting.

Meeting evaluation

- It was harder to stay focused than a regular meeting.
- Using video is helpful. Encourage everyone to use it
- Zoom was a good choice for day with the weather conditions.
- The chat notes will be available after the meeting as well as the audio from the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15pm

Upcoming meetings and proposed topics:

February 13, 2020

- Review status of current FbD projects
- Executive Committee report on membership
- Visioning a 12-month workplan
- Queue up discussion of shared goals and prep for discussion of Puyallup with Kathleen

Conference Calls

- January 22
- January 29
- February 5

Summary prepared by David Roberts with input from Heather Cole.