

Final

RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area Conservation Action Plan Update

Prepared for
Snohomish County Marine Resources
Committee

September 2022



Final

RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area Conservation Action Plan Update

Prepared for
Snohomish County Marine
Resources Committee

September 2022



Snohomish County
Marine Resources
Committee

Contact: Elisa Dawson, MRC staff
(425) 388-6466, elisa.dawson@snoco.org
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S-303
Everett, WA 98201

5309 Shilshole Avenue NW
Suite 200
Seattle, WA 98107
206.789.9658
esassoc.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background and Process.....	1
Early Assessment.....	1
Stakeholder Meetings.....	1
Port Susan MSA CAP Update Recommendations	4
Objectives and Strategic Actions.....	4
Plan Implementation.....	5
Tracking Progress	6
Appendices	8
Appendix A: Recommended Updates to Objectives & Strategic Actions	9
Appendix B: Progress Tracker Concept	17
Appendix C: Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda Crosswalk Template.....	18

This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under Assistance Agreement CE01J97401 to Puget Sound Partnership. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.



BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

The Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area (MSA) Conservation Action Plan (CAP) was first developed in 2012 by a collaborative group of partners representing federal, state, tribal, and local governments and non-profit organizations with a goal of achieving a healthy marine and estuarine ecosystem in Port Susan with thriving biodiversity and strong recreational and resource-based industries. The Port Susan MSA CAP represents a unique place-based approach to identify Strategic Actions to protect and restore Port Susan at a local scale. Port Susan is located between Camano Island and northern Snohomish County.

The plan is comprised of a series of Conservation Targets that focus on the protection and recovery of resources in Port Susan including delta habitat, Chinook salmon, beaches, Dungeness crab, embedded invertebrates, and shorebirds. Each target includes a collection of Objectives and Strategic Actions intended to drive conservation efforts.

Ten years after the CAP was initially developed, the Snohomish County Marine Resources Committee (MRC), in partnership with the Island County MRC, reconvened partners to assess the current status of the CAP and identify ways in which to make the plan more useful and effective for the next decade and beyond. Environmental Science Associates (ESA) partnered with the MRCs to support stakeholder engagement, build understanding of progress made on CAP actions to-date, and develop recommendations for the Port Susan MSA CAP to improve tracking and adaptive management.

Early Assessment

This process began with an Early Assessment comprised of an online survey and one-on-one interviews designed to solicit feedback and input

from a broad array of partners and individuals. Areas explored in the Early Assessment included partners' past involvement in the development of the plan, how the plan has been used in the 10 years since it was developed, and recommendations for how to better align to the most pressing challenges facing Port Susan.

The Early Assessment revealed limited engagement with the CAP: over half of respondents noted they had not referenced the plan within the last 1–5 years, or more than 5 years. Of those who had referenced the plan in recent years, the majority had done so to inform project or funding opportunities. These findings indicate a need to enhance opportunities for engagement between Port Susan stakeholders and the CAP. The Early Assessment results also suggested that many of the same challenges facing Port Susan first identified in 2012 remain today. However, partners shared that new scientific research and additional information developed over the past 10 years would provide necessary updates to the context surrounding these challenges. The Early Assessment revealed a desire by partners to strengthen connections between the CAP and other regional planning efforts, particularly the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda.

Stakeholder Meetings

ESA hosted a series of three meetings with Port Susan stakeholders in late-spring and early summer 2022 to further develop and refine the ideas and feedback shared by partners during the Early Assessment phase. These meetings focused on the Objectives and Strategic Actions of the 2012 CAP and opportunities to enhance plan implementation.

Meeting 1: Introductory Meeting

The Introductory Meeting provided an opportunity to share information with Port Susan stakeholders about the reevaluation process for the CAP update, discuss information learned during the Early Assessment, and provide input on the proposed approach for the Strategic Actions and Implementation Workshops. This meeting took place during the May 2022 Stillaguamish Watershed Council meeting. ESA and the Snohomish MRC provided an overview of the results of the stakeholder survey and interviews, shared a conceptual draft of a progress tracker tool being developed to evaluate the status of Strategic Actions identified in the plan, and reviewed a conceptual crosswalk document to show connections between the CAP and the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda. Stakeholders provided valuable input at this meeting that was used to shape the approach for the subsequent two workshops.

Meeting 2: Strategic Actions Workshop

The Strategic Actions Workshop was an opportunity for Port Susan partners to review the Objectives and Strategic Actions in the CAP and assess progress made toward actions in the 10 years since the plan was originally developed. During the meeting, participants reviewed each of the Objectives and Strategic Actions for all six Conservation Targets. Information collected from the survey and stakeholder interviews about completed projects was presented, and participants provided additional information about previously completed actions as well as upcoming projects that would contribute to the Strategic Actions. This information was used to develop and refine the progress tracker.

