

ILIO TC Meeting Notes

Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	July 14, 2020		
Meeting Time:	1:00pm-3:00pm		
Meeting Location:	WebEx		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark (ILIO Coordinator)	Barbara Bennett (MRC)	
	Ann Prusha (ICDNR)	Dawn Spilsbury Pucci (SRTCC)	
	John Lovie (WRAC, SRTCC)	Paul Ben McElwain (SWS)	
	David Trimbach (OSU)		
	Anna Toleda (ICDNR)		
	Keith Higman (ICPH)		
Meeting Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2020 - 2021 planning for ILIO 2. Ecosystem Recovery Plan update process 3. Human Wellbeing Vital Sign discussion 		
	Total Time:		100 minutes

Minutes

Topic:	Updates	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	•		
Follow-up Items:	•		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Island Marine Resources Committee (MRC) is going to be the outreach arm for the ILIO. • Dennis Lefevre with City of Oak Harbor (COH) sent an email this morning letting Lori know that he is still engaged with the ILIO but has not been able to attend the meeting. This is great news! We really appreciate the COH on the ILIO. They just finished feasibility study for 3 NTAs. • Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) and the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission invite you to participate in their Virtual Puget Sound Days on the Hill, Fridays in July from 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. Please register in advance. At the July 10 session, Representative Derek Kilmer announced that the Appropriations Committee passed the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, to secure a more than 15% increase in the Puget Sound Geographic Program. This program provides critical grant support to state, local, and tribal governments to implement projects to improve water quality, protect shorelines, and enhance fish passage and salmon habitat. This is a \$10 million increase from 2019 and \$5 million more than last year. This is the third year in a row the Trump Administration proposed eliminating this critical program entirely. The bill also included a \$2 million increase in the National Estuary Program—the Environmental Protection Agency’s nationwide effort to protect and restore the water quality and ecological integrity of estuaries of national significance, including Puget Sound. The bill is now heading to the House floor for a vote later this month. They also took Commissioner St. Clair’s question; she is advocating for funding allocation for citizen science monitoring. Lori is following up today on a phone call. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan is on the website if you are interested in looking through it to see the elements that need updating. This is not required reading! We will be breaking down the pieces into sections for updating as needed. Lori has sent it out. For results chains, email Lori and she will keep you updated. • Cisco WebEx ~ to make the WebEx as smooth as possible and avoid any future confusion for meetings, each of the ILIO TC and EC were added directly into Cisco WebEx for the future reoccurring ILIO meetings. This should allow you to click the Join Meeting and directly access the WebEx and/or connect by phone from your calendar invite for the meeting date. The “old” meeting invitation was deleted to reduce any confusion moving forward. Please make sure you accepted this delete so that it will remove the “old” meeting from your calendar. Island County is in Phase 3, however it sounds like we will need to have virtual meetings for the near future. • John Lovie will contribute to the ESRP technical review team this year. • The Stormwater SIL funded Earth Economics NTA to conduct an ecosystem service valuation for the Salish Sea basin. They will be using Island County as a case study. They are looking to gather information on what questions we are trying to answer here. This information could be very useful to the ILIO in updating our Ecosystem Recovery Plan (ESP). The study will not be completed in time but we will be able to use the information to layer onto the vital signs for outreach. They reached out to Anna and are interested in help specifically, but will also appreciate any monitoring information that we can provide. We suggested they work with other LIO’s, so they know that data is coming. • City of Oak Harbor may be ready to move to the next phase of funding for the stormwater and habitat projects – the next phase will be permitting and design. It makes sense to combine the two NTA’s. If they can complete this phase, they will be primed for implementation. Barbara has been in contact with Heidi Siegelbaum (Stormwater SIAT) about upcoming IC projects that are ready for funding. • David has just completed a project with PSP. Over the past 2 years, he has been working on a human dimensions protocol. It is intended for regional planners, but PSP wants it to be used more broadly and be publically accessible. More information is coming. • John is going to be on an advisory group for a project from UW to help the public have access to data about sea level rise vulnerability. This came from the Habitat SIAT. 		
Topic:	LIO Planning for 2020-2021	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):			
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori will send out B-IBI and TIF data and information. 		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSP just lost a couple of valuable team members. • The 2022 Action Agenda (AA) will transition us to a more comprehensive approach to identifying strategies through focusing on pressures. It will also do a better job of prioritizing actions with the “actors” identified. These strategies will be more closely aligned with the Implementation Strategies (IS). Thus it will be important that the ILIO is closely aligned with the IS. The EPA is pushing us to focus efforts on IS. Looking ahead, it will be a more integrated approach for planning, rather than NTA’s, which are missing the step for local integration. Lori is working on this for integration in the fall. The EC meeting to discuss this is coming up, and TC members are welcome to attend. • The IS were intended to provide the basis for program funding decisions and as a way to try to incorporate and/or influence ongoing programs and policies. IS should offer a path to better understanding and prioritizing pressure reduction strategies. There is a concern that if the 2022AA moves to a more focused Request for Proposals (RFP) approach, there may be a de-coupling in the relationship of ISs to the AA. The ISs were used to develop regional priorities in the 2018 AA and they have served to make shifts in ongoing programs, obtain support from the state legislature, and to identify activities to fund. The EPA would like to see the 2022AA to utilize IS integrating regional priorities, local context and human well-being (HWB). • Additionally, the EPA would like to see ongoing programs more closely aligned to the IS at all levels of government. More discussion will be occurring in the next few weeks to gauge the need for LIO’s to visit these plans. They will synthesize information from 10 LIOs and find common threads. We need to make 		

