

## ILIO TC Meeting Notes

### Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	August 2, 2016		
Meeting Time:	10-12pm		
Meeting Location:	Coupeville Library Web-ex available		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark	Anna Toledo	Jim Sundberg
	Suzanna Stoike	Stan Walsh	
	Keith Higman	Anna Toledo	
	John Lovie	Matt Zupich	
	Dawn Pucci	Rob Hallbauer	
	Stephanie Croan	Kathryn Wells (web-ex)	
Meeting Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Adaptive Management process &amp; make recommendations for EC consideration (8/24/16)</li> <li>Review Gaps &amp; Barriers &amp; make recommendations for EC consideration (8/24/16)</li> <li>Discuss workshop to prioritize strategies</li> <li>Discuss process for selecting NTA to receive EPA NEP direct allocation (\$100,000 per year)</li> </ul>		
		Total Time:	120 minutes

### Minutes

Topic:	PSP Updates	Action Item Owner:	Suzanna
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NTA Financial updates in smartsheet due by Friday Aug 12, 2016</li> </ul>		
Follow-up Items:			
Notes:	<p>Suzanna:</p> <p>2014 NTA close-outs complete.</p> <p>September - Joint meeting with San Juan Co. LIO and Macah Tribe for oil spill response/vessel traffic NTA; conceptual model of coordination on spills; date and location TBD. Suzanna suggests communicating with other Tribes conducting vessel traffic discussions</p> <p>Smartsheet guidance documents sent via email; once you've signed in you will always have access to your spreadsheets; Call Susanna, Lori or Alex if you have questions about smartsheet.</p> <p>Strategic Initiative Leads and EPA released documents outlining the funding options and models for the \$100,000 direct funding. Partnership not involved in this funding – EPA, to SI Leads, to NTA owners.</p> <p>Option 1 – one NTA up to \$100,000</p> <p>Option 2 – one NTA phased over years (\$100,000 per year)</p> <p>Option 3 – pool with other LIO to fund one NTA</p> <p>NOT an option – splitting funding over multiple NTAs. There are no carry-overs; you must spend the whole \$100,000 each year, or lose it.</p>		

	<p>Model 1 – Submit priority NTA prior to SI leads releasing their recommendations for direct funding on Nov. 10<sup>th</sup>; can select second choice if the NTA is funded through regional funding.</p> <p>Model 2 – After direct funding, by November 29<sup>th</sup>, LIO provides first priority NTA for direct funding and notify NTA leads; LIOs will have 10 days to make a decision (during Thanksgiving Break!).</p>		
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>Adaptive Management process</b>	<b>Action Item Owner:</b>	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the amount of bulkhead removed, or acres restored, as metrics for project performance</li> <li>• Add more detail about how each NTA should respond to triggers (short-term goals)</li> <li>• Add conceptual models for recovery for storm water, shellfish, salmon, etc.</li> <li>• Send final draft to EC for approval</li> </ul>		
Follow-up Items:	Fits into 5 year ERP, will be combined with Gaps & Barriers		
Notes:	<p>Comments on Word document (thank you for comments/suggestions!):</p> <p>1 - Would like to see more reporting back by project sponsors (accountability) perhaps more monitoring if needed, site visits for all NTAs and lessons learned as each project concludes.</p> <p>2 - Project effectiveness – population status (VSP) not a good indicator of project effectiveness; good data to have for habitat monitoring and regional fish counts, but not necessarily indicative of local project impact; acres restored or amount of bulkhead removed are better metrics. WDFW has a program to analyze land cover using aerial photography and GIS. This is a free program for potential use for measuring project effectiveness.</p> <p>3 – Discussion about storm water; IC currently monitors for source identification, as there is limited funding and staffing for storm water sampling (has to be within a few hours of storm event, which doesn't correspond to sample courier times). ICCD helps by assisting agricultural properties with BMP implementation.</p> <p>4 - Add conceptual models for projects we aren't yet doing, e.g., storm water runoff from roads to the Sound which potentially could be treated prior to discharge; could use this info. To find grant money for these kinds of projects.</p> <p>5 – Roles of regional science – opportunity to learn from what other LIOs or regional watershed recovery partners are doing.</p>		
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>Review Gaps &amp; Barriers</b>	<b>Action Item Owner:</b>	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show how Chinook population is not a good indicator of project efficacy and there's a need for a different metric.</li> <li>• Add site visits and/or presentations to add depth to NTA proposals.</li> <li>• Need support for community engagement in climate change mitigation.</li> <li>• Use "cost effectiveness" for NTA interim targets.</li> <li>• Add support for the Magnuson Amendment to protect against oil and hazardous spills in Puget Sound.</li> <li>• Lori will have the TC review this document once edits are made for final review.</li> </ul>		
Follow-up Items:			
Notes:	<p>Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council meeting on July 28<sup>th</sup> – Chinook numbers are not indicative of project efficacy; there's too much variance naturally, and it takes years to see how habitat effects populations. Works for a stream where you can measure smolt going out and returning adults. Not useful for nearshore effectiveness. Useful for behavior data.</p> <p>Community Engagement - removed eco-networks for outreach, as they don't have guaranteed funding long-term. Need support for community involvement in climate change mitigation.</p> <p>Suggested site visits with project sponsors, very useful during the proposal process. Better than presentations alone, or having time with the SRF Board review panel, because you can see the project first-hand.</p> <p>"Bang for your buck" - use "cost effectiveness" for criteria for selecting NTAs and/or as an interim target.</p> <p>Magnuson Amendment - can't bring oil tankers into Puget Sound or establish refining/shipping facilities in Puget Sound, except for oil that is to be used in the geographic area. Provides protection from oil and hazardous spills. Prevents oil tankers from travelling through Puget Sound, and is currently under threat of</p>		

