

ILIO TC Meeting Notes

Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	August 19, 2016		
Meeting Time:	9-12pm		
Meeting Location:	Coupeville Library Web-ex available		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark	Barbara Bennett	Todd Zackey
	Suzanna Stolke	Stan Walsh	
	Keith Higman	Toren Wood	
	Jim Sundberg	Matt Zupich	
	Dawn Pucci	Rob Hallbauer	
	Stephanie Croan	Dawn Pucci (via WebEx)	
Meeting Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize ILIO sub-strategies • Develop process for EC consideration for selecting local NTA(s) to receive EPA NEP direct allocation (\$100,000 /year) 		
		Total Time:	120 minutes

Minutes

Topic:	Prioritize ILIO sub-strategies	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	Final Sub-strategy Rating attached.		
Follow-up Items:	Check the 2016 NTAs that support C2.3 (many should have B2.3 as the primary sub-strategy)		
Notes:	<p>ILIO TC used the EC approved Prioritization for Sub-strategies (2016 NTAs) to identify which strategies (not actions) would be most effective in achieving recovery. Assign the following scores to each rating within the impact, feasibility and readiness for implementation criteria: low-1, medium-2, high-3.</p> <p>C9.4 Develop and implement Pollution Identification and Correction (PIC) programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shellfish impacted by pollutants identified by on sight collection. Multiple levels of problem mitigation based on level of severity. ○ Possible classification as medium because it fails to address some of the issues related to wildlife. ○ Posited that wildlife has a far less significant impact than agricultural practices/pollutants ○ PIC's focus on bacteriological factors. It does not address other potential areas of impacts (sedimentation, agriculture...). ○ Easiest to implement out of the lists of initiatives. ○ Currently, bacteriological factors are examined. Chemical factors and other potential vectors of pollution are not addressed at the moment. ○ Priority is shellfish protection ○ Each strategy is ready for implementation as they have been sufficiently vetted. 		

C2.5 Provide stormwater-related education and training

C3.1 Voluntary & incentive-based programs to help working farms contribute to Puget Sound recovery

- o Impact is correlated to actions rather than dialogue. Strategies that can be immediately implemented tend to be more effective.
- o Individuals in the community who have been educated on issues haven't necessarily implemented or followed through with learned principles.
- o Difficult to correlate the influence of education on actual impact.
- o Education isn't necessarily enough to cause change. Reinforcing education is important as well as providing individuals with feasible changes in behavior.
- o Posited that those who already have infrastructure in place are unlikely to build new systems in order to address issues such as sources of pollutants. New property owners are more likely to effect change.
- o Unlikely that voluntary initiatives are likely to be especial impactful. A system of incentives is much more likely to affect results.
- o Potential incentive (most effective) include cost sharing.
- o Most programs and initiatives include water quality testing
- o Feasibility is **high**.

C7.1 Prevent downgrade & achieve upgrades of important current tribal, commercial, recreational shellfish harvesting areas

- o Goal for the Crescent Harbor project is to reduce pollutants from sources such as farms.
- o High levels of agricultural usage of land correlates to the results taken from bacteriological surveys.
- o Interesting to note that it is important to separate the impact of human influence and that of local wildlife (deer, seals, sea lions...)
- o Rated as **medium**.

C2.3 Fix problems caused by existing development

- o This initiative encompasses all current construction.
- o Impact is **high**.
- o Related to existing urban development
- o Current focus is on knew developing standards. A potential issue is the lack of issues addressed in relation to older properties and other infrastructure.
- o Feasibility is low because of lack of current regulation.
- o Armoring is necessary where developing is involved.
- o Feasibility is **Medium** taking into consideration technical issues such as property size...

C2.4 This sub-strategy includes local pollution and control programs, inspections, technical assistance, and enforcement. This sub-strategy is intended to identify, address, and reduce toxics, nutrients and pathogens.

level. **Septic systems from agriculture operations; and/or toxics from residential and commercial uses.** **Pro**
 Pinpoint related to pollution source control.