sure that our recovery plan is up to date because it will be the basis for these conversations. We are trying to leverage local values to overcome barriers, and find areas where funding can be shared. Strategies will look different at the local level. At the same time, synthesis is important regionally (such as with orca recovery). This will ensure that strategies are assigned to a specific group so the appropriate partner can advance strategies. We want to get the VS pieces updated first. We are asking them what information they need so that it is relevant and useful. It needs to be a living document.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES (IS)

- There is an effort to allow for much more efficient cross-strategy and cross-plan coordination, both among IS and with LIO plans by translating content from IS Narratives from the existing PDFs into MiradiShare. Implementation Strategies in MiradiShare will help to ensure that content is ready to be used during the development of the 2022 Action Agenda. Partnership contact: Mike Johnson
- B-IBI: The IS Core Team is in the final stages of integrating feedback and comments from public and science review. The Partnership is working with the Stormwater Strategic Initiative to get up-to-date data in Miradi for implementation tracking and future adaptive management. This includes tagging pressures and stressors, and making links to other plans and conceptual models, like those that LIOs have completed and put effort toward “data stewardship” over the last year and half. Lori will send out this data.
- TIF: The interdisciplinary team (IDT) review of the Toxics in Fish IS narrative concluded on 6/26. LIOs will receive a notice for review opportunity for the draft IS narrative later this summer. The process for developing TIF is about 3 months behind BIBI, but they are on the same path of review comments, integrate feedback, and public release. It should be completed, and Lori will share with the group.
- MWQ: A Nutrients/Science Workshop will be hosted in late July 2020, the product of which will inform next steps for the development of the MWQ IS, including a successive workshop focused on identifying and resolving uncertainties related to the proposed marine water quality (MWQ) strategies.
- Climate Protocol in Implementation Strategies: The Implementation Strategies Climate Protocol project will produce a regional-level planning guide and protocol to adaptively manage Implementation Strategies with enhanced integration of climate change. As of late June, a preliminary needs assessment report and a literature review are completed. Cascadia Consulting and Climate Impacts Group (CIG) are progressing on the climate guidance and climate protocol that will directly support the IS workgroups and partners (IS workgroups, Strategic Initiatives, and the Partnership) to integrate climate change into Implementation Strategies
- Anyone can plug into the things they are interested in!
- There are upcoming coordination meetings to see how we can co-create a strategy and adaptively manage plans. The region recognizes the need to ask locals what this looks like on the ground. Hopefully, the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) will build out regional priorities. If we’re at the table when these strategies are being developed, it will benefit Island County (IC). We need to be very clear about priority strategies, and who the players are. We need to be clear about local priorities and how we contribute to the regional priorities. SDM can inform the elements to make sure our plan is relevant.
- Next Steps for Local-Regional Coordination for Action Agenda Development

Shared Objectives (Phase 2): This is the first foundational layer of what will become the 2022 Action Agenda. (Now-Dec 2020)

- Identify the highest priority outcomes. These “shared objectives” should reflect our best understanding of the most important work to undertake to reduce pressures and overcome barriers to make real progress improving Vital Signs and indicators. Identifying priority outcomes also will support developing an initial set of intermediate progress measures, the last measure type needed to complete the Puget Sound Progress Measures framework.
- Developing a catalog of intermediate outcomes drawn from existing plans (including LIO plans) and documents; developing criteria to select priority outcomes (shared objectives) from the catalog; applying the criteria, and reviewing and refining results. Based on input provided during the June 9

