Meeting Minutes

Snohomish-Stillaguamish Local Integrating Organization
Joint Snohomish Implementation Committee & Stillaguamish Implementation Committee Meeting
January 26, 2022, 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Zoom Conference Call

Attendees
Kit Crump, Snohomish County
Alexa Cummings, Snohomish County
Kathleen Pozarycki, Snohomish County
Jason Griffith, Stillaguamish Tribe
Doug Hennick, WFC
Bob Margulis, Snohomish MRC
Michael Wolanek, City of Arlington
Ralph Svrjcek, WA ECY
Tom Freeburg, Evergreen Fly Fishing Club
Bill Blake, Skagit CD
Joycelyn Blue, Snohomish County
Erik Stockdale, Snohomish County
Valerie Streeter, Tulalip Tribes
Gwendolyn Hannam, WDFW
Daniel Howe, Snohomish County
Chuck Stambaugh-Bowey, WDFW
Tim Ellis, Snohomish MRC
Barbara Brock, Island County salmon recovery lead entity
Molly Fay, Pilchuck Creek
Linda Lyshall, Snohomish CD
Hannah Liss, PSP
Duane Weston, Washington Farm Forestry Association
Kirk Lakey, WDFW
Lindsey Desmul, WDFW
Andrea Pellham, Snohomish Health District
Ann Bylin, Snohomish County
Anna Bachmann, Soundkeeper Alliance
Dale Shelton, North Fork Stillaguamish
Heather Khan, WA ECY
Kelsey Payne, Snoqualmie Tribe
Julia-Grace Sanders, Snohomish Health District
Kevin Hushagen, City of Stanwood
Nick Bright, Stillaguamish River At Large
Michael Wagner, Snohomish Health District
Terri Strandberg, Snohomish County
Ben Curley, South Fork Stillaguamish
Marty Jacobsen, WA ECY
Allen Gibbs, Pilchuck Audubon Society
Curt Kraemer, Evergreen Fly Fishing Club
Snohomish/Stillaguamish LIO IC Joint Topic Session (Kathleen, Val, Alexa) (see handout)

Kathleen gave an overview of the Action Agenda update process so far and a timeline for the next 6-8 months.

- **Jan. 6 – 19:** LIO coordinators and committees provide feedback and content on high level actions and additional draft AA sections in close partner review
- **Jan 19:** LIO comments due
- **Jan. 20 – Feb. 9:** Extended window for feedback and content
- **Jan. 27 – Mar. 3:** Winter boards review cycle
- **Mar. 7 – Apr. 20:** *Proposed time for reaffirming of LIO rankings*
- **Mid-Mar. – “Apr. 20:** Public review and comment and SEPA review
- **May 2:** *Tentative* finalized AA draft
- **June 8 – 9:** Leadership Council meeting; approval of AA,
- **June 8 or 9:** SNO/STILLY LIO WORKSHOP in Leadership Council Mtg

She explained what a “high-level” action represents in the 2022-2026 Action Agenda. High Level Actions are activities that will be a shared focus for implementing a particular strategy for the four years from 2022 to 2026. The High Level Actions (HLA) includes:

- Capital projects (e.g., restoration and acquisition); program development, improvement, or implementation; education; outreach; research; legislative or policy improvements; or other types of activities.
- Partners that should collaborate to implement the strategy.
- High Level Actions are higher level and less specific than a Near Term Action (NTA)
- Intended to guide partner implementation and innovation
- Inform support by the boards and regional partners and the focus of public and private funding.

Alexa explained the review process undertaken so far by the LIO for the draft Action Agenda. See handout for a full list of comments. Overall themes from the comments include the following:

- 30 combine/delete comments from July review missed (150 strategies)
  - Mostly around Climate change & Human wellbeing
- 43 revision comments from January review (130 high-level actions/strategies from July)
  - Suggested combine/delete comments in January review
  - Handout shows key revisions for increased engagement/key opportunities

a. Combined LIO Funding approach (5-Year Plan)

Val gave an overview of the work plan subcommittee’s criteria for developing project ideas for the $500,000 in funding over the next 5 years.

- Replacement of the Previous $100k NTA SIL/LIO Subaward with Funding to Provide Additional Capacity for SIL and LIO Collaboration
- PSP, EPA, LIOs, and the SILs will hold joint forum in late winter 2022
- Goal is to develop multi-year subaward plans to the LIOs to support integration of Implementation Strategies and the Action Agenda in the respective LIO watersheds/geographies.
b. Work Plan Update

Val gave an overview of the project ideas the subcommittee has developed so far for consideration.

