

## Island Local Integrating Organization Technical Committee Meeting Notes

### Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	November 10, 2020		
Meeting Time:	1:00pm-3:00pm		
Meeting Location:	Zoom		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark (ILIO Coordinator)	Barbara Bennett (MRC)	Ken Collins
	Ann Prusha (ICDNR)	Paul Ben McElwain (SWS)	Brian Tyhuis (US Navy)
	John Lovie (WRAC, SRTCC)	Todd Zackey (Tulalip Tribes)	Jessica Cote (Blue Coast Engineering)
	Laura Rivas (PSP)	Dennis Lefevre (City of Oak Harbor)	Jonathan Decker (WCLT)
	Anna Toledo (ICDNR)	Gwendolyn Hannam (WICD)	Dawn Spilsbury-Pucci (ICDNR)
	Ahren Stroming (PSP)	Linda Lyshall (Snohomish CD)	Meredith Penny (IC Planning)
Meeting Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Salish Sea Nearshore Project presentation</li> <li>2 Human Wellbeing Vital Sign discussion</li> </ol>		
	Total Time:	112 minutes	

### Minutes

Topic:	Updates	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	•		
Follow-up Items:	• Laura will send out updated VSs and project information		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Island County Department of Natural Resources (IC DNR) has transitioned to Zoom. Lori sent the invite with the Zoom link. Set up instructions were shared.</li> <li>• There have been some internal shifts in thinking with the 2022-2026 Action Agenda (AA) update therefore the development timeline will likely be shifting by a month or more. We are currently in Phase 2 - Identifying priority outcomes for recovery which was expected to be wrapped up December 2020 but this will likely go through January. The next steps are to identify strategies to advance shared objectives and develop actions and commitments that align with strategies. Lori will share updates on this process as soon as there is more definitive information.</li> <li>• Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is using partner input (through workshops and the Mural web app) on grouping to inform a number of themes to organize priority outcomes. After themes are established and refined based on input from workshops, outcomes for each theme will be identified from the original catalog of outcomes (already reviewed by Coordinators) with opportunities for additional LIO input on outcomes at a workshop in November. In September, some Vital Signs (VS) measures were updated with new data on some Human Wellbeing (HWB) indicators. Laura can share this, and it is on the PSP website. The science panel has released its <a href="#">work plan</a> for 2020-2024 and they are asking for feedback. Laura will send this out. They are seeking social scientist members for a panel. Up to \$500k for projects is available; Laura will send out details. Toxics in Fish (TIF) Implementation Strategies (IS) comments can still be submitted, but the comment window did close. They hired a couple of new positions, one for the AA development process, and a new Monitoring Network Coordinator. They will be hiring more</li> </ul>		

positions soon.

