

## Toward a Natural Resources Asset Management Plan for Kitsap County Workshop Agenda

**Date:** November 3, 2021, 12:00-2:00 pm PT

**Goals:** Discuss examples of desired levels of service and collaboratively develop a preliminary framework for desired level of service. Decide the path forward for further refining level of service targets including opportunities for engagement beyond the Core Team.

12:00 PM	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> – Dana Stefan and Elizabeth McManus and (Ross Strategic, Facilitators)
12:10 PM	<p><b>Developing Desired Levels of Service</b> - Matthew Medina (Kitsap County), Charlotte Dohrn (WEC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review existing level of service targets for Kitsap County, Core Team feedback from phone calls, and draft preliminary level of service framework.</li> <li>• Discuss and collaboratively refine preliminary desired level of service framework and approach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ High level reactions – is this on the right track in terms of structure?</li> <li>○ Collaboratively review and revise level of service framework (discussion and possible mural board). Which goals and targets are on the right track? Which are not? What is missing?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Materials:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Document describing draft desired level of service framework and examples</i></li> </ul>
1:10 PM	<b>Break</b>
1:20 PM	<p><b>Updates from Partners</b> - Paul McCollum (Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe), Tom Ostrom (Suquamish Tribe), Kitsap County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates from Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe</li> <li>• Updates from Suquamish Tribe</li> <li>• Updates from Kitsap County</li> </ul>
1:30 PM	<p><b>Discuss and Decide on Path Forward for Refining Desired Levels of Service</b> - Core Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review, discuss, and decide to approve or modify proposed next steps, including stakeholder, partner, and public engagement</li> </ul> <p><i>Materials:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Document describing proposed plan</i></li> </ul>
1:55 PM	<b>Wrap-up and Next Steps</b>
2:00 PM	<b>Adjourn</b>

# KNRAMP Desired Level of Service Workshop Summary

**Date:** 11/03/21

**Attendees:** Tom Ostrom (Suquamish Tribe), Paul McCollum (Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe), Sam Phillips (Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe), Kathy Peters (Kitsap County), Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech (Kitsap County), Liz Williams (Kitsap County), Ryan Huffman (Kitsap County), Shawn Alire (Kitsap County), Michelle Perdue (Kitsap County), Matthew Medina (Kitsap County), Mindy Roberts (WEC), Charlotte Dohrn (WEC), Katie Fields (WEC), Rachel Baker (WEC), Elizabeth McManus (Ross Strategic), Dana Stefan (Ross Strategic)

## Feedback and Discussion on Desired Level of Service Framework

- The vision, mission, and guiding principles in the draft document circulated have not been previously discussed, and there should be an opportunity to discuss/provide feedback on this.
- Overall, the Core Team thinks the proposed structure for describing desired levels of service is promising. It offers enough flexibility to incorporate elements of comprehensive plans from the county and jurisdictions, and consider how elements of those plans affect goals and objectives of natural resource asset management.
- Connecting the goals and time horizons of the natural resource asset management program with the existing goals in the Comprehensive Plan, and the 20- and 6-year timelines used in planning, will be helpful.
- Objectives and targets for the natural resource asset management program need to be tailored to geographies (e.g., watersheds, urban vs. rural) and what is realistic in those specific geographies.

## Feedback and Discussion on Next Steps for Refining Desired Levels of Service

- The group did not have much time to discuss next steps, which could include ongoing work with the Core Team, possible public engagement through a simple survey, a partner and stakeholder workshop, additional engagement with both Tribes, ongoing work to engage divisions across the County, and engagement with leadership as needed.
- Charlotte will reach out via email to ask for input on the possible public survey, how to refine desired levels of service with the Core Team, if a January workshop with a wider audience is of interest, and preferences around meeting with a group of staff at each Tribe.
- The Core Team flagged that there are other County divisions who it would be beneficial to engage, like Roads, because they are doing work relevant to this and may have insights.
- The broader recovery community would also be important to engage on this. The Ecosystem Coordination Board, The Salmon Recovery Council, or the Leadership Council could be interested in this at some point when it is more refined; the recovery community would be helpful to get feedback from.

## Feedback on Draft Desired Levels of Service

The Core Team spent much of the workshop time discussing the draft desired level of service framework. The tables below capture the feedback shared both in the Google Slides and during discussion. Note that there is a section at the bottom of each table for general/cross cutting feedback.