The second portion of this meeting focused on topic areas within the CAP to prioritize and strengthen, given new scientific information learned and changing conditions in Port Susan since the plan was first developed. These topics, compiled from information gathered during the stakeholder survey and interviews, included

climate resilience, water quality/stormwater, kelp conservation, invasive species (green crab), ecosystem protection, and responsible growth/development.

During the workshop, participants were presented with a series of questions on these topics to identify opportunities to enhance these elements within the CAP:

Why are these topics important for Port Susan? Partners noted long-term challenges facing Port Susan from several of these topic areas, as well as connections to other regional planning priorities and initiatives.

What gaps exist in the Strategic Actions around these topics? What questions need to be answered? Identified gaps included scientific questions related to impacts from sea level rise and limited data on marine water quality, submerged vegetation, and protection opportunities.

What are the upcoming opportunities in these areas? Identified opportunities included hydrologic modeling efforts, upcoming planning initiatives, and efforts to address septic issues around Port Susan.

Meeting 3: Implementation Workshop

The final workshop focused on ways to improve implementation of the CAP. Participants first reviewed an updated version of the progress tracker tool to ensure that its format and content would help partners accurately manage projects and Strategic Actions as they are completed. The group also discussed ways in which to stay up-to-date on projects and Strategic Actions as they are implemented; ideas included coordination with the Local Integrating Organization (LIO) and Lead Entity groups as well as the Action Agenda tracker.

The second portion of the meeting focused on more specific ways to support implementation of

the CAP. As noted earlier, the stakeholder survey revealed that most partners had not referenced the plan in the last 1 to 5 years, or more than 5 years. As such, Port Susan stakeholders identified enhancing implementation of the CAP as a high priority topic. The survey and interviews also revealed interest among stakeholders for having regularly schedule meetings to discuss plan implementation and connections to other regional planning processes.

In general, stakeholders expressed interest in hosting two implementation-focused meetings per year: one in the late-winter/early-spring to discuss progress made toward projects in Port Susan, and one in late-summer to visit a project site. Stakeholders would like to use these meetings to update the progress tracker, discuss funding options, identify barriers and challenges to project implementation, and monitor upcoming project opportunities. It was also suggested that these meetings be integrated with existing meetings hosted by groups like the Stillaguamish Watershed Council, LIO, and Lead Entity work groups and subcommittees.

Participants also reviewed the crosswalk document to show connections between the CAP and the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda, and discussed opportunities to integrate the CAP with other planning efforts in the region. Overall, stakeholders agreed that the crosswalk document was the right level of detail and accurately portrayed how progress in Port Susan is reflected against the priorities of the Action Agenda. Other planning efforts identified by stakeholders included the Puget Sound Kelp Conservation and Recovery Plan, the Rockfish Recovery Plan, the original and updated Salmon Recovery Plans, the Shellfish Recovery and Downgrade Response Plan, the Snohomish/Stillaguamish LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan, the Sustainable Lands Strategy, work done by the UW Climate Impacts Group, and the eelgrass recovery strategy. Stakeholders were most interested in aligning the CAP with the

strategies and goals as well as project opportunities of these other plans.

Finally, stakeholders discussed communication materials and how best to distribute information about implementation of the CAP to the network of partners in Port Susan. Stakeholders were most interested in hosting the progress tracker tool on a shared web page, developing factsheets and other handouts, and providing updates via the Northwest Straits newsletter.



PORT SUSAN MSA CAP UPDATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Objectives and Strategic Actions

Based on input gathered from the Early Assessment activities and stakeholder meetings, ESA does not recommend that the Snohomish MRC pursue a full update of the 2012 Port Susan MSA CAP. Instead, we recommend the MRC develop an addendum to the 2012 Port Susan MSA CAP with updated Objectives and Strategic Actions to remove irrelevant actions, incorporate new context, and clarify timelines. To inform a future addendum process, a comprehensive list of recommended updates and gaps to further explore are available in Appendix A. ESA also developed a progress tracker tool (see *Tracking Progress* section), which is designed to capture details that provide an updated status of projects and initiatives that have advanced progress toward the Objectives and Strategic Actions developed in



2012. The tracker will also inform adaptive management of the CAP.

Our recommended updates to the Objectives and Strategic Actions generally include:

Remove or update target dates. Many intended deadlines for Strategic Actions have already come to pass. While target dates can be an important component for conservation planning, in this case many actions are still relevant even though the intended outcome was not achieved by the intended deadline.

Remove or continue to explore Strategic Actions where further activities were identified as unfeasible. Stakeholder engagement in 2022 identified some instances where additional analysis suggested further progress for a Strategic Action would not be possible as originally intended. Consider why progress was not feasible and if new Strategic Actions may be needed.

Incorporate new understanding and context for climate change, sea level rise, food web dynamics, water quality, and human wellbeing.

Decouple implementation partners from Strategic Actions if multiple entities could conduct the work. Instead, track potential leads for each Strategic Action in the progress tracker tool, as appropriate.

Introduce a new labeling structure to add clarity when referencing individual actions.

