

Port Susan Bay Targeted Interviews Summary Report to the Northwest Straits Foundation August 2008

**Prepared by Tom Cowan
With assistance from members of the Port Susan Bay Working Group**

Summary

This report provides background and summarizes the results of 19 stakeholder interviews in Port Susan Bay. These interviews were conducted at the request of the Northwest Straits Foundation with direction from the Port Susan Bay Working Group. The Harder Foundation provided financial support for this effort. Interview information is intended to provide guidance to the Working Group on a vision statement and goals for a Port Susan Bay Marine Stewardship Area.

I. Background

Port Susan Bay's rich estuarine habitat and high biodiversity make it an important place for salmon, Dungeness crab, marine birds, marine mammals, and other wildlife. Port Susan Bay is also important for people: Tribal and non-tribal fishermen, farmers, hunters, birders, kayakers, and landowners all use and appreciate the bay and its uplands in different ways.

Port Susan Bay is bounded on the west by Camano Island and on the east by Snohomish County, with the mouth of the Stillaguamish River in the northern end of the Bay. With its high biodiversity, diverse user groups, and multiple jurisdictional boundaries, Port Susan Bay is a good candidate for a comprehensive ecosystem based management approach. For the past 18 months, Snohomish and Island Marine Resources Committees (MRCs), the Northwest Straits Commission, the Stillaguamish and Tulalip Tribes, Beach Watchers, Shore Stewards, the Nature Conservancy, and a host of other partners (called the Port Susan Bay Working Group) have met several times to lay the initial groundwork for a potential marine stewardship area in Port Susan Bay.

Marine stewardship areas (MSAs) have proven to be successful tools to focus attention and prioritize management decisions in both San Juan MRC and Island MRC. While no one MSA is alike, what's true for most is that they are community-based planning processes that typically target areas of high biodiversity. MSAs can be used to harmonize multiple-use/multiple-value conflicts. Diverse input from stakeholders, concerned citizens, and technical experts is needed to ensure that a potential MSA addresses the right issues and the community's concerns.

Recognizing the need for this kind of information in Port Susan Bay, the Northwest Straits Foundation applied for and received \$15,000 in funding from the Harder

Foundation to conduct a series of targeted stakeholder interviews. In April 2008, the Northwest Straits Foundation contracted with Tom Cowan to carry out this work. This report summarizes interview results and gives recommendations to be used by the Port Susan Bay MSA Working Group.

II. Semi-structured Interviewing

Interview questions, strategy, and interviewees were developed and selected in close partnership with a steering committee consisting of a subgroup of the Port Susan Bay MSA Working Group. The steering committee consists of six members representing the Snohomish and Island MRC, Snohomish County planning staff, Tulalip Tribes, Shore Stewards, and Beach Watchers.

Potential interviewees were proposed by steering committee members and ranked according to criteria developed by the steering committee to ensure broad community participation and representation of diverse interest groups.

A semi-structured interview methodology (Kvale 1996) was used throughout this project. *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods* characterizes a semi-structured interview as having:

a flexible and fluid structure, unlike structured interviews, which contain a structured sequence of questions to be asked in the same way of all interviewees. The structure of a semi-structured interview is usually organized around an aide memoire or interview guide. This contains topics, themes, or areas to be covered during the course of the interview, rather than a sequenced script of standardized questions. The aim is usually to ensure flexibility in how and in what sequence questions are asked, and in whether and how particular areas might be followed up and developed with different interviewees. This is so that the interview can be shaped by the interviewee's own understanding as well as the researcher's interests, and unexpected themes can emerge (Lewis-Beck and Bryman 2003).

This method was selected in recognition of the need to have real conversations with interviewees in order to understand their depth of experience with Port Susan Bay. With only 15-20 interviews planned, this level of depth was necessary to provide the information needed for a vision statement and goals for a Port Susan Bay MSA. In the future, focus groups and other methods designed to reach more people at less depth will be needed to further flush out stakeholder's views on Port Susan.