### Forest Desired Levels of Service

**LOS Goal:** Protect and restore forests in Kitsap County to support healthy habitat, watersheds, and climate resilience

LOS Description	Geographies	Time	LOS Metric	Example References
<p><b>Objective F1.</b> Maintain or increase net forest cover across the county and connected watersheds</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 - Forest cover and open space have similar functions, is there a distinction between the two? Important to think about if forest cover is actually forest or open space</li> <li>Need to go back to the data and figure out where we are at - at the watershed scale (F1)</li> <li>For net cover - focus on keeping older and more mature forests, avoid losing forest and then replanting elsewhere – which could be net maintain but would lose function. Importance of landscape scale targets</li> <li>Want to flag the headwater wetland areas. Watersheds get carved up – need to think about the wet areas in general, not just a watershed. Want to call that out if thinking about looking at open space on the landscape and where development occurs</li> </ul>	Countywide and connected watersheds	20+ yrs.	Forest cover (F1)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcomes PSRC Open Space Plan West Central Ecosystem Recovery Plan (ERP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Target F1.1.</b> Increase forest cover to 65% in priority watersheds through restoration, maintain cover in all watersheds through acquisition and stewardship programs</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target F1.1 and others: a challenge is that some areas are managed for forest harvest. Because our watersheds are small, maintaining forest cover can be difficult.</li> <li>Target F1.1 - Referring to maximum hard surface requirements may help set vegetation retention targets</li> <li>For F1.1 - split targets into increasing and maintenance watershed</li> </ul>	<p>Increase: Barker, Blackjack, Chico</p> <p>Maintain: Countywide</p>	20+ yrs.	Forest cover (F1)	Steelhead recovery plan

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that F1.1 should be split into separate goals for maintaining and enhancing forest cover. These goals may apply to different areas, and require different tools and incentives</li> <li>• F1.1. – the target on maintaining cover in all watersheds – core team needs grapple with urban vs. rural standards for targets. Try to look code requirements for open space and tree retention to guide the target. Get leery we would be successful in urban areas at maintaining cover. Consistent with GMA and growth within UGAs, maintaining cover in urban areas may not be realistic. Poulsbo has tree retention in the code - 25% tree retention at the site if being developed.</li> <li>• Need to think about scale – watersheds could make sense.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target F1.2.</b> Achieve open space LOS standard (71.1 acres/1,000) by acquiring priority forest land for permanent protection</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kitsap county open space has targets that are different for urban and rural. Like the open space target</li> <li>• f1.2 focus on headwater wetlands between watersheds</li> <li>• Target F1.2 is great, but almost seems to define a specific strategy or tactic within the broader category of maintaining forest cover.</li> <li>• Want to understand the rationale for this number</li> </ul>	See County and Regional Open Space Plans	20+ yrs.	Data gap	Capital Facilities Plans Regional Open Space Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target F1.3.</b> Enhance urban tree canopy where low</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F1.3 - consider review of local codes to inform target <a href="https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Poulsbo/html/Poulsbo18/Poulsbo18180.html#18.180.030">https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Poulsbo/html/Poulsbo18/Poulsbo18180.html#18.180.030</a> Tree Retention Requirement: At least twenty-five percent of the existing trees which are ten inches in diameter or greater measured four feet six inches above grade, and meet the priorities in subsection A of this section, shall be retained.</li> <li>• For 1.3 - specific targets that address what counts as “low,” prioritizing % cover in low-income and overburdened communities</li> <li>• F1.3 Target tree canopy cover enhancement in urban areas where critical habitat is mapped</li> <li>• Regarding low canopy - recognize that urban areas contain important natural assets, including freshwater and nearshore habitat</li> </ul>	Urban areas, health disparities analysis	6 yrs.	Forest cover (F1)	Vision 2050
<p><b>Objective F2.</b> Protect late succession forest stands and manage forests to increase hydrologic maturity</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	Countywide	20+ yrs.	Succession class (F2)	Steelhead Recovery Plan Vision 2050

