Island Local Integrating Organization Technical Committee Meeting Notes

Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	December 8, 2020		
Meeting Time:	1:00pm-2:00pm		
Meeting Location:	Zoom		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark (ILIO Coordinator)	Barbara Bennett (MRC)	Hannah Liss (ICDNR)
	Ann Prusha (ICDNR)	Paul Ben McElwain (SWS)	Stan Walsh (SRSC)
	John Lovie (WRAC, SRTCC)	Todd Zackey (Tulalip Tribes)	David Trimbach (OSU)
	Laura Rivas (PSP)	Dennis Lefevre (City of Oak Harbor)	Dawn Spilsbury-Pucci (ICDNR)
	Anna Toledo (ICDNR)	Linda Lyshall (Snohomish CD)	
Meeting Objectives:	• Utilize Human Wellbeing Vital Sign results to make revision recommendations to the ILIO Executive Committee (EC) for updating Ecosystem Recovery Plan priority Vital Signs. • Determine which of PSP's 2021 Legislative Priorities to recommend for endorsement to the ILIO EC.		
	Total Time:	60 minutes	

Minutes

Topic:	Updates	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	• The ILIO TC recommends to the Executive Committee endorsement of PSP's 2021 Legislative Priorities		
Follow-up Items:	• Lori will send the group a link to Commissioner Price Johnson's Kudoboard. • Lori will download and send out the Action Agenda (AA) update Excel sheet. • John will send out information about naval aircraft impacts on orcas.		
Notes:	• We are still in phase 2 of the AA update process. This phase sets a foundation for the 2022-2026 Action Agenda update by articulating the stressors and pressure sources that we want to address through the strategies (phase 3) and actions (phase 4) in the Action Agenda. • So far, during phase 2, the AACG planning group has created a preliminary list of the stressors and sources that are included in existing Implementation Strategies. As a next step, we are interested in comparing the stressors and sources included in Implementation Strategies and other plans that are important for the recovery network. • Lori did a crosswalk of the stressor-strategy linkages that were pulled from Miradi (the Island Ecosystem Recovery Plan) to verify and make needed revisions. This crosswalk is being used as the initial way to integrate the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan (ERP) information into the 2022 AA planning. There will be other opportunities in the later phases to work with the Strategic Initiative Leads (SILs), especially around strategies and actions. • The LIO Coordinators met this month and discussed the 2021 Legislative Priorities. They tried to figure out a process to have a LIO collective priority list that could be used to educate decision makers on how the legislative priorities affect the LIO plans and priorities. Given the time restraint they decided that each LIO should discuss the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) 2021 Legislative Priorities and decide if they can endorse these or a sub-section of these. • PSP criteria for PSP 2021 Legislative Priorities are: 1. Link to the 2018-2022 Action Agenda Near Term Actions		

(NTAs), 2. Link to ongoing programs for Puget Sound (PS) recovery, 3. Link to science work plan priorities, 4. Link to Orca Task Force recommendations, 5. Link to other PS recovery activity, and 6. Leverages other local and/or federal funding.

- It is best we submit this as early as possible. We can still make adjustments as we go.
- Regarding stressors, a study just came out and found that aircraft noise from Alt Field is disruptive to orcas. John will send out a link.
- **The Technical Committee (TC) decided to recommend that the EC adopts PSP's 2021 legislative priorities.**
- Lori has started a virtual card for Commissioner Price Johnson, and will share it with the group. Everyone is invited to join the upcoming EC meeting, which will be Commissioner Price Johnson's last one.
- PSP Update: The legislative session begins in January. They are waiting to see what will come out of the Governor's budget this month. Once they know that, they will know what to advocate for. Please let her know if you are interested in any particular bills. A net ecological gain bill from last year will be reintroduced this year. If you look at the AA development update table that Laura sent out, please do not make edits on the browser. Lori will download it and send it in an email to ensure that the original is not altered.
- LIO coordinators are trying to determine one priority that they can all support. Anna Toledo is on the sub-committee to work on the process to identify how all 10 LIOs can identify a barrier they would like to work on. This will be going to the coordinators later in the winter.
- Anna is presenting to the City of Oak Harbor's City Council on the Oak Harbor Marina project. They will be deciding which alternative to move forward with. There will be an update at the next meeting.

