

## ILIO TC & SRTCC Joint Meeting Notes

### Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	October 17, 2018		
Meeting Time:	1-3pm		
Meeting Location:	Coupeville Library 788 NW Alexander St Coupeville, WA 98239 (WebEx available)		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark	Paul Marczin	Todd Zackey
	Jill Wood	John Lovie	Anna Toledo
	Suzanna Stoike	Barbara Bennett	Barbara Brock
	Keith Higman	Bill Blake	Laura Ferguson
	Dawn Spilsbury Pucci	Ron Wesen	Tom Vos
	Matt Zupich	Keith Higman	Ryan Elting (WebEx)
	Karen Bishop	Greg Goforth	Mona Campell (WebEx)
	Jessica Hammell (WebEx)	Stan Walsh (WebEx)	
Meeting Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize NTA selection for local NEP funding (\$100,000) allocation.</li> <li>Discuss Island ECB and legislative priorities with Ron Wesen</li> </ol>		
	Total Time:	90 minutes	

### Minutes

Topic:	Updates	Action Item Owner:	Lori/Dawn
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	None		
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updating the vital sign target metrics has proven to be more complicated than I had hoped. The Dept of Ecology is in the process of updating the 303D listing (marine and fresh water quality) and the Dept of Health has not updated the harvestable shellfish acreage since 2015. To evaluate progress towards the ILIO goals and/or adaptively manage our strategies we will need to find a way to measure progress. We will be discussing this at the next LIO meeting.</li> <li>PSP has a PS Info Vision and Governance Group to define the high level, common vision for PS Info and rules of governance. Lori is on this committee. PSP will be looking to get our input on creating the landing pages for PS Info and Data Center, Vital Sign indicator reporting, building an Action Agenda tracker and report card, and creating an NEP Atlas replacement. We should see this spring of 2019.</li> <li>Maylor Point restoration is complete! 1,500 feet of shoreline is restored to natural beach. This project is funded with the regional NEP funds (\$354,131) through the Habitat Strategic Initiative team. USFWS Puget Sound Coastal Project is funding \$25,000. PSAR funds were also utilized.</li> <li>NWSF is still on track to begin construction on Sunlight Shores armor removal project.</li> <li>The Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) investment plan was released last week and it is</li> </ul>		