The consultant collaborated with the steering committee to develop an interview guide consisting of question themes, specific questions, and an interview strategy. The interview guide was developed to help the interviewer maintain consistency between interviewees but still pursue individual lines of inquiry as opportunities arose. The Interview guide used in this project is provided as a separate file.

To ensure that all interviewees were provided with the same information about the project, a prepared statement was read by the consultant. This statement described the

project and how information from the interview will be used. It is provided as a separate file.

III. A Sense of Place

Questions were designed to reveal an interviewee's sense of place for Port Susan Bay, to understand how the bay has changed over time, to compare interviewees' visions of Port Susan Bay for the future, and to gauge interest in participation in a community-driven conservation planning process for the Bay. Interview questions were crafted around themes to understand how people use Port Susan Bay, what specific locations are important and why, how experiences with Port Susan Bay have changed over time, perceptions of environmental health, and what a desirable future for Port Susan Bay would be.

Sense of place is a concept with roots in human geography (Tuan 1977) that is gaining traction as a resource management planning tool (Stedman 1999, Geerlofs 2005). Recognizing the value of Port Susan Bay as a place that holds unique meanings, attachments, and satisfactions for stakeholders can reveal the Bay's important social and environmental attributes, as well as perceived threats to those attributes. Understanding that different people hold a different sense of place for Port Susan Bay can reveal where agreement or conflicts might occur during a planning process. Sense of place complements chemical, biological, economic, physical and other kinds of analyses used in conservation planning.

IV. Discussion and Report on Interviews

Nineteen interviews were conducted with a diverse group of state, local and tribal government officials, involved stakeholders and nearby property owners to identify experiences, perceptions, and the importance of Port Susan Bay and to also investigate the concept of establishing a marine stewardship area or initiating a community-based planning process. It was a very pleasurable experience to talk with the variety of people and learn about the history and excitement surrounding Port Susan Bay.

Interviews were conducted primarily in July, 2008 and they generally lasted 40 to 60 minutes. Five were in-person interviews held in Snohomish or Island counties and 14 were conducted by telephone. From the original ranked list of interviewees, only two declined and we were unable to contact two others. With the help of the steering committee, substitutes were identified and interviews were conducted.

It is estimated that the 19 people interviewed had a total of 776 years of experience living on and/or using Port Susan Bay for an amazing average of nearly 41 years each. While this contributed considerably to the richness of the feedback, it also may be indicative that with many newer residents in the area, the interviewees may not be fully representative of the community as a whole.

Other than the considerable time it took to contact and schedule interviews, there were no procedural problems. All interviewees readily gave permission to share the interview notes with the Working Group, however, broader distribution of the notes was not requested and should not happen without permission. Also, actual quotes from the interviewees were captured in some of the individual interview notes, however, permission was not requested to use them in any report that may go beyond the Working Group.

The semi-structured interview process worked well, especially for property owners and stakeholders with interests in protecting or restoring the Bay. For government and tribal officials and those with primarily a professional relationship with the Bay and its issues, it was necessary to move slightly away from the “place experience” and “place meaning” themes in order to capture important input. With little exception, the interviews were quite conversational and people weren’t hesitant at all to speak freely.

The interview guide was very helpful in ensuring consistency in the interviews. The five themes were laid out well as evidenced by the fact that very often the interviewee would transition to the next theme without being prompted, which helped keep a nice flow to the conversation.

V. Key Themes and Differences

The following attempts to capture key themes, points of difference and potential goals for a marine stewardship area. By its nature a summary is generalized. In order to fully grasp key issues and considerations, it is necessary to read each individual interview summary. While it will take an investment in time, it’s the best way to understand the variety of points of view and for the Working Group to draw conclusions as to next steps. The complete set of interview notes are attached as a separate document.

Because permission was not given to share interview notes beyond the Working Group, a summary table is also provided as an attachment, which provides detail beyond the summary below but does not attribute names to information. This table is more appropriate to share beyond the working group.

