

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

JEFFERSON, KITSAP & MASON COUNTIES
PORT GAMBLE S'KLALLAM & SKOKOMISH TRIBES
STATE & FEDERAL AGENCIES

Integrated Watershed Plan Steering Committee: Review of the Draft 2016 LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan/IWP Update

May 8, 2017, 12:00 pm – 4:00 pm
at HCCC, 17791 Fjord Drive, NE, Suite 124, Poulsbo, WA

Summary

HCCC Integrated Watershed Plan Steering Committee Members/Attendance:

- Dave Herrera (HCCC Board Member): Present
- Kate Dean (HCCC Board Member): Not present
- Paul McCollum (HCCC Board Member): Present
- Terri Jeffreys (HCCC Board Member): Not present
- Teri King: Not present
- Erin Ryan-Penuela: Not present

Others present:

- Haley Harguth, HCCC Watershed Planning & Policy Coordinator
- Scott Brewer, HCCC Executive Director
- Robert Warren, Bonneville Environmental Foundation
- Alicia Olivas, HCCC Lead Entity Coordinator
- IWP Technical Committee members:
 - Cynthia Rossi, Point No Point Treaty Council
 - Kathy Peters, Kitsap County

Call to Order and approval of agenda

This was a meeting of the HCCC IWP Steering Committee to participate in a joint workshop with the IWP Technical Committee and HCCC staff for IWP priority setting. This meeting will be followed by a second workshop of the IWP Steering Committee/Technical Committee and HCCC staff on June 6th, before a recommendation is finalized to bring to the HCCC Board of Directors for approval.

Meeting Notes

Introduction

This is the final phase of our LIO plan/IWP update development, to take the strategies we have developed thus far, and use the prioritization criteria to compare and rank strategies. The results of this prioritization will ultimately guide HCCC workplanning. HCCC IWP core team is open to refining existing strategies, filling gaps, with discussion and approval of IWP committees. This is a working, living document, open to constant adaptive management.

Relative weighting of prioritization criteria is challenging and helpful to compare strategies with real-world implications. Need to consider that social and political context changes, frequently. Shouldn't necessarily be a driver of priorities.

Strategy Prioritization Discussion

1.0 – Restore and protect Hood Canal Shoreline

1.1- Remove/soften/prevent shoreline armoring

1.1.1 – Outreach and ed. on shoreline protection and stewardship

Potential Impact:

Score 1.5 - difference across jurisdictions, and impact on pressure, outreach wont have as direct an impact as actual restoration. Audience is too broad, too distilled

Score 2 – if you had great outreach and ed., the public pressure on politicians would create impetus for project. This is how we build political will.

Score 3 – With current regulations, outreach is the only way we can get this done. If there was other ways it would be a different discussion. How else are we going to get the behavior change?

Score 4 – because of the important, if people were well education about impacts of everyday actions; its not only way to change behavior, but is important part of equation

What's the metric? If you change one person, you are making a difference on the ground, for the ecosystem.

Person targeted needs to be contractor, the bulkhead builder

Developer has a lot of influence over action on the property

Outreach as tool to expand on restoration on a nearby parcel, to reach more people

Kitsap program – getting shoreland owners to put in soft protection, neighbors see it, education spreads

Expand strategy – money talks, tools work, outreach by itself doesn't work

Org/ capacity:

Score 1 – HCCC would need lots of help to do this, depends where and what

Score 2 – Even partners who do this are seeing funding decreasing

Score 4 – All formative research has been done on BMPs, many active partners, lots of momentum, resources exist, tools exist

1.1.2 Improve shoreline planning and regulatory frameworks

Tech feasibility:

Score 4: its technically feasibly, problems are elsewhere; ECY codes do not let sediment enter the nearshore, that prevents armoring removal, because that is exactly the goal. We have the knowledge, much of regulatory framework is in place, but not enforced, and implemented across different agencies, not coordinated.

Political opportunity:

Score 4: structure is in place, but no will to do it

Score 1.5: lots of impediments in reg structure. Difficult to tell counties to implement more strict regs; or tell property owners to make changes

1.2.1 Adaptively manage salmon recovery plans for Hood Canal watersheds (estuarine habitats)

Tech feasibility

Score 1.5 – Hwy 101 is big problem; don't have expertise for how to deal with that hwy, and estuaries, and climate change/SLR – lots of uncertainties. Most estuaries have a big road.

2.0 Protect and improve Hood Canal water quality

2.1 Prevent Pollution sources from entering Hood Canal marine and fresh waters

2.1.2 Improve planning and regulatory frameworks for water quality protection

Tech feasibility –

Score 0.5: NPDES permits not hood canal wide

Score 4: The technology exists, but counties aren't required to do NPDES

2.1.3 Reduce impacts from stormwater runoff

Feasibility–

Score 1: regulatory thing, massive and expensive projects, but very important; small scale tech exists, but large projects have not been scaled up to address pressure. Need to push regulators to enforce it. Many unknowns about stormwater from hwy 101, Bangor point source pollution

Score 4 – know how to reduce stormwater, but many reasons why it doesn't happen. Tech exists, but funds do not to meet the scale of the need.

Social context

Score 4: many people want to see stormwater solved

Score 2: lot of indifference all around

3.0 Protect and restore Hood Canal forests and freshwater salmonid habitat

3.1 Hood Canal Forests and Open Space Strategy

3.1.1 Prioritize forest lands for protection based on ecological value and risk of conversion

Funding –

Score 2.5: could fund prioritizing, its implementation that is limited to funds. We have the knowledge, but do we know what's planned in county land use to prevent conversion

3.2 Restore and protect priority freshwater salmonid habitat

3.2.3 Implement priority salmon recovery projects (freshwater habitats)

Funding –

Score 1 – high variability, never enough to implement all the projects; we are at the point of large big scale projects, require larger amounts of funds

4.0 Hood Canal Shellfish Initiative

Potential impact –

Higher for native populations

Difficult to get people interested in Olympia oysters

Restoration potential for native species for climate resilience, increased biodiversity

Scientific gaps in native population restoration

5.0 Proactively prepare for climate change impacts across Hood Canal

Potential impact –

Very high, but with uncertainty

What are we trying to adapt to?

Technical Feasibility –

Uncertainty of what to do to combat scale of climate impacts lowers score

6.0 Outreach on IWP implementation effectiveness and ecosystem improvements

Potential Impact –

High score: very important to help with everything else; need this to do everything else, but need everything else; HCCC's stance on issues is powerful, so messaging can be a tool to achieve change

Low score: HCCC message doesn't make much of a difference; its important but requires huge effort for small impact

6.2 Maintain role as central information source on Hood Canal ecosystem recovery

6.2.1 Maintain HCCC website as information resource for project partners and local decision makers

Funding –

Results Discussion

This is a really important first step in prioritizing the IWP. Need to follow up on what this means for HCCC. How does this guide decision-making on sequencing of projects.

HCCC staff should provide input on how to implement priorities – how does it translate into workplanning.

Need to help board to understand how this fits into their other work, alignment with other partners and LIOs, how to achieve multi-beneficial outcomes for natural resources.

Recommendation to the Board of Directors: Seek convergence with IWP Steering Committee members at June 6th meeting.

Materials distributed: The IWP Prioritization Guidance materials distributed to the IWP Steering Committee and IWP Technical Workgroup is linked [here](#). The draft Hood Canal LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan is linked [here](#).