Some Objectives and Strategic Actions would benefit from additional discussion with stakeholders to identify the most appropriate updates. The following section in this report, *Plan*

Implementation, presents a structure the Snohomish MRC can consider for how to encourage additional stakeholder input and continue to shepherd progress for conservation actions in Port Susan. See Appendix A for specific Strategic Actions to further explore with stakeholders.

Plan Implementation

As noted above, enhancing implementation of the CAP was identified as a key priority by stakeholders in both the Early Assessment and workshop series. The Snohomish MRC should consider championing a suite of activities to assist stakeholders in advancing implementation of the CAP.

Our recommendations for activities to support implementation of the CAP include:

Host biannual implementation meetings.

Stakeholders broadly support meetings focused on implementation of the CAP. These meetings should happen twice per year:

- Late-winter/early-spring: Document recently completed actions using the progress tracker tool, review upcoming project opportunities, identify funding sources, and address barriers and obstacles to plan implementation. The timing of this meeting is important as it allows for the Marine Resource Committees to prepare for upcoming grant rounds.
- Late-summer/early-fall: Site visit to either view recently completed projects and actions, or assess areas identified for upcoming projects.

These meetings would be an opportunity to discuss target completion dates for both proposed and under-way actions in Port Susan. This exercise would support accountability for implementation of the CAP and help stakeholders align their

actions with the original intent of the CAP as well as the principles of conservation planning.

Integrate implementation meetings with existing planning meetings. To encourage greater participation and reduce the level of effort required for planning, the implementation meetings should be integrated into the agendas of existing planning meetings in the region. During the Implementation Workshop, stakeholders recommended hosting these meetings with the Stillaguamish Watershed Council. Invitations for these meetings should also be extended to the Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO and Island County Salmon Recovery Lead Entity.

Coordinate with the Sustainable Lands Strategy (SLS) facilitator, David Roberts, to solicit input from SLS members and attend 1–2 meetings.

The SLS was identified as a key place to hear input from partners on progress made for several Strategic Actions.

The following stakeholders expressed interest in attending biannual implementation meetings:

Scott Andrews (Audubon Washington); Elisa Dawson and Natasha Coumou (Snohomish MRC); Dani Driscoll (Snohomish County); Jenn Johnson (Island County); Kurt Nelson (Tulalip Tribes); Alexandra Plumb (Island County Lead Entity); Barbara Bennett, Scott Chase, and Kelly Zupich (Island County MRC).

Representatives from other organizations to invite include the Whidbey-Camano Land Trust, Snohomish Conservation District, Stillaguamish Tribe, Pilchuck Audubon Chapter (Allen Gibbs), Skagit Audubon Chapter (Tim Manns), WSU Extension in both Snohomish (Jonathan Robinson) and Island (Kristine Vannoy) Counties, the Northwest Straits Commission, Sound Water Stewards (Kris Holley), and the Pigeon Guillemot Study.

Develop communication materials to support implementation activities. To enhance the distribution of information related to plan implementation, communication materials should be developed and updated. These materials could include the following items:

- Web-hosted progress tracker tool: The progress tracker tool developed by ESA could be hosted on a shared web-based platform to allow for easy access by stakeholders to review how progress is being made and to be easily updated as actions are completed. While the tool is currently designed to support MRC coordination of the plan, a version of the tracker with limited information could be appropriate for stakeholders to provide updates.
- Factsheets or CAP report cards: Factsheets and a report card would be helpful materials for stakeholders to use when preparing grant applications for projects and other actions. These materials would explain the principles of the CAP and highlight why particular actions and funded sources are needed to meet the goals of the plan.
- Newsletters: Newsletters would keep stakeholders informed about the various actions and efforts underway in Port Susan. Instead of developing a new newsletter, information should be distributed using existing newsletter sources like the Northwest Straits newsletter and Mike Sato's Salish Sea News to streamline communication.

Tracking Progress

ESA developed a progress tracker tool for the Snohomish MRC to utilize to support plan implementation, which will be provided in tandem with this report (see concept in Appendix B). The progress tracker is a culmination of the effort to better understand progress made on the Objectives and Strategic Actions since 2012. Key components of the progress tracker include color coding to indicate progress for each Strategic Action, opportunities for the Snohomish MRC to support progress, projects and initiatives accomplished over the past 10 years, and action metrics where applicable. Each Conservation Target section also includes an area to draft a qualitative summary of progress made for that broader Conservation Target. We recommend that the Snohomish MRC pursue an addendum process and additional stakeholder engagement through the structure outlined in *Plan Implementation* before drafting these qualitative summaries. The progress tracker is designed as an internal tool but may be appropriate to share with partners during implementation meetings or in an online hub.