Everyone seems passionate about Port Susan Bay. There may be a wide variety of reasons, but there is no question that the Bay is important. Many of the interviewees had spent all or a major portion of their lives living on and/or using the Bay. The many stories about personal experiences with the Bay were revealing about how strongly people feel about it.

Most of the interviewees recalled abundant wildlife and recreational opportunities like fishing, crabbing, boating, swimming, bird watching and beach walking as primary memories.

There are many favorite places, but people identified locations at the northern end of the Bay more than elsewhere.

There was a wide variety of perceptions about the environmental health of the Bay. Most people believe the health is poor and getting worse. Continuing and increasing sedimentation was cited most frequently as the biggest problem and failing septs and other pollution sources are of concern as well. There was widespread concern regarding the decline in fish, especially salmon, crabs, birds and other wildlife.

Several people recognize that the health of Port Susan Bay is poor, but emphasized that it is improving and pointed to scientific studies that demonstrate improvements. Many reported that Spartina, once a significant threat to the Bay, is now under control thanks to the efforts of government and volunteers. A couple of people noted that the environmental health of the Bay is good and a couple of people felt that they couldn't assess the health.

Most people see the need for protection and prevention actions in Port Susan Bay, however, there wasn't consensus on what needs to be done. The most common concerns expressed were impacts from residential development and when asked for more specifics, septs, stormwater, tree removal and general water quality were mentioned by several people. Protection from increased sedimentation, flooding and farm pollution was mentioned as well as protecting public access and the ability to farm.

When discussing restoration, a variety of actions were called for including maintaining the dikes, removing the dikes, septs repair, Spartina removal, introduce woody debris, more dredging, remove derelict fishing gear, wetlands restoration and revegetate the shorelines. Two people expressed that no restoration was needed.

Not surprisingly, many activities were identified as important to maintain. Leading the list was recreational fishing and numerous people also mentioned bird watching, crabbing, boating, and general public access to recreation activities like beach walking and picnicking. Less frequently, but still identified more than once were hunting, tribal fishing, swimming, farming and clamming.

Teasing out responses to the "how can a better future for Port Susan Bay be achieved" theme was the most difficult part of the interviews. Some people repeated what they had said about protection and restoration and for a few it was not easy for them to discuss processes that may help them achieve stated goals.

Key themes for engaging the community were recognition that broad public involvement was necessary for any successful effort and that stakeholder collaboration was also a key ingredient. Several people identified that government (especially both counties) leadership and dedication is needed, as well as tribal involvement. It was broadly recognized that, without adequate funding, efforts would be unsuccessful. Public education was consistently cited as essential. The Beach Watchers and Shore Stewards programs were mentioned as good models.

With the exception of only a couple of people, the interviewees enthusiastically welcomed the opportunity to participate in a community-based planning process. Some expressed that they would be obligated because they represent a stakeholder group, but most people genuinely feel it is important to participate if the result is a better Port Susan Bay. A few skepticisms were expressed, but most were refreshingly supportive.

VI. Potential Goals for a Marine Stewardship Area

The Working Group intends to use the results of the targeted interviews to prepare a vision and goals statement for a potential Port Susan Bay Marine Stewardship Area. In reviewing the one-page **Port Susan Bay MSA Summary** prepared by Jen Seigny and Chrys Bertolotto, the Actions/Benefits identified were all supported by the results of the interviews. In particular the interviews brought out that:

- Port Susan Bay is a distinct area with specific beneficial resources and problems.
- There are numerous potential protection and restoration activities.
- Collaboration would provide a win-win for many interests.
- Designation of Port Susan Bay as a marine atewardship area would focus and improve communication.
- A marine stewardship area designation would help leverage outside funding for action.