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F2 - for hydrologic maturity, could also include groundwater recharge as an objective in F2 – target could be certain soil classes with forest conducive for recharge.</li> <li>• For F2 - also include long-term targets (20 year as well as 6 year) within both targets</li> <li>• Need to better understand the data gaps related to F2 - can be hard to define</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target F2.1.</b> Identify and increase acreage of older forests under permanent protection</li> </ul>	Management units with late succession forest	6 yrs.	Succession class (F2), but data gaps	Open Space Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target F2.2.</b> Manage forest owned by Kitsap County to enhance structural complexity and composition</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F2.2 is a great goal, would likely require relying on field data rather than geospatial data. Creating a policy or management plan to encourage this could be a non-quantitative metric.</li> </ul>	County forests	6 yrs.	Data gaps	Kitsap Forest Stewardship Policy
<p><b>General feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geography is important – think about watersheds and which are predominately urban vs rural and what is feasible. Watershed scale is beneficial for many objectives</li> <li>• Take a look at the Parks, Recreation and open space plan to inform objectives - <a href="https://www.kitsapgov.com/parks/Documents/PROSPlan2018.pdf">https://www.kitsapgov.com/parks/Documents/PROSPlan2018.pdf</a></li> <li>• For all - as process evolves, include columns for needed resources, estimated costs, and data sources for metrics</li> <li>• Regarding vegetation retention requirements and hard surface thresholds, these are site level development standards or regulations. I think it's important for us to think at a landscape level and not at a site/parcel level. Really should be focusing on improving or protecting functions, for example at the scale of the Chico Creek watershed.</li> <li>• Agree about thinking about landscape scale. But creates a challenge for targets, may need to be at the highest level to maintain or increase. But then could have sub-scale.</li> </ul>				

## Stream Desired Levels of Service

**LOS Goal:** Improve watershed health, habitat, and water quality to support healthy fish populations and clean and abundant water

LOS Description	Geographies	Time	LOS Metric	Example References
<p><b>Objective S1.</b> Restore riparian areas of streams and prevent loss of riparian forest cover within 204ft of streams, or one site potential tree height.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S1- similar to the forest LOS goals, it may make sense to split this into two goals on restoration and preventing loss/conversion</li> <li>S1- Is the 204 ft referenced drawn from site potential tree height?</li> </ul>	Countywide	20 yrs.	Riparian vegetation (S1)	Riparian management recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Target S1.1.</b> Increase riparian forest cover to &gt;70% throughout county</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to think about priority watersheds on the HC side - because steelhead plan only covers east Kitsap and if targets can be parallel or need to be different</li> <li>Consider urban and rural</li> </ul>	Countywide, and/or focus on Blackjack, Chico, Clear, Curley, Gorst, Grovers; Hood Canal?	20 yrs.	Riparian vegetation (S1)	Steelhead Plan (note the plan does not specify a cover target)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Target S1.2.</b> Manage riparian forests to support growth of large, mature trees</li> </ul>	Countywide	20 yrs.	Data gap	NWIFC habitat strategy
<p><b>Objective S2.</b> Improve stream habitat to support instream biological communities</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S2- improving stream habitat for fish populations also requires maintaining woody debris input</li> </ul>	Countywide	20 yrs.	B-IBI (S2)	PSP DRO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Target S2.1.</b> Improve B-IBI scores to a minimum of “good”</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>s2.1 target watersheds associated with salmonids</li> <li>Need to review and learn more about how B-IBI links to key ES and how responsive it is to habitat improvements</li> </ul>	Streams where currently below targets	6 yrs.	B-IBI (S2)	PSP Vital sign target
<p><b>Objective S3.</b> Reduce pollution in streams to protect water quality from headwaters to Puget Sound</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective S3 - possible prioritization of areas where loading of 6PPD quinone or other toxics are high and fish are exposed. Could think about 6PPD quinone for targeting where we need to reduce pollution, prioritize areas where we have inputs. It’s a compound on tires, manufacturing. Lethally toxic to Coho and other salmon – efforts ongoing on this. Think about targeting areas for retrofits for this compound. Could be a target for pollution reduction</li> </ul>		20+ yrs.	WQ standard (S3)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target S3.1.</b> All streams meeting WQ standards for 95% of the year</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few streams are monitored for water quality; the main “pollutant” is heat. Suquamish Tribe has monitoring data. Suggest S3.1 switch to meeting temperature water quality standards</li> <li>• Temp is good for identifying areas where have compromised riparian conditions. The main prescription is restoration for riparian areas that aren’t healthy – have that listed as a goal. Great idea to look at that info. The outcome is the status of WQ criterion. Would help us prioritize areas for action.</li> </ul>	Countywide	6 yrs.	WQ standard (S3)	
<p><b>Objective S4.</b> Remove, retrofit, or manage culverts, dams, and other infrastructure to ensure fish passage and functional downstream habitat</p>	Countywide		Fish passage (S4)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target S4.1.</b> Steelhead can access 100% of historically accessible habitat in priority drainages</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What percent in non-priority areas?</li> </ul>	Blackjack, Chico, Curley, Clear, Gorst, Grovers; Hood canal?	20+ yrs.	Data gap	Steelhead Plan
<p><b>General feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forest levels of service provided some strategies such as acquisition of fee title or easement. I think that would work here as well.</li> <li>• Take a look at the Parks, Recreation and open space plan to inform goal and objectives - <a href="https://www.kitsapgov.com/parks/Documents/PROSPlan2018.pdf">https://www.kitsapgov.com/parks/Documents/PROSPlan2018.pdf</a></li> <li>• May need to distinguish urban LOS for streams from rural/forested</li> <li>• General, noticing that there isn’t strategy-type language in these, need to add similar language for meeting those targets, or cover separately.</li> </ul>				