- The grouping and splitting exercise that we went through for the outcomes catalog is to have a more refined (and more accurate) list of outcomes to make sure we have a solid list of values (and ways to measure them, or “criteria”) that reflect the recovery community’s interests for distinguishing priority outcomes for the 2022-26 Action Agenda. The outcomes have been translated into stressor related as oppose to the mix between stressor related and enabling conditions.
- Stressor-based outcomes can relate to what we want to achieve without targeting a specific stakeholder. The next step will be to look at recovery strategies and actions that will address these outcomes and then looking to partner commitments for these actions.
- The Stormwater SIAT hosted an unpermitted jurisdiction workshop on October 19th to share ideas about improving policies, processes, and actions that could benefit water quality throughout the Sound which also improve resilience, economic planning and protect human health. They will continue to have other workshops. Call Lori if you would like to talk about it.
- There was an opportunity to review the Toxics in Fish IS products (narrative, results chains, etc.) from Sept 15-Oct 16. John Lovie and Lori provided feedback. All comments will be reviewed by the TIF Core Team to adjust and improve IS content based on external input. Thank you to those who participated in the development and review of these products.
- Strategies for Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) is expected for public release by the end of 2020. There will be another opportunity to contribute.
- “Reflections on the FFY2020 HSI Shared Investment Pilot” was shared on October 21<sup>st</sup>. We took advantage of this opportunity, and the funding is going to the Livingston Whidbey Camano Land Trust project.
- Habitat Strategic Initiative Lead (HSIL) is currently developing its 2020-2021 work plan tasks related to Implementation Strategy updates (final year before the next National Estuary Program (NEP) funding model)
- Stormwater SIL is planning to host workshops on Toxics and Transportation to start building strategy for addressing the myriad of Puget Sound transportation issues (runoff, culverts, regional transportation planning, etc.).
- Lori has not heard much from Shellfish SIL.
- Human Wellbeing Project: Oregon State University is currently scheduling and conducting interviews with LIO Coordinators and LIO members from all 10 LIOs. Interviews relate to the ongoing Human Wellbeing Project (2017-present). Many LIO Coordinators and members have already participated in this study (2018 interviews) and/or have heard of it through the Partnership or LIO Coordinators. David is still looking for members to participate in this study which will involve a 30-minute interview (via Zoom) with a member of the research team. All information collected will be anonymized and remain confidential. Your participation will help the team better understand our multi-year collaboration, human wellbeing integration, and overall lessons learned. If you are interested in participating in interviews, please contact Dr. David Trimbach to schedule your interview at 253-254-6398 or [david.trimbach@oregonstate.edu](mailto:david.trimbach@oregonstate.edu).
- Rotating the Management Conference through the Leadership Council. On Sept 9, the Leadership Council launched the first ‘Rotating the Management Conference’ for the Strait LIO geography. The Strait Ecosystem Recovery Network, The North Olympic Lead Entity, and the Hood Canal Lead Entity prepared five agenda items. Two of these related to Oil Spill Preparedness and Large Scale Permitting Barriers were discussed in depth. It was likely recorded if anyone is interested.
- The Ecosystem Coordination Board formed a subcommittee (Aug 13<sup>th</sup>) to develop a proposal for how the ECB will travel to LIO geographies and tee up LIO topics for discussion. The subcommittee is working with LIO coordinators for input on this proposal.
- Congressman Rick Larsen visited Seahorse Siesta and Sunlight Shores restoration sites on October 7th. The barge and bulkhead removal at Seahorse Siesta started this week, so the visit was great timing! It was a small group at each site due to COVID restrictions. Anna and Kelly Zupich did an excellent job!
- Anna Toledo was interviewed about nearshore restoration work and the MRC on a [new podcast, Northwest Fish Passage](#).
- The Northwest Straits Foundation just released the first in a series of Shore Friendly videos. This one covers coastal beaches and bluffs, and features Hugh Shipman! Check it out [here](#), and if you feel inclined to share and/or comment, that will help spread the word.