- o Addresses some of the same issues of the PIC program.
- o In most instances, pour flow of water sources, and a variety of pressures makes it hard to pinpoint the sources of bacteriological issues.
- o Noted that specific "language" has an operational definition. (Discussion of the implication of the diction Toxic)
- o The lack of identification of potential pollutants is an issue that should be addressed. Examples

	<p>include metal sampling, chemical (fertilizers), and sediment sampling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Navy has a significant impact on the ecosystem. (hard to address for obvious reasons) ○ Feasibility is rated as high. <p>B5.3 Prevent, rapidly respond to invasives' introduction & spread</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Railroads increase the transfer of invasive species ○ Issue tends to be reactive. Funding is given in response to identified problems rather than prevention. ○ Difficult to find funding for invasive species introduction prevention through conventional processes ○ High impact, low feasibility ○ Scotch broom is an example of a particularly troublesome invasive species. <p>B2.1 Protect priority intact nearshore physical & ecological processes & habitat</p> <p>B2.2 Implement prioritized nearshore and estuary restoration projects and accelerate projects on public lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Projects take a lot of time and money to implement (on order of decades) ○ Potential impact is much more feasible on public rather than on private land. ○ Feasibility rated as high. <p>A6.1 High priority projects</p> <p>A2.2 Implement and maintain priority freshwater and terrestrial restoration projects</p>		
<p>Topic:</p>	<p>Develop process for EC consideration for selecting local NTA(s) to receive EPA NEP direct allocation (\$100,000/year)</p>	<p>Action Item Owner:</p>	<p>Lori Clark</p>
<p>Decisions Made and Action Item(s):</p>	<p>The ILIO TC recommends the following criteria for 2016 NTA selection criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the current \$100,000 NEP funding allocation catalyze the project to completion? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 points – Project will be completed (final phase) with 2016 NEP funding ○ 2 points – Project will be moved forward significantly with 2016 NEP funding. ○ 1 point – NEP will only fund a preliminary phase of the full project. 2. Is the project timely? Will it support other actions currently underway? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 points – Project must be implemented within the next year. ○ 2 points – Project is critical but not under near-term constraints. ○ 1 point – Project is not time bounded. 3. Does this NTA support planning or action? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 points – Action ○ 3 points – Planning 4. How many ecosystem components (multi-benefit) does this project address? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 points – Project addresses 5 or more ecosystem components. ○ 3 points – Project addresses 2-4 or more ecosystem components. ○ 1 point – Project addresses 1 ecosystem components. 5. How many strategic initiatives does this project fit into? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 points – Project fits into all 3 strategic initiatives. ○ 3 points – Project fits into 2 strategic initiatives ○ 1 point – Project fits into 1 strategic initiative 		

Follow-up Items:	The ILIO EC will meet to review/approve the selection criteria on August 24 th .
Notes:	<p>Priority of funding (100,000 dollar budget)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest priority projects potentially cannot be funded by such a small budget • Trying to contract out multiple projects is difficult because it costs more to coordinate multiple projects. • Likely that the focus will be on one project in terms of the allocation of funding. • Storm water, shellfish, habitat are the targets of budget prioritization • \$100,000 annually for 5 consecutive years (many projects need much more funding than this cap) • Discussion surrounding a potential 5 year project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Funding a particular project for 5 years presents the problem that for the next 5 years funding cannot be allocated to other endeavors. • Current focus on recovery is on habitat • It is hard to determine whether or not outside funding is secured for a given project. • New criteria; would the money bring the project to completion • Developments around projects that have the potential to be fully funded are not currently on the table. • Scoring might not be the best indicator of what projects should be funded. Projects that can be completed with the provided funding should be prioritized. • Decided that the project that should be funded is one that can be fully funded with 100,000 dollars and can be completed by the end of the year. • Elected officials want to see progress. • Unknown as to what criteria for spending is required to be met. (does the budget have to be spent by the end of the year? Can there be carry over?) • Part of the criteria is a breakdown of levels that a potentially funded project addresses. • Attention should be limited to financially feasible projects. • There are five potential projects that are under 100,000. • Match percentages are an important consideration