	<p>SIL/LIO workshop and experience with the Vital Signs revision process, this might be a bit of a barrier, and we are working with local implementers to help determine what these steps should be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSP is planning four main channels for engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Online. Anyone can engage at any time through an online forum which will be launched in July. This forum will invite people to review a draft catalog of intermediate outcomes that is being assembled from existing plans and reports and to collaborate on criteria to identify priority outcomes (shared objectives) from the catalog. We can look at documents as they are being produced. b. At regular LIO coordinator meetings. Information will be offered and input sought at regularly scheduled meetings including at the next LIO coordinators meeting where we will solicit input on the draft catalog of intermediate outcomes and contributions to criteria on how identify priorities. Please fill out the Doodle Poll. c. Workshops. There will be two workshops, one to talk about the draft catalog and development of criteria (this Summer) and another to talk about application of the criteria and to review and refine results (Fall). An invitation will be shared with you and you will be asked to share with the technical committee members and others as you see relevant. d. At LIO meetings. LIO coordinators may request briefings and/or discussions at any upcoming July committee meeting. Contact your ER liaison if you are interested in this option. • Drinking water VSs are not in the plan. 		
Topic:	Ecosystem Recovery Plan update process	Action Item Owner:	Lori/John
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):			
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILIO will begin adaptively managing the Ecosystem Recovery Plan (ERP) with a structured decision making (SDM) approach to revising our VSs and evaluating which of the HWB VSs are most relevant to incorporate in our ERP. This will inform the strategies that we should focus on for the upcoming 5 years for our recovery efforts. • The ILIO has several opportunities to engage with the regional planning for the 2022-2026 Action Agenda (AA). • Phase 1 of Action Agenda development (scope and schedule) is complete. The Leadership Council approved a collaboratively developed concept for the 2022-2026 Action Agenda on June 10. • The outline for the intentions for the process and content of the 2022-2026 Action Agenda will guide work between now and adoption in 2022. • Subsequent phases of Action Agenda development include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Phase 2 - Identifying shared objectives for recovery (now – December 2020 *new timeframe in response to furloughs and desire for sufficient engagement) ○ Phase 3 - Identifying strategies to advance shared objectives (Jan – July 2021) ○ Phase 4 - Developing actions and commitments that align with strategies (Aug – Dec 2021) <p>An issue that is very timely is the pressure of forest conversion. Apparently, we are seeing a huge influx of people moving to the south end from Seattle with the new telework policies in King County. People are buying up land to develop to move here from cities. Janet Saint Clair is interested in talking about policy related to forest cover/conversion. Lori is following up with Kelsi with WICD to see if they have capacity for forest plans and see what services they are offering. We may want to consider becoming involved in this. The Puget Sound Caucus of Conservation Districts was funded through an NTA to support Conservation Districts (CDs) in the area for forest conservation. Island County will be a beneficiary of this. There was discussion about the controversy involved in forest conversion on private land and property rights. This item has been brought up to be considered – we should determine if this is something we want to take on. CDs are not regulatory, and participation would be voluntary. The ILIO could take this on because we're not in an either-or situation; the state mandates what can be done on land – education comes from CDs and forestry plans.</p>		

	<p>Conversion to housing is outside of what we can control, but conversion is an ecosystem service potentially looked at by valuation of ecosystem services. Land conversion is a topic region-wide. Harvest management plans are another component. ILIO could be perfect to help with communication. We can help empower our representatives. We don't need to have solutions, pressures, or answers right now. There was discussion about shoreline management no net loss consideration. It has not been quantified but considers how entire ecosystems are affected. We could also use the upcoming needs assessment to test the waters on these issues. Barbara is meeting with elective officials to see where barriers are with the survey and if we want to push in or pull back. It will be a good litmus test. Other counties have experienced similar issues, and David conducted a similar study in Lewis County. We can do something geared more towards forests and needs here.</p>		
<p>Topic:</p>	<p>Human Wellbeing (HWB) Vital Signs</p>	<p>Action Item Owner:</p>	<p>Lori</p>
<p>Decisions Made and Action Item(s):</p>			
<p>Follow-up Items:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> David will update the survey to incorporate today's discussion. 		
<p>Notes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> David drafted a survey to check in with our partners and the residents of Island County to gauge our priority Vital Signs and see which Human Wellbeing Vital Signs would be most relevant to incorporate in our Ecosystem Recovery Plan update: https://app.box.com/s/tycochrxiu4pj904ann04ix2vhpkls49. Subtask 5.02 is to conducting follow up interviews with elected officials after we get the data back from the survey. Another interesting twist is that Barb Bennett (LIO member and MRC member) is planning to do an interview with elected officials this year AND also in the LIO contract SOW is the ability to have the MRC act as the outreach network for the LIO and LE. I can have Anna (MRC coordinator) start to better align some of the outreach work and use the data we get from the survey to start doing a better job at messaging. Anna is also the Shore Friendly project manager so it fits nicely with the work you will be doing as well!! Lori went through the survey and the group discussed the comments made as needed. She noted that this is the first draft and we can change formatting. We can adjust the number of words if there are too many. Q0 survey purpose: The group accepted Anna's comment to change the first sentence from "This survey aims to gauge Island County residents' landscape and natural resource values." to "This survey aims to gauge Island County residents' values regarding shorelines and natural resource priorities." Q1 local foods: The group decided to incorporate John's language suggestion "The locally harvestable foods indicator is intended to track the frequency of collecting different Puget Sound wild foods for traditional, subsistence, and recreational use. These include: fish, shellfish, mushrooms/plants, and animal meat." Q1 onsite sewage: Remove. Q1 air quality: We can update this to just talk about the issues that are under local control – outdoor burning and wood stoves. Relative to other issues, we don't have bad air quality and there isn't a need to take action on it at this time. Q1 drinking water: There was discussion about using only nitrate levels to talk about drinking water. We have data on this. However, focusing on nitrate helps account for water quality, but not quantity. There was also discussion about the value of including this question at all, since the public has little say in decisions regarding this, it is strongly considered for all of our projects, and it's not a known concern. However, having some sense of the relative priority of the importance of this issue to the public could be valuable. It could be included in the ERP and not as a VS. We would also need to include sea water intrusion. The group decided to remove this from the survey, but include its importance in the ERP. Q2 first paragraph: The group discussed John's comment "We need to redo these in alignment with the vital sign revision we should take the opportunity to reselect the vital signs we care about from the full list using a values based approach." We were focused on what we care about, but we also need to consider what we can measurably impact. We can broaden thinking, put a whole list onto the survey, or 		