**Topic:** Salish Sea Nearshore Project

**Action Item Owner:** Ahren Stroming

Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ahren Stroming is a Special Projects Assistant with PSP and he presented at the LIO Coordinators meeting this month on mobilizing funding. What he shared was so exciting and could have significant beneficial impacts for Island County and certainly for Puget Sound. He will be sharing how PSP is partnering with NOAA to set up conservation credits for shoreline development permit mitigation. We (IC staff) have been talking about the need for a mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program in Island County for some time. Although the PSP/NOAA program will not cover wetland mitigation, it will offer effective mitigation alternatives for shoreline projects.</li> <li>• The Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) relies on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries to give expert opinions on Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance for permit applications. NOAA issued a biological opinion on a batch of 40 projects for this first round. The findings were that the projects would jeopardize endangered species. This acts as a forcing mechanism for their permit. One of the alternatives would be for permit applicants to purchase conservation credit offsets. PSP is proposing that they act as a broker in the process. An applicant will first go to the ACOE, then use NOAA's calculator. If there are impacts, they will need to offset them. Then, buying credits from PSP becomes an option. They will use the funding for conservation projects. They can also use the calculator to quantify beneficial projects. Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) will receive funds and disperse them to PSP. PSP will be primarily working with the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR), but will look for other sponsors if need be. NOAA's calculator will continue to be developed. All of this needs to happen within one service area, and there are 5 service areas total. The offsetting conservation credit work needs to happen in the same service area as the construction. This will give more benefit to areas that occur closer to a site in the calculator. PSP is prepared to sell credits in any service area, and some already have projects set up.</li> <li>• For the initial 40-project batch, they are going to focus on creosote pier and pile removal. This entire program is designed to start out simply in order to judge how well and feasible it will be. They can set a consistent price, and are not sure what the demand will be. This is scalable, and will contribute to forage fish success, and health of humans and marine life. This will hopefully prove the concept.</li> <li>• This program will allow for conservation projects that would not happen otherwise. The buyer will need to offset impacts of builds that would have happened anyway, and PSP gets to leverage the expertise of the recovery network.</li> <li>• There was a question if the driver of the calculator is no-net-loss, and how that is captured as a tool that can be used for other things in the future. The federal program is tied to no-net-loss. The calculator is conservative and requires more than enough conservation.</li> <li>• There was discussion about mitigation banking, including critiques. This included concerns that 1) <u>credits will pay for projects that would have happened anyway</u>. They are selecting conservation projects that do not have funding available to them now. This is unknowable for the future, but they are trying to choose projects that do not have funding lined up, or projects that are unlikely to find funding. If mitigation credits can mostly complete a project, they can bring in a sponsor. 2) <u>It is putting a price tag on damage to endangered species</u>. PSP will not be the only ones doing this, and they believe it improves the status quo. 3) <u>The proposed mitigation is not exactly going to be a like-like replacement for the damage being done by construction projects</u>. The calculator does its best to add a multiplying factor for situations like this. They are rolling this out and developing it slowly, and do not want to stay in creosote removal exclusively forever – they would like to move into more like-for-like work. Right now, they do not have confidence in the amount of funding coming in, or what the projects will be. They will have a better sense of this in the future. 4) <u>A restored area is not going to be better than an original (at least for a very long time)</u>. The calculator does consider this. There will be situations where the credit obligation causes permittees to rethink their project. Almost all have redesigned to be less impactful. There are times that, if the habitat is really great, the credit obligation would be so high that it is not financially feasible. 5) <u>We are introducing an environmental economy</u>. 6) <u>We are in a state of recovery, so it might be better to move past no-net-loss</u>. The calculator will</li> </ul>

generate a quantified impact.

- They are partnering with DNR because they have an inventory of creosote pilings around Puget Sound.
- This is for projects which fall under ACOE jurisdiction and permitting. NOAA batched projects so they could move them through the system. They would not issue a biological opinion for everything, but this will help streamline the process and address the backlog. If a project is not in the backlog now, it will be looked at from a more holistic view.
- The Tribes have been involved, mostly by talking to NOAA. There is a monthly meeting between PSP's Executive Council and any tribe that wants to come.
- There was a question about this funding being directed to ILIO. Once PSP knows how this program works, they will look to expand. There was a comment that maybe ILIO could choose which pilings the funding is directed to.
- In each of the services areas, the totals need to offset. There is more than enough to offset anticipated demand for the foreseeable future. PSP would not sell credits if they were not confident that they could provide them, and the applicant would need to find another way to mitigate if that were the case.
- The calculator is not publically available yet, but it will be soon. It will go on a public webpage for anyone to put a project into, hopefully before the end of the year. He will let us know. NOAA will also host multiple information sessions.
- Service areas are determined based on major populations of Chinook. Whidbey Island is broken into 3. NOAA has defined the area, and the ACOE does not divide as much. There was a comment that it could benefit us to be in three service areas.
- NOAA will be able to start accepting payments next week. Once they are paid, PSP has three years to come up with a plan to implement. This will hopefully happen ASAP. PSP chose creosote removal because it can be done quickly, and they can groundtruth and adaptively manage it.
- ILIO and MRC can have input.
- The ACOE cannot preference different credits.
- Sometimes creosote removal projects involve larger restoration. ILIO and MRC can have input in funding restoration around the creosote removal that was paid for by the credit offset.
- There was a comment that this seems like a good fit for Shore Friendly. They want to get to the point where they can have more competitive project selection. They have spoken with other conservation banks. They are not taking a competitive market approach. Other partners have been tribal, state, or federal agencies. They have not really engaged land trusts and land conservancies. They would take this step once they are certain they can move beyond creosote.
- Contact Ahren at [ahren.stroming@psp.wa.gov](mailto:ahren.stroming@psp.wa.gov) if you would like to follow up on this.