- A sub-committee (6-7 people) developed themes to address barriers to recovery
- **Barrier:** issue (such as institutional, legal, policy, regulatory, technical, communication, or funding) that blocks or impedes progress
- Staff cross-checked for alignment of the themes with the 26 Action Agenda strategies and our Ecosystem Recovery Plan and found significant alignment

Project Criteria developed and proposed by the subcommittee:

- Addresses a barrier to achieving goals of the Sno/Stilly LIO
- Does not replace SILs grant round to fund a specific project or “NTA”
- Spans both watersheds
- Addresses a barrier that we believe we can make significant progress on
- Addresses an ecosystem scale problem
- Doesn’t duplicate other efforts to create significant project complexity
- Staff capacity in place to achieve project goals
- Meets multiple strategies in the action agenda crosswalk and/or is a high priority noted through the crosswalk
- Link to Implementation Strategies in Action Agenda
- Optional bonus: If one of the barriers is being addressed by one or more LIOS that would provide a more regional focus to the work and bring solutions beyond just a one county focus

Discussion:

There was discussion about how the LIO could make the best use of the funds and capacity over the next five years.

Ralph suggested it might be good to do a comparison between district approaches which could include Island as well. He added that a regulatory approach and a public voluntary approach go hand in hand. As good as our outreach is, there is still a need for incentives, especially with Ecology. For example, better coordinated messaging that is highly researched and effective such as Snohomish County pet waste community based social marketing. Look for ways to be more effective across the state in terms of messaging.

Bill Blake shared he thinks we need to be brave and step up to share our failures over the past 30-years. The barrier list is the same, good to point out what works, but I think there is value is sharing what hasn’t worked so we can do it better.

Jason Griffith added that onsite septic system issues and regulatory barriers have been around for decades. It comes down to political will. The Lorraine Loomis Act proposal is receiving a lot of comment against it and not looking like it will pass. Our hope was that the Partnership, and that the Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) and Stillaguamish Watershed Council (SWC) would be able to address that. It’s
unclear and treaty tribes have a sense of urgency. The Stilly tribe has pivoted to proactive on the groundwork benefiting treaty resources. He suggested talking to Bill and others about the cautionary tale and why other efforts have failed in the past. Septic systems are one of the areas that we can make real progress on because people can get behind it and support it.

Linda Lyshall asked about plans to solicit members ideas for the work plan. Will there be another survey? Kathleen explained that the survey was postponed until more information on EPA’s criteria for the funding becomes available.

Ralph Svrjcek spoke to the criteria, “Address an ecosystem scale problem”, and that it is too ambiguous as a criterion, as well as there is a lack of organization and resources to do accomplish it. Jason mentioned a complaint driven system for Critical Area Regulations (CAR) violations is an ecosystem scale problem. This method of enforcing protection laws is problematic. This leads to neighbors having to report on neighbors. CAR enforcement needs to have a stronger system beyond relying on neighbor reports of violation. Also, a lack of adequate funding is another issue. There are large, regional problems that would be better addressed by regional organizations like the Puget Sound Partnership.

Bob Margulis suggested providing free drinking water tests for wells as a way to incentivize checking problem septic systems. Water quality and septic issues are connected. Can we use a carrot instead of a stick? For example, the Friends of Teton River offered people free drinking water testing as an incentive to check their septic systems. Kathleen explained that Snohomish County doesn’t have regulations to enforce septic inspections and maintenance. Ralph mentioned that the Snohomish Health District (SHD) tried offering voluntary water testing, but it didn’t work out well due to a lack of community buy-in and interest.

Jason Griffith asked if under their delegated CWA authority, has Ecology ever contacted the Snohomish Health District about the OSS inspection issue? Ralph said Ecology's delegation is for the NPDES permit program only, I think. But we have had quite a few discussions with SHD historically on this and other issues. We are working now with them at the Stilly PIC regarding shoreline high priority areas/properties.

c. **Next Steps**
   - LIO Staff Track EPA funding
   - Reconvene with LIO about how the funding will go for $500k
   - LIO Workplan Subcommittee on hold until March LIO/SIL/PSP/EPA Planning Forum