Connecting the Progress Tracker to Measures of Success

The 2012 Port Susan MSA CAP outlines a Conservation Measures Plan¹ to track progress relative to the desired results of ten specific Strategic Actions. This is focused on tracking implementation of the plan and includes helpful details on who and when the tracking should occur, along with triggers. However, because clear targets were not included in the 2012 Conservation Measures Plan, the trigger points to conduct adaptive management are not clear or actionable for people who were not part of the creation of the original plan. Developing targets and triggers for all indicators would take a high level of effort but may be useful for a subset of high priority indicators. Instead, using the progress tracker to

¹ Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area Conservation Action Plan Phase II, Page 40, <https://www.snocomrc.org/media/1340/port-susan-msa-plan-phase-ii-dec-2012.pdf>

determine what is most useful and feasible to track as part of an adaptive management approach will be useful prior to working with partners to update indicator tracking and trigger details.

We recommend comparing the “Very High” indicators with metrics that partners have tracked since 2012 to better understand what was or was not monitored and why. Where appropriate, the measures outlined in the Conservation Measures Plan are captured in the *Action Metrics* section of the progress tracker tool (see Appendix B), although the original methodology and lead individuals or organizations are likely no longer applicable.

The viability table in the same section of the 2012 Port Susan MSA CAP is meant to monitor the status and trends of Conservation Targets. This type of monitoring is far more intensive and expensive

than implementation tracking. In some cases, these targets are already being measured by partners in the region, such as the Puget Sound Partnership, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Skagit River System Cooperative, and others. Determining the scale at which the target should be monitored (in some cases beyond Port Susan) is an important step. Then, identify who is currently tracking the targets and what information they can provide to assist with adaptively managing the Port Susan MSA CAP. Forging regional partnerships and data sharing can be part of an addendum or update to a new Conservation Measures Plan for the CAP. Additionally, the complementary report² developed by the University of Washington Evans School of Public Policy and Governance graduate students includes a literature review with new context to consider for measuring the success of each Conservation Target.



² 2022 Comprehensive Review of the Marine Stewardship Area Conservation Action Plan. University of Washington Evans School of Public Policy and Governance.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Recommended Updates to Objectives & Strategic Actions

General Recommendations	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When all Objective and Strategic Actions are finalized in an addendum, consider introducing a new labeling structure for Strategic Actions connected to the Conservation Target and Objective. Model: Strategic Action RD-1-1 (River Delta - Objective 1 - Strategic Action 1), Strategic Action EI-2-1 (Embedded Invertebrates - Objective 2 - Strategic Action 1). 	
2012 Objective/Strategic Action	Recommended Update
Conservation Target 1: River Delta	
<p>Objective 1: Increase delta complexity of approximately 100(+/-) acres between South Pass and Hat Slough and improve flood conveyance by creating a restoration project that increase freshwater inputs to the mudflats by 2020.</p>	<p>Objective 1: Increase delta complexity of approximately 100 acres between South Pass and Hat Slough and improve flood conveyance by creating a restoration project that increases freshwater inputs to the mudflats.</p> <p>Summary of updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove or update target date. Update extent if more is needed for delta function.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Develop agreements and incentives for landowners to redistribute flood water into new distributary channels on their land by 2015.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Develop agreements and incentives for landowners to redistribute flood water into new distributary channels on their land.</p> <p>Summary of updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove target date. Consider additional updates to this Strategic Action following discussion with the Snohomish Conservation District (see progress tracker). Consider reframing Strategic Action to support restoration on private land by expanding on existing or developing new incentives.
<p>Strategic Action 2: Design and build appropriate (historic) distributary channels to convey flood water to 200 (+/-) acres of mudflat by 2020.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Design and build appropriate distributary channels to convey flood water to 200 (+/-) acres of mudflat.</p> <p>Summary of updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove target date. Consider adding a next step for this action, such as “monitor effectiveness.” Remove “(historic)” and work toward what is needed based on latest climate-informed science.
<p>Strategic Action 3: Work with the Snohomish Conservation District and WSU Snohomish County Extension Agriculture Educators to improve BMPs in</p>	<p>Strategic Action 3: Improve BMPs in new and existing channel drainage areas to meet all Department of Ecology water quality regulations.</p>