<b>Topic:</b>	HWB Survey Results Discussion	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):			
Follow-up Items:	• none		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This survey aims to gauge Island County residents' values regarding natural resource priorities and shorelines. This survey mirrors regional efforts aimed at better understanding residents' values of and experiences with the natural environment in Puget Sound. The Island County Local Integrating Organization in collaboration with Oregon State University's (OSU) Human Dimensions Lab created this survey in order to: (1) better include Island County residents' perspectives and voices in local natural resource management decisions; (2) update Island County's ecosystem recovery plan; and (3) understand how residents feel about the county's shoreline. For more information on Island County's recovery plan, please <a href="#">click here</a> to see the current version. All residents over the</li> </ul>		

age of 18 may complete the survey, including part-time and full-time residents. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete and all responses will be recorded anonymously. All responses collected will contribute to Island County natural resource management decisions, including those related to ecosystem recovery planning and shoreline management. If you have any questions related to the survey and its contents, please contact Dr. David Trimbach at [david.trimbach@oregonstate.edu](mailto:david.trimbach@oregonstate.edu).

- Also note: The first two purposes outlined below are directly connected to your participation in OSU's HWB Project. The second purpose relates to a separate ongoing project that Lori is working on focused on shorelines. She intends on providing you all the results and writing 1-2 manuscripts. She would ideally like to write a manuscript with the LIO or Lori as a representative of the LIO (even if you all have minimal input, I'd love to have you all named as a co-author). The paper will focus on community-based research and knowledge co-creation with an emphasis on shoreline sense of place.
- Funding: OSU's HWB Project and David's Research Grant from the American Association of Geographers
- Sampling: This survey uses snowball sampling methodology, a non-probability or convenience form of sampling that is often used to target underrepresented and hard-to-reach populations. While this form of sampling is not necessarily the most ideal, it is considered legitimate especially in community-based or -focused research and widely used in interdisciplinary social sciences.
- David noticed differences in responses with the HWB/VS survey shorelines questions compared to the regional survey that he conducted previously. He thinks our community has a very different relationship with the nearshore environment, which is great to capture.
- Lori is keeping the survey open for a few more weeks in hopes of capturing more diverse perspectives.
- At 220 responses 90% of respondents were white and 73% were over 60 years old. Since we want to ensure non-white and younger residents respond, Lori sent the survey to a few underrepresented groups through Facebook. Lori also contacted the Oak Harbor School District asking for their help getting the word out to parents and students. The flyer was shared at Lone, Deer and Goss Lake, Bayview and Marguerite Dog parks, Pen Cove, Double Bluff, Good Cheer Food Bank, Goose, Dave Mackie Park, Freeland Park, Possession Point, Corner Bay and General Store, the N&W beaches of Deception Pass, and at the boats and terminals for both ferries. Thank you to Gwendolyn for posting!!!
- Brian with US Navy has committed to getting the survey announcement out to the Navy housing community.
- David says that with a population around 85K, 383 - 400 responses would give us an estimated confidence level of 95% and margin of error around 5%. But since we are using snowball sampling, really we want as many people as possible to increase confidence and reduce error. Often with this type of sample you also want to see response saturation, so if we get to a point where responses are fairly the same without a lot of variation, that can help us call the survey.
- Most frequently selected HWB Vital Signs: (1) drinking water; (2) sound stewardship; (3) air quality; (4) outdoor activity; and (5) good governance.
- ON Q1, the responses are showing that our top three HWB indicators in IC are Sound Stewardship, Drinking Water and Air Quality. Lori was a bit surprised to see that Shellfish Beds were the lowest, however residential Shellfish Beds are captured under Local Foods VS which is currently in 4<sup>th</sup> place.
- Most highly prioritized HWB Vital Signs: (1) drinking water; (2) air quality; (3) sound stewardship; (4) good governance; and (5) outdoor activity
- Q2 forced the respondent to put the "goals" (HWB VS) in ranked order of importance (1 is highest, 10 is least). Currently, Air Quality and Drinking Water are the most important, with shellfish beds least important. We added things that were not necessarily what we cover. There was some surprise to see Orca rated so low. Maybe people don't see the immediate connection.
- Most frequently selected Biophysical Vital Signs: (1) beaches and marine vegetation; (2) forests and wetlands; (3) salmon; (4) marine waters; and (5) freshwater
- Q3 is gauging how important the VS are to the respondent. Lori pointed out that our community really sees a lot of value in our natural resources. Groundfish, benthic invertebrates, and zooplankton are rated the lowest but this is likely because the general public isn't aware of the importance these play in our ecosystem. In the future, it could be beneficial to give someone an option of "I don't know what this is" instead of forcing them to rank. It would also