	<p>looking very promising that the Seahorse Siesta Barge and Armor Removal (\$46,815) and Oak Harbor Marina Restoration Feasibility projects will be funded. Oak Harbor Marina Restoration Feasibility is ranked number 20 and Seahorse Siesta is 18 on a list of 49 projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Human Wellbeing Project Year 2 Kickoff Meeting was last week. The team is working on HWB Survey results and preliminary findings from LIO interviews. Next steps include a DASEES presentation that including LIO data or applications (more tailored presentation) will be provided to LIOs.</li> <li>• Island County released an RFP for a cost benefit analysis for armoring options this week. And two additional realtor workshops are being offered. The first one was on October 11 in Stanwood and the next one is on Oct 25<sup>th</sup> in Coupeville. Anna is still working with a filming crew to shoot a video of IC residents who have chosen a natural beach or soft shore options to promote the Shore Friendly program.</li> <li>• The AACG is discussing how closely some of the Governor's Southern Resident Orca Task Force (TF) efforts have been aligned to Action Agenda efforts and how our recovery community's work has been used to seed TF conversations.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Topic:</b></p>	<p><b>Finalize decision on local NEP funding (\$100,000) allocation</b></p>	<p>Action Item Owner:</p>	<p>Lori</p>
<p>Decisions Made and Action Item(s):</p>	<p>The ILIO recommends the following for "local priority funding": 1. fully funding Coupeville Outfall study, 2. with the money remaining, apply funds to the SCD Sound Horsekeeping NTA for implementation (for work on Camano Island only), and 3. Move the Island County Stormwater Technical Assistance and Outreach Network (2018-0637) NTA forward as an alternate.</p>		
<p>Follow-up Items:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lori will email the ILIO EC with the ILIO TC "local priority" funding recommendation. Lori will wait until the SI Leads release their funding list before giving them the ILIO "local priority" project ranking.</li> </ul>		
<p>Notes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ILIO Technical Committee was authorized (by the EC) to utilize both the total scoring from the approved criteria as well as discussion to select an NTA for 2018-2022 local NTA to submit to PSP for FY2018 NEP local funding.</li> <li>• The Town of Coupeville has capacity and is very excited about the opportunity to receive funding to implement the Coupeville Outfall study (NTA#2018-0324). The project budget is still \$49,000.</li> <li>• SCD said they could implement the Camano Island portion of the Sound Horsekeeping NTA with the remaining funds (approx. \$51,000). For the smaller streams (non-fish) the 50' NMFS Buffer width is easier but for the larger streams, SCD would not likely be able to implement BMPs. Although, there are other sources of funding SCD can use to implement projects on Camano if they don't fit with Department of Ecology (ECY) guidelines - namely WA State Conservation Commission Shellfish funds as well as Assessment funds. These assessment dollars could be directed to cost-share if SCD can support more staff time through this NTA grant.</li> <li>• The Stillaguamish Watershed Council (SWC) did not recommend the Sound Horsekeeping NTA for "local priority" funding by the Stilly-Sno LIO. Stilliguamish Technical group ranked the Sound Horsekeeping as a top 10 priority project (made priority for 4 years) but it didn't make the top 3 list for recommendation to the Watershed Council. Watershed Council makes the final decision next week. Bill Blake said he will share the ILIO TC conversation about this NTA at the meeting.</li> <li>• We are working with the Shellfish SI Lead on the requirement for the NMFS buffer standard minimums for BMPs. Apparently there has been a significant barrier with implementing projects for Conservation Districts due to this buffer requirement on NEP funds.</li> <li>• The only way a LIO can recommend two projects for funding is under Option 2 (2018 LIO Priority NTA Funding Process, attached) where extra funds can be added on to an existing contract (or will exist with the next round of decisions by the SIAT).</li> <li>• The Shellfish SIAT will be moving forward with making their recommendations for funding later this year with the Shellfish SI funds, which could include creating a contract for the Sound Horsekeeping project.</li> <li>• We will not have the SIAT regional funding list until after we submit our list of NTAs for local NEP funding. This is the reason the SIATs are requesting a list of three NTAs so that they can fund the next in line if one of the NTAs are funded with the regional NEP pot of money. Stan suggested that this is not a good strategy and that the ILIO should hold our list until the SIAT release their funding decisions. The group</li> </ul>		