we could pre-select a little. However, this might be too confusing. We could potentially list VSs and add a link to the PSP page, but the information there might not be up-to-date. We need to follow the new VSs.

- Q2: The group decided to delete the goal information and instead add links for the VSs so those taking the survey can look up what they need to. David showed the group the new VS information.
- General: David spoke about prioritizing VSs. He suggesting keeping in mind that we are working with a discreet list. There is no “other” within the list. There is an opportunity within the survey to convey anything that participants feel was left out. There was discussion about VSs. We could potentially have “not important, somewhat important, very important” as choices. There could also be an option for survey takers to select what is important to them. If all are present, they could select what’s important, then follow up to rank their selections. This should be all-encompassing and representative of what is important to all of us. It does not have to be limited. Some members like the idea of having these within categories and asking if they’re important, and then ranking order. It is a representation of what people care about.
- Q3: Barbara suggested altering so that participants not forced to choose on a scale. The changes discussed earlier should help with this.
- Q5 and Q6 map: There was discussion about including another option to express this, especially with a very strong sense of place. A possibility would be providing an open format in a question below. There was also discussion about using caution when creating a list of segments along the shoreline, when a functioning shoreline requires wholeness.
- General: There was discussion that the questions look like the ones we’d be asking if we wanted to get a metric on HWB items. Knowing what our community cares about is not necessarily the same thing. The emphasis should be on what drives the actions we take.
- General: The shoreline is a collection of many different perspectives. Some of those could have a valuable perspective that can be ranked. Many aspects cannot be ranked. This could be captured by asking about the importance of interacting with the shoreline (seeing it, walking on it, etc.). Questions about frequency might fit there. We can create room for people to fit in their own language. Then we can ask about specific locations and allow that to be the location closest to the survey taker, or specific destinations along the shoreline. This expands the questionnaire, but helps respondents drill down. This can provide another opportunity to help people articulate their feelings. Adding location destinations would be helpful, and it might be better to allow people to pick more than three. This could potentially be used as planning doc to see what’s worth salvaging.
- Q7: The group discussed Anna’s comment about providing clarification about pinpointed areas or other areas. We want to know where the meaningful locations are, and what their issues are.
- We could add a question about shoreline armoring, and provide a definition.
- The group decided to add a question about Blue Therapy (the mental wellbeing piece of being near the waters of Puget Sound).
- David is going to work on the next draft. He can have new draft out by Wednesday.
- There is one more survey question for consideration. The issue is that the more questions you add the less likely people may respond and the more challenging the logical flow becomes (making it harder to follow and respond appropriately).
- Since drinking water is one of the HWB vital signs, we could formulate a question for the survey around water availability and the perceived biggest threat to drinking water supply. People in Coupeville and OH would say contamination and people in South Whidbey and Camano may say farm activities. Water availability needs to be important to us – a large percentage of residents are on wells. We need to be clear about what we want to know from the community and fit it in without it being too wordy.
- The drinking water question could help inform the adaptive management of the ILIO ERP. Based on the responses below, please select what you think is the primary cause of reduced drinking water quality in Island County:
 - Agricultural activities
 - Climate change

- Industrial pollution
- Residential contamination
- Other, please explain: _____
- I don't know.

- John suggested that it may be better to phrase the question in terms of how important clean drinking water is to people, similar to the other questions. The cause are more a matter of science.
- Lori would like to share this at the upcoming EC meeting. She will be asking about the language, and if it is appropriate for their constituents. She will ask about distribution and if we are missing anything as well.