Topic:	HWB Survey Results Discussion		Action Item Owner:	Lori

Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	The ILIO TC recommends the following list for the updated ILIO Vital Signs to revise the ILIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan to the Executive Committee for approval (December 23, 2020): • Natural Resource goals: drinking water, Sound stewardship, air quality, outdoor activity, good governance, local foods, sense of place, cultural welcoming, economic vitality, commercial shellfish beds. • Biophysical components: beaches and marine vegetation, forests and wetlands, salmon, marine waters, freshwater, birds, orca, estuaries, toxics in aquatic life, streams and floodplains, forage fish, zooplankton, groundfish and benthic invertebrates.

Follow-up Items:	• none

Notes:	**Natural resource goals additional goals or values** • (question 1) The most frequently selected components (identifying what matters) included: (1) drinking water (302), (2) Sound stewardship (288), (3) air quality (285), (4) outdoor activity (257), (5) good governance (248), (6) local foods (218), (7) sense of place (212), (8) cultural wellbeing (166), (9) economic vitality (164), and (10) shellfish beds (commercial) (122). The numbers here refer to how many respondents (n) selected each component (the higher the number, the higher the selection frequency – meaning more people thought this item was important or had value). • (question 2) The highest prioritized components (prioritization of what matters) included: (1) drinking water (2.54), (2) air quality (2.84), (3) sound stewardship (4.16), (4) good governance, (5.16), (5) outdoor activity (5.61), (6) local foods (6.05), (7) economic vitality (6.53), (8) cultural wellbeing (6.61), (9) sense of place (6.80), and (10) shellfish beds (8.72). The numbers here refer to the mean score (the lower the number, the higher the priority – meaning the lowest numbers illustrate the highest priorities or what people value most comparatively). There is a slight difference between these 2 lists, which illustrates some nuance in responses and how residents think and prioritize these items. **Biophysical** • (question 3) The most frequently selected components (identifying what matters) included: (1) beaches and marine vegetation (302), (2) forests and wetlands (296), (3) salmon (289), (4) marine waters (287), (5) freshwater (286), (6) birds (280), (7) orca (278), (8) estuaries (268), (9) toxics in aquatic life (264), (10) streams and floodplains (256), (11) forage fish (220), (12) zooplankton (218), (13) groundfish and benthic invertebrates (198). The numbers here refer to how many respondents (n) selected each component (the higher the number, the higher the selection frequency)