Strategy	Pressure/Ecosystem Component	2016-2018 NTAs	Potential Impact	Feasibility	Readiness for Implementation	SCORE
<p>C2.4 Control sources of pollutants</p> <p>This sub-strategy includes local pollution and control programs, inspections, technical assistance, and enforcement. This sub-strategy is intended to identify, address, and reduce toxics, nutrients and pathogens. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote enforcement and compliance related to pollution source control.</p>	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p>	<p>2016-0299 Crescent Creek Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0323 Maxwellton Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0329 Penn Cove Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p>	5	5	5	5.0
<p>C3.1 Voluntary & Incentive-based programs to help working farms contribute to Puget Sound recovery</p> <p>This sub-strategy addresses programs, guidelines, and technical assistance opportunities that help farmers identify potential pollution impacts from farming activities and implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce, control, or eliminate pollution.</p>	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Residential & Commercial Shellfish</p> <p>Marine Water Quality</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p>	<p>2016-0299 Crescent Creek Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0323 Maxwellton Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0329 Penn Cove Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0120 Livingston Watershed Ag and Residential SW BMP Implementation</p>	5	5	5	5.0
<p>A6.1 High priority projects</p> <p>In submitting work under this sub-strategy, proposers should use the information developed for each watershed under Phase I of the Chinook monitoring and adaptive management effort, as well as updated project lists submitted to the Puget Sound Partnership in 2015. For the Eligibility section of this solicitation: Not all salmon recovery projects should be submitted as NTAs. Actions should implement one or more of the priorities identified in the other sub-strategies.</p>	<p>Marine shoreline infrastructure</p> <p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p>	<p>2016-1216 Kristoferson Creek Fish Passage Improvements</p> <p>2016-0059 Camano Island State Park</p> <p>2016-0055 Crescent Harbor Creek Restoration</p>	5	5	5	5.0
<p>C9.4 Develop and implement Pollution Identification and Correction (PIC) programs</p> <p>This sub-strategy helps implement local pollution identification and correction programs that determine the causes and sources of water pollution in specific geographical areas, and ensures corrective actions are taken to address the pollution sources and protect Puget Sound marine and fresh water health. PIC programs with a high probability of success include the following essential elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> term, ambient water quality monitoring to prioritize projects and evaluate action effectiveness; increase community awareness, participation, and support. financial support to correct identified sources of pollution. capability. Enforcement is used when compliance efforts fail. maintain long-term stability of the program. 	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Residential & Commercial Shellfish</p> <p>Marine Water Quality</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p>	<p>2016-0105 Island County PIC Program</p>	3	5	5	4.3
<p>C7.1 Prevent downgrade & achieve upgrades of important current tribal, commercial, recreational shellfish harvesting areas</p> <p>This sub-strategy addresses regional and local programs that protect and improve water quality and control pollution, helping to prevent the degradation of healthy shellfish beds and to achieve upgrades of degraded shellfish beds.</p>	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Residential & Commercial Shellfish</p> <p>Marine Water Quality</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p>	<p>2016-0105 Island County PIC Program</p> <p>2016-0299 Crescent Creek Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0323 Maxwellton Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0329 Penn Cove Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0120 Livingston Watershed Ag and Residential SW BMP Implementation</p>	5	3	5	4.3
<p>B2.1 Protect priority intact nearshore physical & ecological processes & habitat</p> <p>This sub-strategy seeks to accelerate the implementation of priority projects that address problems identified for Puget Sound nearshore environments and move acquisition and restoration efforts forward.</p> <p>provided as examples—they do not reflect an exhaustive list of sensitive habitats that warrant protection.</p> <p>(e.g.: Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP) Strategies for Nearshore Protection & Restoration) Regional priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> level strategy (e.g.: drift cell, watershed) that integrates protection, restoration and enhancement opportunities. provide high value ecosystem services (e.g.: large sites with low levels of degradation). improve data, planning, and stakeholder coordination important to inform landscape level (e.g.: drift cell) strategy development and implementation. benefits, including resilience/adaptation to climate change. 	<p>Marine shoreline infrastructure</p> <p>Forage Fish</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p> <p>Shellfish</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p>	<p>2016-058 Possession Sound Nearshore Protection</p>	5	3	5	4.3