	agreed.
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>SRTCC update on SRFB Grant Round and existing projects</b>
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	none
Follow-up Items:	Dawn will take the “what if” Ramping Up [project] Implementation ideas to Walla Walla to the State-wide Lead Entity meeting at the end of October.
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force (SRKW TF) has two more meetings. They have received a lot of public comments on the draft recommendations.</li> <li>• As Puget Sound Conservation Districts has received funding for an event to raise awareness for the work that the CD's do that support SRKW recovery. November 10<sup>th</sup> is Puget Sound Orca Day. WICD will be having rain garden workshop and open house. The Orca Day is a call to action to empower residents on simple things they can do to protect the orcas.</li> <li>• It is important to connect the work that we do to the orca story.</li> <li>• Island County Commissioners sent a letter with comments on the Governor's SRKW TF Draft Recommendations.</li> <li>• SRTCC met yesterday to discuss “what if” salmon recovery gets a large sum on money. Where are the opportunities? How do we get projects on the ground fast? Good ideas were kicked around.</li> <li>• The next SRTCC meeting will be at Padilla Bay on Tuesday, Nov 20<sup>th</sup> 10-1. The group will be going over the project list and to make sure projects are updated. The group will prioritize the list and identify where we need to find sponsors to implement priority projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>ECB Areas of Focus/ Priorities</b>
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	none
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lori will work with Jessica (Stilly Sno LIO Coordinator) on efficient communication with Ron and Bill.</li> </ul>
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ron Wesen has been a Skagit County Commissioner for 10 years and has served as the Whidbey Basin representative on the ECB for 9 years.</li> <li>• Tribes and Skagit County do not share the same priorities so Skagit doesn't have a LIO. The Watershed Council is active and serves in this capacity.</li> <li>• The Clean Samish shellfish initiative has been in action for 10 years. Local meetings farming, small farms, septic systems.</li> <li>• Orca Task Force is dramatically effecting what we are doing on the ground. How do we pick a task that will move the needle?</li> <li>• Bill Blake is on the Stillaguamish Watershed Council and has been the Chair of the Stilly-Sno LIO. He sees value in the way LIO's coordinate, help partners and lobby for the LIO members. He sees a lot of value with functions of the LIO.</li> <li>• Bill shared that many issues cross over between the ERC and SRC.</li> <li>• The Dept of Commerce needs to be at the table for the ERC meetings.</li> <li>• Local grassroot efforts will drive the priority projects. The Puget Sound Partnership provides resources as LIOs need them.</li> <li>• Vital Signs 2020 are useful because we are all measuring the same thing to show progress. We need to establish and track interim targets to show progress.</li> <li>• Stillaguamish and Snohomish LIO talking about splitting up (currently Stilly-Sno LIO).</li> <li>• The value of the LIO structure is not always in receiving the funding. It gives an opportunity to develop meaningful projects and advocate for local priorities.</li> <li>• The ECB is updating their plan.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to understand how our work is affecting the salmon and Orca. Balance! We must look at whole picture. We are not going to solve it all. Dividing our efforts makes the approach too diluted; can't make needle move.</li> <li>• The stormwater runoff costs to local government is tremendous. Culvert cases will roll down to local government. Legacy stormwater issues in Seattle are more of an impact. Growth management; sprawl is happening.</li> <li>• We have to figure out how to come up with funding (1631). WA funding sources for particular items. Need to prioritize state wide.</li> <li>• Transportation planning (TIP) uses a good approach. Legislatures are used to this format. This makes permitting predictable, etc. This would demonstrate how we are planning ahead (CIP). We should look at crafting our 4 year workplans to be more similar to TIP format. Perhaps make them 6 year workplans. Show projects are moving up the list. Natural resource budgets should be aligned like the TIP.</li> <li>• Some of the State budget items are more emotional. Not many people will vote against the kids (education).</li> <li>• The public needs to better understand the decisions they make (voting) affect the projects.</li> <li>• Legislative process needs to be understood. Talk to candidates today before they are elected.</li> <li>• The LIOs tend to have the same issues. They differ in how they prioritize project. Good projects are getting implemented. Permits seem to be inhibiting success on some of these projects.</li> <li>• Bill discussed the idea of having a team of key players to review permits all at once. It shouldn't take so long to get projects permitted.</li> <li>• ECB has a lot of cross over with SRC with committee members.</li> <li>• Barb asked how the ECB fits with planning, permitting and economic development.</li> <li>• ECB has federal and state agencies, local government, and environmental groups. From County perspective, planning doesn't have a voice.</li> <li>• Commerce has regulation authority; we need to push to get Commerce at the table (ECB or Leadership Council).</li> <li>• Functioning shorelines are major economic resources. Our county has a lot of natural beaches (resource).</li> <li>• SMP planning process focuses on protecting and restoring the shoreline. Small communities trying to take out tide gates face permitting challenges. Permitting is written in framework of growth instead of incentivizing restoration.</li> <li>• We could do a better job of protecting properties, but property rights often conflict.</li> <li>• Natural resources are at stake.</li> <li>• It is easier to put in the bulkhead than to add nourishment (permits). Need a partnership with planning (Shoreline permits).</li> <li>• Required buffers do not always make sense. What would happen if there was a 200 ft buffer on Mercer Island?</li> <li>• Private ownership of shorelines prerogatives may need to be changed.</li> </ul>
<b>Topic:</b>	<b>Island Priorities</b>
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	none
Follow-up Items:	none
Notes:	<p><b>Public Infrastructure &amp; fish passage barriers - challenges and opportunities (Barbara Brock)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For every WSDOT barrier, on average, there are 2 other (non-WSDOT barriers) downstream and 5 upstream according to a July 2012 WDFW Study. It is estimated that 40% of all barrier culverts are county/municipality-owned</li> <li>• We support aligning local road improvement programs with priority stream restoration</li> </ul>

- Integrating environmental recovery funding with restricted transportation dollars for local infrastructure investments will increase barrier replacement rates.
- 2015 culvert prioritization. County started planning to address publicly-owned barrier culverts. Looking at the watershed as a system.
- We have been working on removing the lower Kristoferson culverts since 1999. In 2004, over 100 adult chum returned to Kristoferson. East Camano way is being considered for a culver replacement.
- There are barriers in the lack of flexibility in funding source. SRFB does not want to fund what they see as PW priorities.
- Ron suggested that we have to consider that the taxpayers may not be willing to use their road funds for these culvert projects

