



San Juan Action Agenda Oversight Group/San Juan Local Integrating Organization (SJ-LIO)
Implementation Committee (IC) Workshop
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, May 6, 2015, 11:00 am – 4:00 pm
San Juan Island Grange, 152 N 1st Street, Friday Harbor

Action Items	Person(s) Responsible
Discuss LIO staffing at the June 2015 LIO meeting.	IC members
Develop a handout outlining the SJ-LIO pressures, sources, and stressors discussed during the meeting.	SJ-LIO Coordinators
Update NTAs on the SJ-LIO website.	SJ-LIO Coordinators
Check-in with the IC to confirm upcoming meeting dates.	SJ-LIO Coordinators
Develop a glossary of terms used in Action Agenda planning.	SJ-LIO Coordinators
Provide additional resources about the Puget Sound Pressures Assessment (PSPA) and how it relates to the SJ-LIO as needed.	Scott Williamson
Share the draft letter to the Department of Ecology regarding oil spill response with the Accountability and Oversight Committee (AOC) to review.	IC members/SJ-LIO Coordinators
Members interested in participating in the Strategic Initiative update workgroups will notify the SJ-LIO Coordinators.	IC members

Introductions

Linda Lyshall, Chair of the San Juan Local Integrating Organization (SJ-LIO) Implementation Committee (IC), opened the meeting and everyone introduced themselves (see Attachment A for a list of participants). Betsy Daniels and Megan Johnston of Triangle Associates are the new SJ-LIO Coordination Team (SJ-LIO Coordinators) through September 2015. The IC reviewed the agenda and agreed to accept the April 1, 2015 meeting summary.

A member suggested discussing LIO staffing at the June IC meeting, and also asked that LIO members review a draft letter to the Department of Ecology requesting more definition of spill response in San Juan County. This topic was added to the May 6 meeting agenda. Another member shared that Byron Rot is the new San Juan County Salmon Recovery Coordinator. In addition, copies of the MOU between San Juan County and the consultant conducting the analysis of spill response in the County were shared with the IC.

Public Comment

Several members of the public introduced themselves and shared brief comments (see Attachment A for a list of members of the public). One member of the public noted that there are two commenting opportunities for the SJ-LIO to be aware of regarding upcoming projects in Metro Vancouver:

- 1) Roberts Bank Terminal 2 (new container ship facility): This project will likely significantly increase vessel traffic in the Salish Sea. There is an opportunity to comment on the environmental documents submitted for this project until June 15th.
- 2) Port Metro Vancouver, Fraser Surrey docks: The docks have been proposed as a coal transport facility. The public commenting period is May 4th-19th.

Additionally, a member of the public expressed concerns that the Port Metro Vancouver numbers included in the Department of Ecology *Marine and Rail Oil Transportation Study* are not up to date.



Previous Action Agenda Processes in the San Juan LIO

Scott Williamson, Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) liaison, provided a presentation on previous SJ-LIO Action Agenda processes and outcomes. He began with a summary of three pre-SJ-LIO planning processes (Marine Stewardship Area planning, San Juan Initiative, and 2008 Action Agenda local profile). He also reviewed the 2011-2012 SJ-LIO process, and the 2013-2014 Action Agenda update. Next steps for SJ-LIO planning efforts include:

- Continue implementing and reporting on 2014 NTAs.
- Frame the 2016 process.
- Link with Puget Sound Partnership taxonomies to: facilitate technical review, allow all LIO-scale planning to “roll up” (i.e. summing of actions), and share learning across LIOs.

Presentation Discussion: It was noted that the SJ-LIO advocated for important San Juan County issues to be included in the Action Agenda. A member clarified that the SJ-LIO used the 5S process in the original Marine Stewardship Area planning process, and also used threat ranking based on scope of irreversibility and severity.

Puget Sound Pressures Assessment

Scott Redman, PSP Science and Evaluation Program, provided a presentation on the Puget Sound Pressures Assessment (PSPA). The PSPA helps to answer two questions:

- 1) Which parts of the Puget Sound ecosystem are most vulnerable to current pressures?
 - Note: “Endpoints” are parts of the ecosystem we care most about. “Intrinsic vulnerability” is an endpoint’s vulnerability to one or more pressures.
- 2) Given endpoints of concern, what are the greatest pressures on the ecosystem?

Scott explained the connections between pressures, sources, and stressors. PSPA results outline: intrinsic vulnerability, stressor intensity, and potential impact. The PSPA rates specific stressor-endpoint pairs. The purpose of the PSPA is to help identify important stressors and sources in order to develop appropriate strategies to address them. The intention is to use information from the PSPA to help prioritize strategies for actions. In sum, PSPA results may be used to: 1) prioritize strategies sound-wide; 2) inform funding priorities; 3) focus monitoring (new and improved); and 4) inform research priorities.