- (question 4) The highest prioritized components (prioritization of what matters) included: (1) beaches and marine vegetation (3.65), (2) forests and wetlands (5.16), (3) marine waters (5.37), (4) estuaries (5.46), (5) freshwater (5.50), (6) birds (6.31), (7) salmon (6.89), (8) orca (7.28), (9) forage fish (8.01), (10) toxics in aquatic life (8.10), (11) streams and floodplains (8.29), (12) groundfish and benthic invertebrates (10.22), and (13) zooplankton (10.67). The numbers here refer to the mean score (the lower the number, the higher the priority). There is a slight difference between these 2 lists, which illustrates some nuance in responses and how residents think and prioritize these items.
- It is clear that it was difficult to prioritize responses.
- Some caveats to remember: (1) the sample of population is somewhat limited and specific based on the demographics that we have recorded (kind of a glimpse at a segment of the population), but it is better than nothing; (2) like with any survey, the responses and findings reflect a specific time and space (or context), so this is likely to change over time (it might be cool to map the response differences, if place of residence matters here); (3) respondents may have varied interpretations of each component (e.g., sense of place or even zooplankton); and (4) respondents likely have varied geographic and scientific literacies (e.g., people likely have different understandings and values attributed to forage fish, depending on how much they know about forage fish and why they matter to an ecosystem). Often some of these caveats can be alleviated through another method or tool, like a focus group or series of interviews, where you can get more detailed nuanced information to help better flesh out what people know or what people mean in their more quantitative responses. Some of the open-ended questions in the survey can help with some of that. But with any tool, there are always limitations to consider.
- The MRC will be meeting with elected officials and department heads over the next couple of months.
  1. The Island Local Integrating Organization recently conducted a survey of Island County (IC) residents, which found that residents identified drinking water, air quality, and sound stewardship as their top natural resource priorities. How does this finding relate to your department/organization's priorities?
  2. The results from this survey were compared with a larger 12-county survey around Puget Sound, which found that Island County residents in particular feel their identity is tied to the shoreline, and they utilize the shoreline to benefit their psychological wellbeing and find relaxation. In addition, 69% of Island County residents have observed changes along the shoreline, and more frequently indicated they felt the changes were negative (44% negative vs. 13% positive). These findings tell us that Island County residents value the shoreline and notice changes that are happening. How do you think this finding fits with your department/organization's priorities?
- David shared a presentation that he prepared for the upcoming EC meeting. It gives context for why the survey is important, the type of sampling tool used, and the survey's origins. It also shows results from natural resource goals Q1 and Q2. Initially, the EC was hesitant about our capacity for measuring each. We need to decide if we want to recommend all of them or a subset. PSP, through Oregon State University (OSU), does measure all of these every two years for the region. We would need to measure them ourselves if we wanted it to only reflect IC. For the biophysical portion, there was more value placed on the landscape, and less so on individual species. It is clear that those taking the survey connected with the survey's contents. Many people recognize the connections among the ecosystem components, which made it difficult to prioritize their responses.
- Air quality might have ranked so high because of the recent wildfire smoke, and may not reflect priorities outside of that timeframe. However, wildfire smoke is a recurring problem and will be an issue for years to come.
- There was discussion that the natural resource goals results are from VS that are designed to capture the pulse of Puget Sound as a whole, but are not necessarily the best things to use for ranking projects. There is another layer of measuring how projects are doing (intermediate project measures). The survey results are connected to results chains because the more of these that a project can address, the higher it can rank. Our plan needs to be updated with the HWB vital sings, and we might need to come up with our own intermediate project measures.
- Our projects need to focus on the vital signs as a whole, and it's difficult to prioritize one over another. These are the outcomes, or symptoms, that are important to us, but derive from deeper processes. For project activity, we need to dig down to the deep level of the processes. This would be supported by choosing all of them to move forward with. Many people selected all of them, and selecting all would give us a language to help us communicate with different audiences.
- There is value in identifying the top 3 or 5 natural resource goals because it does help our focus.
- **The group agreed to recommend all 10 VSs, without prioritizing them, to the EC for adoption into our**

ecosystem recovery plan.

- Biophysical VS: it is important to communicate the importance of the organisms who form the base of the food web. We sent the survey out to ask what matters to IC residents without trusting that they understand the ecosystem recovery processes that are important in our plan. We could recommend including this, but we may need to do a deeper dive to prioritize what is most important for protection and restoration projects in IC. It might have been more accurate to leave the bottom few ones as "marine food web," because the public will likely understand that better. The responses did include comments about the interconnectedness of the VS. We can keep this list in mind as projects come along, but the general public are ranking a set of points that are not designed for a general public audience. We are going to prioritize strategies and actions, not VS, and cannot address everything at this level. We can have a criteria that considers importance to the public.

- Some of these cannot be easily impacted at the county level (such as forest fires and pollution from cars). This will impact how we prioritize our strategies. This whole set is an important component for making judgements, but is not the entire picture. There are no easy answers, but there are contributions to help make decisions about answers. Some of these are very important locally, and some are more important regionally. We need to articulate this better in our plan. There are local actions and activities that we can work on together, like Conservation Futures and interdepartmental relationships. These are not as important on a regional level. This highlights the need to have two ways of thinking when doing ecosystem recovery planning.

- **The group agreed with the strategy of rolling out these lists for the EC to observe and consider, as this is what the citizens of Island County find as important. We will include all of these as priorities in our plan, but will be working as an LIO on prioritizing pressures, stressors, and strategies in the coming months.**