In developing a process for proceeding with a MSA, the Working Group may want to consider ideas including the following:

- Place “bookends” around a potential MSA. San Juan County was willing to designate its marine waters a MSA prior to any planning process results partly because a decision was made that the MSA would be voluntary and would use education and incentives rather than regulations.
- Recognize early the potential difficulties of working with two counties and two tribes on a common designation and ultimately a common plan. Clear communication is very important.
- Seek partnerships that will provide staff support and funding. The Nature Conservancy invested valuable time and money in leading the planning process for the San Juan County MSA.
- Emphasize that one of the main benefits of a MSA is that the community can speak with one voice. Prior to the MSA in San Juan County, decisions were made in an uncoordinated manner as different interests often became the “squeaky wheel that got its way.”
- Ensure that the planning process is truly community-based. San Juan County held numerous workshops and reached out to the public for input frequently. This is a major reason for its success and widespread support.

References

- Geerlofs, Simon Haas. 2005. *Tourism, marine trades, and sense of place on the urban waterfront: Port Townsend, Washington*. Thesis (M.M.A.)--University of Washington, 2005.
- Kvale, Steinar. 1996. *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviews*. Sage Publications.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S; Alan Bryman; and Tim Futing Liao. 2003. *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Sage Publications, Inc. P. 1020.
- Stedman, R.C. 1999. *Sense of Place as an Indicator of Community Sustainability*. The Forestry Chronicle 75:5 (1999):765-770.
- Tuan, Y.F. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Port Susan Targeted Interview Project, Summary Table of Interview Information—All information derived from actual interview notes

Theme	Response
<p>Key Places: Places or locations around Port Susan Bay specifically mentioned as “favorite” places by interviewees. These places may warrant special protection or investigation in an MSA plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnum Point (still peaceful and relatively undeveloped) • Caballero Beach • Cama Beach State Park • Camano Head (clamming) • Central Bay out from Kayak Point (crabbing and sea-run cutthroat fishing) • Davis Slough (hunting) • Deeper waters between kayak point and west Camano • Driftwood Shores (water quality may be limiting shellfish harvest) • Hat Island (clamming) • Hermosa Point • Iverson’s spit (warm swimming waters) • Juniper Beach (concerns that crabbing opportunities are down here, others noted that they enjoyed the cabins and resort area) • Kayak Point • Livingston Bay (Whidbey Camano Land Trust owns 3,000 acres of tidelands here. Concerns that crabbing opportunities are down here) • Mouth of Hat Slough (hunting, high biodiversity, soft shell crabs, sturgeon) • Mudflats near middle of bay (great for birding) • South tip of Camano • Speedibah Beach (used to be a great beach seining location) • Sunny Shores Spit • The mouth of the Stilly (abundant wildlife) • The one mile tidal estuarial area from south of the main channel of the Stilly to the residential development • The shorelines of Camano Island • Tide flats at north end of the bay. Mentioned by many interviewees, this is a place where water quality is a major concern. Needs protection. • Triangle Cove • Tulalip Bay • Tulalip bay to Kayak Point (like a sanctuary, wonderful for beach walking and picnicking) • Warm Beach (warm water for swimming, good swan habitat)

<p>Key Human Uses: These are in response to a line of questioning on how interviewee's "use" the Bay. Many of these uses were mentioned by multiple interviewees.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birding • Boating, sailing • Canoeing • Clamming • Crabbing • Cultural or spiritual events • Enjoying the views • Farming • Fishing—salmon, sturgeon, others • Goose and duck hunting • Kayaking • Playing on the beach • Science • Shoreline walking • Swimming • Visiting friends, barbeques • Visiting parks • Walk dikes • Wildlife viewing
<p>Major Changes: Interviewees expressed many changes that have occurred in Port Susan during the course of their experience with the Bay—some positive and some negative. Responses have been summarized and sorted into categories. Each category contains the views of multiple interviewees.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing Habitat: There has been an 80% loss in freshwater wetlands in the last 70 years. Birds have become agriculturally dependent because of altered natural habitats. The once deep lagoon behind driftwood shores is now essentially a mud flat. Hat slough has been opened up. More habitat protection in the bay by land trusts, especially TNC and in Livingston Bay (seen as positive by some, negative by others). Tidal flows have changed beach locations causing growth of alder, fir, and grasses near beaches. • Development increasing, character of the landscape and social structure is changing: Islands of rural landscape remain, but there has been significant development on both the Camano and Snohomish sides of the bay. Not as rural and pristine, more invasive species. Full-time residences dominate, where it used to be primarily summer homes. More traffic. Less activity on the bay: fewer resorts, less sport fishing, less tribal fishing. The Bay's residents are becoming more affluent, less working class, with lots of recent arrivals. • Environmental Improvements: There has been a lot of work over the last decades to improve the health of Port Susan Bay, and in some cases the Bay is responding. Spartina has invaded, but is being controlled. Fecal pollution is improving because of better practices by farmers, who apply manure to their fields rather than dumping it into irrigation ditches (though other interviewees note that many