Scott reviewed the process for conducting the PSPA and compared the 2009 highly rated threats and the 2014 highly rated stressors and sources of stress based on the 2014 PSPA results for vital sign endpoints. He also presented the highly rated stressors to vital sign endpoints for Puget Sound Watersheds and Marine Basins overall, as well as specifically for the San Juan Watershed, San Juan and Georgia Straits Marine Basin, and for the San Juan/Georgia Strait Basin and San Juan Watershed combined. The very high and highly rated stressors to vital sign endpoints for the San Juan/Georgia Strait Basin and San Juan Watershed combined are summarized in the table below.

Highly Rated Stressors to Vital Sign endpoints (slide 31 of Scott Redman’s presentation)

Very High (happening now)	High (risk of happening in the future)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land cover conversion • Nonpoint pollution • Peak flows from land cover change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point source toxic pollution • Large spills • Shore hardening • Marine species disturbance



Presentation Discussion: Throughout the presentation members asked clarifying questions and engaged in discussion about the PSPA process and outcomes.

Review of Pressures Assessment: How the Pressures Assessment Applies to the SJ-LIO

The IC discussed what may be missing from the list of very high and high stressors for the San Juan/Georgia Strait Basin and San Juan Watershed from the PSPA. The stressors identified in the PSPA are a suggested list, and the SJ-LIO can determine if there are other stressors that need to be considered. SJ-LIO members were encouraged to focus on the endpoints they care most about, and not to limit NTA development. Members discussed that there are international pressures (specifically from Canada) that impact the San Juan Islands and are important to the SJ-LIO. International pressures were not included in the PSPA, and it was suggested that the SJ-LIO express its concerns about international pressures to PSP. The SJ-LIO can determine if there are pressures from the Canadian system that are important, and can make a statement about those pressures to highlight this issue. Related to this, one suggestion was to provide comments about international pressures to San Juan County to King County Executive Dow Constantine. Members also noted that the pressures identified through the San Juan Watershed salmon recovery planning process need to be considered (i.e. shoreline hardening, roads, shading, over water structures, etc.).

The IC discussed translating SJ-LIO pressures to the new PSPA taxonomy, and walked through translating sources to stressors. Below is a summary of this discussion.

SJ-LIO Pressures	Sources	Stressors
Shoreline development (including armoring)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine shoreline infrastructure: housing and urban areas, tourism and research areas, roads (including culverts), utility and service lines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion of landcover Shoreline hardening Shading of shallow water habitat
Runoff from the built environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ag. & forestry effluents → Confirmed yes, this is still a source Septic → Uncertainty if this is still a source Residential → Confirmed yes, this is still a source <p><i>**Canadian sources of nonpoint pollution**</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonpoint source: Conventional, persistent toxics, non-persistent toxics Altered peak flows from land cover change
Oil Spills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extreme oil spills Chronic oil spills 	<p>Large Spills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 gallon + Other spills

PSP defines “large spills” as any oil spill that is one gallon or more at a time. Smaller spills (including chronic small spills) are considered to be nonpoint source pollution. Some members expressed concerns about this definition, and would like PSP to reconsider this. Some members would like to see a more nuanced system to describe spill sizes and would also like other hazardous materials spills to be considered. San Juan County uses spill category tiers. A member suggested PSP use the state definition for large spills. The SJ-LIO can further define oil spills in its NTAs.



The IC also discussed PSPA stressors with unidentified local sources. Below is a summary of this discussion:

Potential Sources	PSPA Stressors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine traffic People activities (ex: kayaking) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine species disturbance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater treatment and sewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pointsource pollution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upland Development Human population growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion of landcover for: transportation & utilities, natural resource production, residential/commercial/industrial use Altered peak flows from landcover change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change/climate resiliency (increased carbon emissions) 	TBD

Scott Redman clarified that there are approximately six different climate-related stressors in the PSPA, and nearly all of those stressors rank in the “higher” categories. For now, climate change/climate resiliency was added to the potential sources list, with the exact PSPA stressors to be determined. The IC also suggested adding population growth as a source for conversion of landcover and altered peak flows. Scott noted that population growth and sea level rise was not significantly addressed in the PSPA.

The SJ-LIO Coordinators will develop a handout outlining the SJ-LIO pressures, sources, and stressors discussed during the meeting. Scott Williamson will provide additional resources about the PSPA and how it relates to the SJ-LIO as needed.