<p>new and existing channel drainage areas to meet all DOE water quality regulations by 2020.</p>	<p>Summary of updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove partners. Remove target date. Consider additional updates to Strategic Action following conversation with the Snohomish Conservation District (see progress tracker tool).
<p>Objective 2: Reduce the delivery of flood water to the whole delta area to accommodate more productive agriculture that allows farmers to return a portion of their land to natural functioning conditions (either buffer or marsh). Goals for marsh and buffers are consistent with salmon recovery plan of restoring a minimum of 315 acres of estuarine area by 2016.</p>	<p>Objective 2: Reduce the delivery of flood water to the whole delta area to accommodate more productive agriculture that allows farmers to return a portion of their land to natural functioning conditions (either buffer or marsh).</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference to salmon recovery plan given the new regional planning context.
<p>Strategic Action 1: City of Stanwood and Snohomish County solidify wetland protection, connection, and restoration components as part of stormwater retrofits in Comprehensive Plans by 2015, to create increased water storage in agricultural fields and decrease runoff.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Solidify wetland protection, connection, and restoration components as part of stormwater retrofits in the City of Stanwood and Snohomish County Comprehensive Plans to increase water storage in agricultural fields and decrease runoff.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove partners. Remove target date. Rephrase for clarity referencing Comprehensive Plans.
<p>Strategic Action 2: Retrofit Stanwood developments with low impact development (LID) techniques by 2020.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Retrofit Stanwood developments with low impact development (LID) techniques.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove target date.
<p>Objective 3: Work with farmers, researchers and marketers to develop profitable and environmentally sustainable opportunities to farm under the changing conditions in the Stillaguamish Delta.</p>	<p>Objective 3: Increase profitability and environmental sustainability of farms operating under changing conditions in the Stillaguamish Delta.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rephrase to read as an objective.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Farm Link connects Snohomish Farm Incubator (farm hands-on training center, including classes on regulations and ecosystem processes) graduates with Stillaguamish properties to encourage incoming farms to promote stewardship and environmentally friendly productivity techniques.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Encourage incoming farms to promote stewardship and environmentally friendly productivity techniques.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference to specific program.
<p>Strategic Action 2: WSU Snohomish County Extension Agriculture and Snohomish Conservation District</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Conduct outreach to teach environmental stewardship and productivity techniques for farmers to</p>

<p>conduct outreach to teach environmental stewardship and productivity techniques for farmers to respond to growing demand for local food produced with good environmental stewardship techniques (and increase profitability by 10–20% overall).</p>	<p>respond to growing demand for local food produced with good environmental stewardship techniques while supporting profitability.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove partners. • Remove profitability target percentage. • Consider additional updates to Strategic Action following conversation with the Snohomish Conservation District (see progress tracker tool).
<p>Strategic Action 3: Promote local sustainable seafood harvesting options for salmon, clams and crustaceans.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Objective 4: In areas that have degraded flood protection infrastructure, construct setback dikes that ensure that fields behind the setbacks will be better protected and return a portion of the original property to tidal marsh in partnership with the Sustainable Lands Strategy (SLS), Stillaguamish River Flood Control District, and the Stillaguamish Technical Advisory Group (STAG).</p>	<p>Objective 4: In areas that have degraded flood protection infrastructure, construct setback dikes to ensure that fields behind the setbacks will be better protected and return a portion of the original property to tidal marsh.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove partners. • Consider additional discussion with stakeholders to explore other actions that anticipate changing climate conditions and sea level rise. Explore framing this Strategic Action as an outcome (e.g., increase ecological function and reduce flood risk by 20XX).
<p>Strategic Action 1: Evaluate areas with high salinity due to frequent tidally influenced river flooding.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Evaluate areas with high salinity due to frequent tidally influenced river flooding to inform priority areas for setback dikes.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional connection to the Objective.
<p>Strategic Action 2: Construct setback dikes that protect property.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Construct setback dikes that protect property. Aim to use vegetated stabilization techniques in construction to mimic natural features.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the climate adaptation strategy of using vegetated stabilization techniques.
<p>Strategic Action 3: Restore areas on the waterward side of the dike.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 3: Restore areas on the waterward side of the dike and address degraded infrastructure where applicable.</p>
<p>Conservation Target 2: Chinook Salmon</p>	

<p>Objective 1: Remove all project area waters from the Clean Water Act 303(d) list for nutrients and prevent agrochemicals from entering project area waters by 2017.</p>	<p>Consider additional stakeholder engagement to incorporate context for dissolved oxygen and temperature. Proposed Objective language to explore: Improve water quality through reduction of nutrients and agrochemicals entering Port Susan.</p> <p>It may be appropriate to consider changing this overarching Conservation Target from Chinook Salmon to Water Quality. Strategic Actions in other Conservation Targets also inherently benefit the Chinook salmon target.</p>
<p>Strategic Action 1: Snohomish Conservation District promotes a comprehensive approach to land management for farm owners to include agriculture, habitats, and water quality BMPs that incorporates education, grant funds, and other resources or partners to implement BMPs by 2015.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Promote a comprehensive approach to land management for farm owners to include agriculture, habitats, and water quality BMPs that incorporates education, grant funds, and other resources or partners to implement BMPs.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove partners. • Remove target date. • Consider additional updates following conversation with the Snohomish Conservation District and Snohomish Clean Water District Advisory Board (see progress tracker tool).
<p>Strategic Action 2: Prevent introduction of priority commercial/residential landscaping chemicals into surface waters by 2015.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Prevent the introduction of priority commercial/residential landscaping chemicals into surface waters.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove target date.
<p>Strategic Action 3: Increase landowner awareness of environmental stewardship as it relates to water quality through education and outreach partnership efforts.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Objective 2: Encourage and/or maintain 90% of future growth in the lower Stillaguamish watershed within the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) by 2020.</p>	<p>Consider removing Objective or explore new Strategic Actions through additional stakeholder engagement.</p>
<p>Strategic Action 1: Address vesting laws on lands critical for salmon through sun-setting or other mechanism by 2015.</p>	<p>Consider removing Strategic Action. Vesting laws unlikely to be revised.</p>
<p>Strategic Action 2: Re-visit grandfathered non-conforming lots on Ag-10 zoned lands.</p>	<p>Consider removing Strategic Action. Opportunity ranked as “none” in 2012 with no other opportunities identified since.</p>
<p>Strategic Action 3: Local governments develop incentive programs to encourage the maintenance of</p>	<p>Consider removing Strategic Action. Incentive programs now primarily at the state level.</p>