	<p>being over-written and needs support.</p> <p>Marine water quality – DO measurements in freshwater used for indicator of marine water quality vital sign. Not a good indicator needs work.</p>		
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>Prioritizing strategies workshop</b>	<b>Action Item Owner:</b>	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-send NTA list for next meeting</li> <li>• Next meeting Aug 19<sup>th</sup> (before the Aug 24 deadline) to rank strategies and come up with process for NTA selection</li> </ul>		
Follow-up Items:			
Notes:	<p>Questions about who can vote for prioritizing NTA's; concerns over conflicts of interest; reviewed Executive Committee and Technical Committee voting members which include some employees of Island County, as well as the City of Langley, Tribes, and WICD. Voting members will be accounted for at the next meeting when voting happens. Lori will send out DoodlePoll to select next meeting date/time before the Executive Committee meeting on August 24<sup>th</sup> along with a survey to start the process of prioritizing strategies. SEAT discussion next week; Stan Walsh participating. Selecting SIs that fit our area – nearshore habitat is IC focus, while regional focus is on large river watersheds. Local priority strategies will be combined with regional level strategies, with an opportunity to review strategies annually. Lori is available to come discuss SI with your group, if needed.</p> <p>Current list of strategies with pressure/ecosystem component will be used to start prioritization along with criteria. Difficult to prioritize things with multiple causes, i.e., intact nearshore vs. control of sources of pollutants. Prioritizing strategies is key component of recovery planning, doesn't influence direct funding. No other way to refine how to proceed without prioritizing. Also helps proponents understand where their projects lie within the LIO priorities. Can review priorities every 3-4 years, or as needed. This way, we start with what we care about first – start with "why".</p>		
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>Criteria for EPA NEP direct allocation (\$100,000 per year) &amp; Timeline</b>	<b>Action Item Owner:</b>	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask if splitting the funds among two or more NTAs can be added as an option</li> <li>• Ask partners which projects could be phased and if there's any other funding available for their NTAs</li> </ul>		
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• August 12<sup>th</sup> deadline to select SI for NTAs</li> <li>• Meet before Aug 24<sup>th</sup> to rank strategies and come up with process for NTA selection - bring budget and details for each NTA</li> <li>• Aug 29<sup>th</sup> deadline for selecting SI</li> <li>• September meeting to select NTA for funding</li> </ul>		
Notes:	<p>Strategic Initiative Leads and EPA released documents outlining the funding options and models for the \$100,000 direct funding. Partnership not involved in this funding – EPA, to SI Leads, to NTA owners.</p> <p>Option 1 – one NTA up to \$100,000</p> <p>Option 2 – one NTA phased over years (\$100,000 per year)</p> <p>Option 3 – pool with other LIO to fund one NTA</p> <p>NOT an option – splitting funding over multiple NTAs. There are no carry-overs; you must spend the whole \$100,000 each year, or lose it.</p> <p>Model 1 – Submit priority NTA prior to SI leads releasing their recommendations for direct funding on Nov. 10<sup>th</sup>; can select second choice if the NTA is funded through regional funding.</p> <p>Model 2 – After direct funding, by November 29<sup>th</sup>, LIO provides first priority NTA for direct funding and notify NTA leads; LIOs will have 10 days to make a decision (during Thanksgiving Break!).</p> <p>Difficult to find NTAs that will use the entire \$100,000 on one project in Island County. Another option may be to fund a smaller project and then donate remaining funds to a regional NTA elsewhere; need list of NTAs with budget and details to discuss. Strategy suggestion: if stormwater has fewer projects and higher likelihood to be</p>		

funded, habitat might be less competitive so funding the habitat NTA might be the best option for getting it done. Suggest adding certainty for success to the ranking criteria of NTAs. Phasing might be difficult for future collaboration; partners may become disinterested. Consensus amongst the group for a request to allow splitting the funds amongst two or more NTAs. Regional ranking may be a consideration when deciding how to proceed with NTA ranking, or those listed in the EPA Strategic Initiative Leads Funding Guidance document. Another option is to prioritize by strategy to focus on, i.e., PIC programs, shellfish harvest areas, or storm water.