#### **Region Wide Consistency of Critical Area Mapping (Todd Zackey)**

- We need a common vision of who, how and where to reach goal of a consistent and accurate hydrography layer.
- Current mapping responsibilities are decentralized and outputs differ across jurisdictions.
- Support NTAs that aim to do just this.
- Old process of water typing in the state results in inconsistencies.
- State is passive with stream typing. Not conveyed well in local jurisdictions. WDFW is doing an update. WA could do a better job communicating this to local level.
- There is currently a 'stream type modification' process. It is a form that is filled out by the applicant and then reviewed or approved by WA DNR and WDFW. Changes in hydrography layer is not communicated routinely back to local jurisdictions from WA DNR.
- There is a new WDFW water typing layer that has been produced but not yet released.
- Local government doesn't have money to go out and map these.
- Many critical areas use water typing for regulating activity. Less accurate the data, the more likely over or under regulating depending on presence of fish.

The current mapping (stream typing) may not be accurate so the public is skeptical.

#### **Agricultural Buffer Incentives (Matt Zupich)**

- Incentive programs are underutilized by farmers for Ag buffer assistance.
- WICD was working on contracting with ECY for the local LIO funding NTA. Project included technical assistance to inform BMPs. ECY just wanted to pay for implementation
- The ECY staff came to Whidbey Island from Olympia to tour some of these sites. Buffers are in place here primarily for nutrient management, not temperature. NMFS buffer does not always work. Streams mapped as a type F require NMFS buffer to meet these standards. WICD almost turned the money back because they would not be able to get willing land owners. ECY decided to let them use NRCS buffer specifications. They present both NMFS buffer option along with NRCS buffers. Landowner decides. If they choose NRCS then the WSCC will fund the implementation. Many of our "streams" are not fish bearing. A buffer requires trees and shrubs and a fence. A lot of our streams dry up in the summer and could be used (grass or low shrub buffer) this would be adequate to filter. ECY has conceded to looking at this on a case by case basis.
- A lot of our small coastal streams do have salmonids. Managing for temperature in streams is important.
- Many farmers feel that the "stream" is just a drainage ditch with weeds thus they see no need to have a buffer.
- CREP is not utilized here because of 'lack of fish habitat'.
- Requirements from the funding source limits the CD from targeting project components in order of priority. If a retention pond needs to be built, the funding source requires any buffers and fencing to be in place first.

### Nearshore (Barbara Bennett & John Lovie)

- We don't have big rivers, floodplains. We have the most feeder bluffs than anywhere else in Puget Sound. We have been able to increase the amount of sediment in the system through armor removal. The Whidbey Island Land Trust acquired the Waterman Property and removed an armor wall. We are working with landowners to remove armoring but you need a beach where the sediment will accrue. Historical shoreline communities (piano keys) do not allow for sediment accrual. In communities like Seahorse Siesta and Sunlight Shores the shoreline will be restored to a natural condition.
- Triple benefit (Flood – Fish – Farm Program in Skagit). Floods are a threat, SLR, storm surge, wave overtopping and people are concerned about property. Triple benefit is needed to move projects along.
- Island County has pocket estuaries that are functioning, some need restoration. We have critical habitat around our islands. We used to have tidal wetland marsh habitat but this has been diked and drained and used for other purposes. Need to open these up! We need to look at a model of how to do it that doesn't put farms out of businesses, protect property values and restores tidal wetlands. Regulations and difficulty around getting permits is a significant issue.
- Island County has eelgrass and bull kelp beds that are durable but boats are harming these.
- The MRC find beaches where forage fish are spawning. Classify beaches related to permitting.
- Forage fish are the bottleneck to the food web.
- MRC has taken on the role of (Shore Friendly) raising awareness with communities. What to do with deteriorating armoring and infrastructure (septic, bulkheads, drinking water wells). People want to come to beach house and have a good time without worrying about this. Funding strategies, collaboration, expectations. MRC conducted workshops, people were engaged. They discussed ways to incentivize shoreline infrastructure/habitat improvements. "Piano key" developments have big impacts. The accumulation of all of these structures makes a significant impact. Permitting is geared to developing property. Need to address removal incentives.