ecosystem goods and services (ex: flood storage, forest cover and clean water) by 2016.	
Strategic Action 4: Outside of the UGA, limit future growth by making access to water utilities stricter by closing sensitive basins (where water rights are already over appropriated) to future exempt wells.	Consider removing Strategic Action. Potential adoption in 2023 of water code to require connection to water systems when available.
Conservation Target 3: Beaches/Forage Fish	
Objective 1: Protect 100% of remaining natural shoreline. Where instances of armoring are legally permissible under the single-family exemption in State law, encourage soft shore armoring.	Objective 1: Increase protection to 100% of remaining natural shoreline. Where instances of armoring are legally permissible under the single-family exemption in state law, encourage soft-shore armoring. Summary of changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rephrase for consistency.
Strategic Action 1: Strengthen Island County’s SMP to reduce hard armoring and increase Snohomish County’s and Island County’s enforcement by 2020 to ensure objective one is met.	Consider removing Strategic Action. Shoreline parcels analyzed revealed minimal opportunity for bulkhead removal and minimal remaining natural shoreline.
Strategic Action 2: Encourage Snohomish and Island Counties to adopt new or existing soft-shore armoring design standards.	None.
Strategic Action 3: Implementation of education programs targeted at contractors, engineers, realtors, and landowners to encourage soft shore armoring and bioengineering, and raise awareness about the impacts of shoreline hardening by 2015, and prevent future armoring.	Strategic Action 3: Implement education programs targeted at contractors, engineers, realtors, and landowners to encourage soft-shore armoring and bioengineering, and to raise awareness about the impacts of shoreline hardening and access to financing tools to prevent future armoring. Summary of changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rephrase for active voice and clarity.• Remove target date.• Add access to financing tools.
Strategic Action 4: Change Island County permitting requirements to increase permitting standards for new or enhanced hard armoring and evaluate Snohomish County permitting requirements to determine if standards for new or enhanced hard armoring are adequate.	None.
Strategic Action 5: Change permit requirements to shift burden of proof from permitter to landowner to require a review process that includes onsite meetings	Strategic Action 5: Encourage permit requirement changes to shift the burden of proof from permitter to landowner to require a review process that includes onsite meetings by interested parties, similar to the forest resources process.


by interested parties similar to forest resources process.	<p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reframe from “change” to “encourage” to more accurately connect to the opportunities to support progress.
<p>Strategic Action 6: Protect unarmored shoreline parcels in Port Susan through acquisition.</p>	None.
<p>Objective 2: Enhance functionality of 25% of marine vegetated buffers, on public and private lands, by conserving existing buffers and restoring degraded habitat by 2020.</p>	<p>Objective 2: Enhance functionality of at least 25% of marine vegetated buffers, on public and private lands, by conserving existing buffers and restoring degraded habitat.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reframe for opportunity beyond 25%. • Remove target date.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Restore 25% of degraded buffers to functional buffers within 100 feet of the marine shoreline by 2020.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Restore at least 25% of degraded buffers to functional buffers within 100 feet of the marine shoreline.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reframe for opportunity beyond 25%. • Remove target date.
<p>Strategic Action 2: Island County SMP amends public and private regulations and incentives for tree and buffer protection by 2014.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 2: Amend Island County SMP’s public and private regulations and incentives for tree and buffer protection.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rephrase for active voice. • Remove target date.
<p>Strategic Action 3: Island and Snohomish Counties develop a comprehensive education and outreach plan to enhance marine buffers by 2020.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 3: Develop a comprehensive education and outreach plan for Island and Snohomish Counties to enhance marine buffers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rephrase for clarity. • Remove target date.
<p>Conservation Target 4: Dungeness Crab</p>	
<p>Objective 1: Maintain population structure by reducing take of undersize crabs by at least 50% of WDFW 2011 reported level by 2015 and reduce incidence of Dungeness crab mortality in derelict gear by 50% of WDFW 2011 levels by 2020.</p>	<p>This objective would benefit from additional conversation with stakeholders (see progress tracker). Appropriate activities for population management have likely changed. Explore adding potential actions for European green crab management as it impacts Dungeness crab habitat and resources.</p> <p>Also consider additional engagement with the Department of Natural Resources around their <i>Puget Sound Kelp</i></p>