### Shoreline Desired Levels of Service

**LOS Goal:** Improve water quality and natural shoreline and nearshore functions to support healthy habitat, abundant fish populations, and opportunities for shellfish harvest

LOS Description	Geographic Focus	Time	LOS Metric	Example References
<p><b>Objective M1.</b> Restore natural shoreline processes by reducing impacts of shoreline armor and development</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M1 - Maintain setbacks to avoid armoring and allow natural bluff recession. Adequate setbacks are important and play into this objective.</li> </ul>	Countywide	20+ yrs.	Shoreline armor (M1)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcomes, Vision 2050

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M1.1.</b> Prevent new armoring of natural marine and estuarine shorelines</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For M1.1 Review exemptions for building new armor and overall regulations that allow for this. Focus on setbacks.</li> <li>• The Vital Sign target for armor focuses on no net increase of shoreline armor - recently reporting success in more armor coming out than going in, but still new armor going in. so if this is the reality, need to think about M1.1 and how to achieve goals</li> </ul>	Drift cells with <25% armor	20+ yrs.	Shoreline armor (M1)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M1.2.</b> Remove or soften armor on priority marine shorelines and estuaries through Shore Friendly and other approaches</li> </ul>	Armored shorelines throughout the County; initial focus on feeder bluffs	20+ yrs.	NA	PSP Desired Recovery Outcome, West Central ERP
<p><b>Objective M2.</b> Restore shoreline riparian vegetation to natural conditions wherever possible</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective M2 - how can this be related to SMP shoreline designations</li> </ul>	Countywide	20+ yrs.	Forest cover (M2)	Vision 2050
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M2.1.</b> Shoreline riparian forest cover maintained or increased to at least 70% cover through forest restoration</li> </ul>	Increase in drift cells with cover <70%	20+ yrs.	Forest cover (M2)	HCCC ERP (not a specific target)
<p><b>Objective M3.</b> Address pollution and contamination so shorelines are safe for harvesting shellfish</p>	Countywide	20+ yrs.	SGA Status (M3)	PSP Vital Signs (increase acreage)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M3.1.</b> Re-open conditional and prohibited commercial shellfish growing areas using the PIC program and other approaches</li> </ul>	Chico Bay, other immediate priorities?	6 yrs.	SGA Status (M3)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcomes, HCCC ERP, West Central ERP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M3.2.</b> Maintain approved areas through ongoing monitoring and existing programs</li> </ul>	Approved growing areas countywide	6 yrs.	SGA Status (M3)	PSP Desired Recovery Outcomes
<p><b>Objective M4.</b> Protect important ecosystem components and assess possibilities for setting targets</p>	Drift cells with forage fish, eelgrass, kelp, feeder bluffs	6 yrs.	Presence attributes, but note data gaps	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M4.1.</b> Sites with increasing eelgrass area outnumber sites with declining eelgrass area</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target M4.1 - East Kitsap has one of the better data sets of eelgrass condition and change. This has been a partnership of DNR and ST. Should ID funds for LTM.</li> </ul>	Countywide	6 yrs.	Eelgrass presence, but data gaps	PSP Target Setting Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M4.2.</b> Increase area of high-quality forage fish spawning habitat</li> </ul>	Countywide	6 yrs.	Data gap	Steelhead Recovery Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Target M4.3.</b> Identify areas where historical kelp forests have been lost, research drivers, and opportunities for recovery</li> </ul>	Countywide	6 yrs.	Data gap	

<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support ongoing research</li></ul>				
<b>General feedback:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need all to have strategies or take them out. Need to have this convo – strategies will be a mix of things that fall into a capital facilities plans and better, more effective regulations.</li></ul>				

DRAFT