help us focus outreach and education efforts.

- Most highly prioritized Biophysical Vital Signs: (1) beaches and marine vegetation; (2) forests and wetlands; (3) marine waters; (4) estuaries; and (5) freshwater
- Q4 again forces the respondent to put the VS into a ranked order. We see that our community values our beaches and marine vegetation. Estuaries, forests and wetlands, freshwater and marine waters are close. And we see again that they are least interested in groundfish, benthic invertebrates, and Zooplankton.
- Q5 is about if these natural resource goals described the respondent's values; majority of respondents agree that these items reflect their values (41% strongly agree, 46% agree)
- Those that did not agree were given the opportunity in Q6 to provide additional goals or values. Lori will share these with the group and find a way to capture commonalities so that the ILIO TC might consider gaps in our priorities.
- Q7 shows that most people agree with these ways of relating to the shoreline. Residents have a strong or positive sense of place of the county's shoreline, particularly when it comes to attachment (bond or connection) and dependence (feeling like one relies on the shoreline for recreation, work, relaxation, etc.). Residents also feel a strong sense of responsibility to take care of the shoreline. All of this could be used to inform shoreline-focused volunteer activities or restoration communications.
- Q8 offered the opportunity to share what the shoreline means to the respondent. Very interesting perspectives. This should be used in messaging and in updating our ERP. Much of the county's shoreline is considered to consist of meaningful destinations.
- Q9 respondents were able to select the beaches that are most important.
- Residents perceive coastal change, including erosion, development, flooding, and even decreases in public access. Sea level rise (SLR) is lowest, which is interesting because it is a cause of erosion.
- Residents perceive these coastal changes mostly as negative or neutral.
- Q10 reveals that most of our community has observed changes along our shoreline, and then Q11 shows that they observed these at the location they shared as being important to them in Q9. Q12 asks what these changes are. And, no surprise, coastal erosion was the one that most have noticed, and development is second highest. Interestingly respondents did not see SLR as one of the most observed changes. This tells us that the general public still does not see erosion being directly linked to SLR. Q13 confirms that the general public does see the changes on our shoreline as negative.
- Q14 shows us that our general public visits our shoreline weekly, and sometimes daily, with the most popular activities (Q15) being relaxation and wellbeing. Residents seem to visit the shoreline daily (31%) or weekly (49%)
- Residents visit the shoreline for a wide range of reasons, notably psychological wellbeing (21%), relaxation (20%), and health reasons (15%), among others. It is interesting that we can quantify this way, but it tells us that our residents value relaxation and wellbeing. We have previously used fishermen for community outreach, but that and shellfish harvest ranked low. The Executive Committee did not want us to use the term "Blue Therapy."
- There was a comment that Washington laws consider the ability to view ocean as preservation of public trust, and access to public beaches does not substitute for this.
- Survey will continue to be active.
- Here are some potential questions for the group: How might this sample size be increased? How can this survey target other communities in Island County, particularly young (under 60) and non-white populations?
- It is still open for at least the rest of the month. You can still send it out.
- Barbara requested that Lori and David give the MRC 2 questions to ask for their interviews.