	<i>Conservation and Recovery Plan</i> . Kelp can provide important habitat for Dungeness crab, and actions in that regional planning effort may be compatible with conservation action in Port Susan.
Strategic Action 1: Implement comprehensive outreach plan to maintain good population structure and reduce loss of fishing gear by 2013 using WDFW crab endorsement funds.	Consider updates to this Strategic Action following additional conversation with stakeholders (see Recommended Updates for Objective 1).
Strategic Action 2: Increase enforcement efforts in Port Susan by 2015 in conjunction with statewide efforts by WDFW.	Consider updates to this Strategic Action following additional conversation with stakeholders (see Recommended Updates for Objective 1).
Strategic Action 3: By 2015, conduct biennial crab pot removal in Port Susan and reduce new pot loss by 50% using WDFW funds from crab endorsement.	Consider updates to this Strategic Action following additional conversation with stakeholders (see Recommended Updates for Objective 1).
Conservation Target 5: Embedded Invertebrates	
Objective 1: Improve health of eastern soft shell clam and sand shrimp populations.	None
Strategic Action 1: Develop and institutionalize a Co-management Plan for Eastern soft shell clams and local data.	None. Consider working with stakeholders to incorporate human wellbeing and current water quality considerations in the Co-management Plan.
Strategic Action 2: Develop and institutionalize a Co-management Plan for sand shrimp.	None. Consider working with stakeholders to incorporate human wellbeing and current water quality considerations in the Co-management Plan.
Objective 2: Maintain homeostatic pH levels in Port Susan in perpetuity.	<p>Objective 2: Adapt to changing ocean conditions, including pH, in Port Susan.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rephrase objective to incorporate new understanding of ocean acidification in Puget Sound. Consider additional stakeholder engagement around potential new Strategic Actions related to other stressors connected to pH, such as temperature. Consider engaging the Puget Sound Restoration Fund.
Strategic Action 1: Develop and implement an early warning pH monitoring system to trigger action when TBD threshold is reached.	Consider updates to this Strategic Action following additional discussion with the Stillaguamish Tribe (see progress tracker).
Objective 3: Eradicate <i>Spartina</i> in Port Susan.	<p>Objective 3: Manage and, if possible, eradicate <i>Spartina</i> in Port Susan.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add “manage” given that the 2013 analysis suggested eradication may not be feasible.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Snohomish and Island County Noxious Weed Control Boards, The Nature Conservancy, Stillaguamish Tribe, and WSU Snohomish County Extension coordinate to continue the monitoring and treatment of <i>Spartina</i>.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Monitor and treat <i>Spartina</i> where feasible to minimize negative impacts on native species.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove partners. • Rephrase for clarity.
<p>Conservation Target 6: Shorebirds</p>	
<p>Objective 1: Maintain quality and quantity of mudflats and intertidal marsh by allowing habitat migration in the face of sea level rise (in perpetuity).</p>	<p>Objective 1: In the face of sea level rise, maintain quality and quantity of mudflats and intertidal marsh to preserve migration habitat for shorebirds.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove “in perpetuity.” • Rephrase for clarity.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Set back dikes in delta areas with failing infrastructure to restore a portion of delta habitat (overall goal is a minimum of 315 acres by 2016) and offer increased protection to agricultural lands.</p>	<p>Strategic Action 1: Set back dikes in delta areas with failing infrastructure to restore a portion of delta habitat and increase protection to agricultural lands.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove target date.
<p>Strategic Action 2: Limit future development in floodplain migration area.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Objective 2: By 2014, orchestrate local, State, and Federal response to mitigate unintended damages from spill response related impacts to intertidal habitats.</p>	<p>Objective 2: Increase coordination among local, state, and federal response to mitigate unintended impacts from spill response actions in intertidal habitats.</p> <p>Summary of changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove target date. • Rephrase for clarity.
<p>Strategic Action 1: Ensure that Snohomish and Island Counties have personnel or volunteers trained and coordinated in response in response tactics to the standards/levels of high risk spill areas.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Appendix B: Progress Tracker Concept

The progress tracker tool will be delivered separately from this report. A snapshot of the progress tracker tool is provided below for reference.