EPA Funding

The IC discussed the new U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) funding model (still in development), which is designed to support LIOs and enable implementation of the Action Agenda to achieve 2020 targets. EPA will provide \$175,000 for coordination and capacity funding to each LIO to assist LIOs with putting together a five-year recovery plan and updating NTAs (in addition to the \$75,000 typically distributed to LIOs for coordination). This funding will need to be spent by September 2016. As a part of this, the SJ-LIO needs to develop a “first installment” of the five-year plan by August 2015 (using Open Standards, products to include: results chain, schematic, and narrative outlining the planning process). EPA and PSP would like 2016 NTAs (due in October 2015) to be linked to this plan. The purpose of the plan is to have documented logic for developing NTAs. EPA and other funders need this in order to provide direct funding to LIOs for implementing actions. Actions that fall under the Strategic Initiatives and align with the Action Agenda will be eligible for direct implementation funding in the future. Once the first installment of the plan is developed, the SJ-LIO will continue to develop a comprehensive, five-year recovery plan (through September 2016). Guidance for use of the capacity funding is still being developed, and will likely be available in June. The SJ-LIO will consider how best to use these funds.

Open Standards 101 Overview

Scott Williamson provided an overview of Open Standards. He reviewed conceptual models and results chains and shared a sample results chain from the San Juan Chinook planning effort. He noted that some habitat NTAs have already been put into results chains as part of the salmon recovery planning effort. PSP is moving towards using Open Standards for the Action Agenda, and in the future results chains will



go under technical review to satisfy expectations of EPA and other funders. Scott also reviewed an eelgrass schematic, which is an example of how to communicate an Open Standards plan. He noted that it's important to link actions to vital signs.

SJ-LIO NTA Timeline

Members reviewed the draft NTA development timeline. Developing 2016 NTAs runs parallel to development of the SJ-LIO two-year recovery plan. The IC will discuss previous/existing NTAs, pressures, and how to condense SJ-LIO materials into a two-year recovery plan during June meeting. Prior to the next meeting, SJ-LIO LIO Coordinators will:

- Re-package and distribute the current pressures and stressors (as discussed during meeting).
- Update NTAs on the website.
- Check-in with the IC to confirm upcoming meeting dates.

Members were encouraged to review current NTAs and stressors before the next meeting.

Other Updates and Announcements

Members shared several updates and announcements, including:

- A member introduced a draft letter to the Department of Ecology regarding marine spill response. Several members provided edits and suggestions for the letter. The IC agreed to move forward with sending this letter to the Accountability and Oversight Committee to review.
- PSP extended invitations to policy and technical experts to participate in Strategic Initiative update Work Groups for the stormwater and habitat Strategic Initiatives. These Work Group meetings will take place in-person in Tacoma and via WebEx on the following dates: May 11, 13, 18, 20, and June 2.
 - Members interested in participating in these meetings should let the SJ-LIO Coordinators know. It was noted that EPA capacity funding may be used towards local participation in groups these (potentially for reimbursement for travel).
- A member suggested developing a glossary of terms frequently used Action Agenda planning processes. The SJ-LIO Coordinators will work on drafting this.

Future Agenda Topics

- Future staffing of the LIO
- Review NTAs and pressures
- Confirm Open Standards process
- Confirm vital signs and components, reaffirm priorities
- Review glossary and vocabulary related to PSPA and Action Agenda planning

Meeting adjourned



Attachment A- Meeting Participants
Members

Name	Affiliation
Barbara Bentley	SJC Marine Resources Committee
Marta Branch	SJC Marine Resources Committee
Stephanie Buffum	San Juan Stewardship Network/EcoNet Representative
Alan Chapman (via phone)	Lummi Nation Natural Resources Department
Sam Gibboney	San Juan County Community Development & Planning
Patti Gobin	Tulalip Tribes
Phil Green	SJC Marine Resources Committee
Ed Hale	San Juan County Dept. of Public Works
Linda Lyshall (Chair)	San Juan Islands Conservation District
Suzanna Stoike	Puget Sound Partnership
Kimbal Sundberg	Water Resources Management Committee
Billie Swalla	Friday Harbor Labs
Stan Walsh	Swinomish Tribe, Skagit River System Cooperative
Scott Williamson	Puget Sound Partnership
Betsy Daniels	LIO Coordinator Lead – Triangle Associates, Inc.
Megan Johnston	LIO Coordinator Point of Contact – Triangle Associates, Inc.
Chandler Colahan	LIO Recording Secretary

Guests

Name	Affiliation
Laura Arnold	SJC Marine Resources Committee
Lovel Pratt	
Kurt VanHyning	Round Towner
Scott Redman	Puget Sound Partnership
Jennifer Thomas	San Juan Community Foundation, Environment Group
Terry Turner	SJC Marine Resources Committee