<p>B2.2 Implement prioritized nearshore and estuary restoration projects and accelerate projects on public lands</p> <p>This sub-strategy supports Sound-wide restoration, including on public lands where opportunities for acquisition, landowner negotiation, or access permission can often be implemented more quickly than similar projects on private lands and can provide models for future restoration efforts on other lands.</p>	<p>Marine shoreline infrastructure</p> <p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p>	<p>2016-0085 Cornet Bay Pier Retrofit</p> <p>2016-0122 City of Oak Harbor Marina Beach Soft Armoring Project</p> <p>2016-0085 Cornet Bay Pier Retrofit</p> <p>2016-0121 City of Oak Harbor Marina Water Shading Reduction Project</p> <p>2016-0059 Camano Island State Park</p>	5	3	5	4.3
<p>A2.2 Implement and maintain priority freshwater and terrestrial restoration projects</p> <p>This sub-strategy supports the continuation, expansion, and further coordination of programs to effectively encourage private landowners and industrial/commercial landowners to undertake and maintain restoration projects. It includes support for incentives and assistance, such as direct and indirect financial incentives, technical assistance, recognition/certification for products or operations, and conservation leasing. Structural barriers include culverts, dikes, dams, and similar structures.</p> <p>improve data and information to prioritize and accelerate riparian restoration and protection.</p> <p>prioritize and accelerate removal of structural barriers.</p> <p>structural barrier removals.</p>	<p>Marine shoreline infrastructure</p> <p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p>	<p>2016-1216 Kristoferson Creek Fish Passage Improvements</p> <p>2016-0055 Crescent Harbor Creek Restoration</p>	5	3	5	4.3
<p>B2.3 Remove armoring, and use soft armoring replacement or landward setbacks when armoring fails, needs repair, is non protective, and during redevelopment</p>	<p>Marine shoreline infrastructure</p> <p>Forage Fish</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p> <p>Shellfish</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p>	<p>2016-0085 Cornet Bay Pier Retrofit</p> <p>2016-0122 City of Oak Harbor Marina Beach Soft Armoring Project</p> <p>2016-0085 Cornet Bay Pier Retrofit</p> <p>2016-0121 City of Oak Harbor Marina Water Shading Reduction Project</p> <p>2016-0059 Camano Island State Park</p>	5	3	5	4.3
<p>C2.5 Provide stormwater-related education and training</p> <p>This sub-strategy focuses on information, education, and training on stormwater-specific issues to be provided for multiple audiences. Regional priorities: Design, develop and implement innovative stormwater education programs that target residents and businesses</p> <p>Promote stormwater education programs that are designed to be replicated across Puget Sound.</p>	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Agricultural & Forestry Effluents</p> <p>Residential & Commercial Shellfish</p> <p>Marine Water Quality</p> <p>Freshwater Quality</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p>	<p>2016-0299 Crescent Creek Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0323 Maxwellton Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0329 Penn Cove Watershed Tech. Assistance & BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0120 Livingston Watershed Ag and Residential SW BMP Implementation</p> <p>2016-0120 City of Oak Harbor Marina Stormwater Improvement Project</p>	1	5	5	3.7
<p>B5.3 Prevent, rapidly respond to invasives' introduction & spread</p> <p>This sub-strategy is a priority only when supporting the implementation of another restoration or protection action.</p>	<p>Roads & Railroads (including culverts)</p> <p>Freshwater Wetlands</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p>	<p>2016-0057 Crockett Lake Invasive Species Removal</p>	5	1	5	3.7
<p>C2.3 Fix problems caused by existing development</p> <p>This sub-strategy includes fixing problems from existing development through structural retrofits; ongoing regular maintenance and enhanced maintenance (e.g.: high efficiency street sweepers and system cleaning to remove legacy pollutants); and redevelopment policies and activities. Urban Centers are designated by cities and counties within the urban growth area in comprehensive land use plans to accommodate population growth under the Growth Management Act. The Puget Sound Regional Council has also identified urban centers in VISION 2040, the regional growth strategy for the four central Puget Sound counties and associated cities.</p> <p>accommodate re-development within designated Urban Centers in an urban growth areas (UGAs)</p> <p>stormwater infrastructure, and prioritize infrastructure replacement needs.</p> <p>create and/or implement innovative approaches to promote retrofit programs on private property</p> <p>the intent of filling data gaps.</p>	<p>Runoff from residential and commercial lands</p> <p>Forage Fish</p> <p>Pocket Estuaries & Estuarine Wetlands</p> <p>Eelgrass & Kelp Beds</p> <p>Chinook & other listed salmonids</p>	<p>2016-0120 City of Oak Harbor Marina Stormwater Improvement Project</p> <p>2016-0337 Ebey's Prairie Watershed Stormwater Reduction</p> <p>2016-0090 Seahorse Siesta Feeder Bluff Armor Removal</p> <p>2016-0088 Maylors Point Feeder Bluff Armoring Removal</p> <p>2016-0122 City of Oak Harbor Marina Beach Soft Armoring Project</p> <p>2016-1216 Kristoferson Creek Fish Passage Improvements</p>	5	1	3	3.0