 <p>Snohomish County Marine Resources Committee</p> <p>Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area Conservation Action Plan Progress Tracker</p> <p><i>Last updated 8/3/2022</i></p>																																		
<p>Progress Legend</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Needs refinement/consider relevance</td> <td>No progress made; needs attention</td> <td>Some progress made; not meeting targeted goals</td> <td>Progress is on-track or complete</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Before tagging progress color, review "Opportunities to Support Progress" for actions to solicit updates on progress to date.</i></p>						Needs refinement/consider relevance	No progress made; needs attention	Some progress made; not meeting targeted goals	Progress is on-track or complete																									
Needs refinement/consider relevance	No progress made; needs attention	Some progress made; not meeting targeted goals	Progress is on-track or complete																															
<p>Conservation Target 1: River Delta</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Objective</th> <th>Strategic Action</th> <th>2012 Opportunity Rank</th> <th>Opportunities to Support Progress</th> <th>Actions Completed To-Date</th> <th>Action Metrics (if applicable)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2"> Objective 1: Increase delta complexity of approximately 100(+/-) acres between South Pass and Hat Slough and improve flood conveyance by creating a restoration project that increase freshwater inputs to the mudflats by 2020. </td> <td> Strategic Action 1: Develop agreements and incentives for landowners to redistribute flood water into new distributary channels on their land by 2015. </td> <td>High</td> <td> Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u>. In 2012, there were plans for the Stillaguamish Watershed Council partners to solicit interest from local delta landowners (particularly those who have known stormwater flooding issues) Upcoming project to track: Channel Migration Easements (Snohomish County). As of 2022, this is still a pilot program in the Lower Skykomish </td> <td>Ag Resilience Plan, Snohomish Conservation District</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Strategic Action 2: Design and build appropriate (historic) distributary channels to convey flood water to 200 (+/-) acres of mudflat by 2020. </td> <td>High</td> <td> Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u> Upcoming projects to track: Zis a ba II (2024 or 2025), Stillaguamish Tribe; Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration, The Nature Conservancy </td> <td> Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration Project, Port Susan Bay Preserve (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Livingston Bay Pocket Estuary Restoration (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Greenwood Creek Enhancement Project (2014, Tulalip Tribes, Snohomish County SWM, Snohomish MRC) </td> <td> 150 acres of estuary restored 10 acres restored 1 barrier culvert replaced </td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Zis a ba Estuary Restoration (2017, Stillaguamish Tribe)</td> <td>87 acres of estuary restored</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Kristopherson Creek Fish Passage</td> <td>1.6 miles of stream made accessible</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Objective	Strategic Action	2012 Opportunity Rank	Opportunities to Support Progress	Actions Completed To-Date	Action Metrics (if applicable)	Objective 1: Increase delta complexity of approximately 100(+/-) acres between South Pass and Hat Slough and improve flood conveyance by creating a restoration project that increase freshwater inputs to the mudflats by 2020.	Strategic Action 1: Develop agreements and incentives for landowners to redistribute flood water into new distributary channels on their land by 2015.	High	Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u> . In 2012, there were plans for the Stillaguamish Watershed Council partners to solicit interest from local delta landowners (particularly those who have known stormwater flooding issues) Upcoming project to track: Channel Migration Easements (Snohomish County). As of 2022, this is still a pilot program in the Lower Skykomish	Ag Resilience Plan, Snohomish Conservation District		Strategic Action 2: Design and build appropriate (historic) distributary channels to convey flood water to 200 (+/-) acres of mudflat by 2020.	High	Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u> Upcoming projects to track: Zis a ba II (2024 or 2025), Stillaguamish Tribe; Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration, The Nature Conservancy	Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration Project, Port Susan Bay Preserve (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Livingston Bay Pocket Estuary Restoration (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Greenwood Creek Enhancement Project (2014, Tulalip Tribes, Snohomish County SWM, Snohomish MRC)	150 acres of estuary restored 10 acres restored 1 barrier culvert replaced					Zis a ba Estuary Restoration (2017, Stillaguamish Tribe)	87 acres of estuary restored					Kristopherson Creek Fish Passage	1.6 miles of stream made accessible
Objective	Strategic Action	2012 Opportunity Rank	Opportunities to Support Progress	Actions Completed To-Date	Action Metrics (if applicable)																													
Objective 1: Increase delta complexity of approximately 100(+/-) acres between South Pass and Hat Slough and improve flood conveyance by creating a restoration project that increase freshwater inputs to the mudflats by 2020.	Strategic Action 1: Develop agreements and incentives for landowners to redistribute flood water into new distributary channels on their land by 2015.	High	Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u> . In 2012, there were plans for the Stillaguamish Watershed Council partners to solicit interest from local delta landowners (particularly those who have known stormwater flooding issues) Upcoming project to track: Channel Migration Easements (Snohomish County). As of 2022, this is still a pilot program in the Lower Skykomish	Ag Resilience Plan, Snohomish Conservation District																														
	Strategic Action 2: Design and build appropriate (historic) distributary channels to convey flood water to 200 (+/-) acres of mudflat by 2020.	High	Seek updates from <u>Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy</u> Upcoming projects to track: Zis a ba II (2024 or 2025), Stillaguamish Tribe; Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration, The Nature Conservancy	Port Susan Bay Estuary Restoration Project, Port Susan Bay Preserve (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Livingston Bay Pocket Estuary Restoration (2012, The Nature Conservancy) Greenwood Creek Enhancement Project (2014, Tulalip Tribes, Snohomish County SWM, Snohomish MRC)	150 acres of estuary restored 10 acres restored 1 barrier culvert replaced																													
				Zis a ba Estuary Restoration (2017, Stillaguamish Tribe)	87 acres of estuary restored																													
				Kristopherson Creek Fish Passage	1.6 miles of stream made accessible																													

Appendix C: Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda Crosswalk Template

See the following pages.