	<p>beaches are closed to clamming because of fecal coliform levels). Swans began to frequent the bay in the 1970s. This is now one of the top shore bird sites on the Pacific Coast. Many more swans and geese than ever before. Could be due to conversion of agricultural land elsewhere. Eight years ago, shellfish beds were polluted, now efforts have been made to pinpoint problems and fecal levels are reduced. Derelict fishing gear is being removed. The bay is slowly healing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of marine resources: Long-term residents note fewer fish and crabs in the bay then there were in the past. No more of the flounder or big sole. No more salmon like there used to be and less fishing opportunities over all. Loss of clamming and crabbing opportunities because of water quality concerns. Soft shell clam harvesting was noted by several respondents as a past activity, but doesn't seem to be as strong as it was in the past. • Perceptions of beautiful Bay with declining water quality: Superficially the Bay looks like it hasn't changed much over time, but it is not as clean as it was in the past. • Sedimentation increasing: Nearly all respondents note that siltation and sedimentation is a worsening problem, especially at the head of the Bay. There has been considerable degradation in Port Susan's estuarine environment in recent years (some disagreement on this between interviewees).
Remaining Ecological Capital:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bay continues to be a major "wildlife corridor" for deer, river otter, birds, seals, crabs, and fish. • Native plant life remains • Warm water for swimming • The bay is important for the sheer numbers of birds and salmon that use it • While the river channels have moved and sedimentation has occurred, Port Susan remains remarkably the same over the last 40 years • Whales still use the bay to feed • Bird populations are abundant and healthy • Iverson Spit was protected with money from the state

<p>Existing Social, Political, Capital and Infrastructure:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger farms are cleaning up their act because of regulations and economics. • Snohomish County and the community have been successful in fighting <i>spartina</i>. • Upgraded sewage treatment plant in Stanwood • Puget Sound Partnership is seen as a key potential partner for protecting or restoring the Bay • There has been an increase in environmental education and awareness • Beach Watchers are engaging the public • MRCs are making elected officials aware of issues in Port Susan Bay.
<p>Threats to the Health of the Bay: Responses have been summarized sorted into categories. Each category contains the views of multiple interviewees.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulation and Sedimentation: Siltation and sedimentation, particularly in northern part of Bay seem to be changing circulation and leading to stagnation and toxicity. <u>This was identified by many of the interviewees.</u> Land slides are closing off access to salmon habitat in the watershed and may be a source of siltation. Flooding is a problem, as is saltwater intrusion into wells (may not be related to sedimentation and circulation). • Habitat Changes and Loss: Upland development and land use changes further up the Stilly in places like Darrington and Oso are leading to loss of habitat for salmon. A major new development at Warm Beach was mentioned by several interviewees as a threat to Port Susan. Bulkheads on beaches were noted as a threat. Conversely, with rip-rap no longer an easy option, shoreline erosion is occurring. • Management and Policy: There is inadequate enforcement of environmental standards. Lack of beach access and boat launches makes Port Susan Bay an aloof and unapproachable place. It is a bay that is looked at but not publicly used much and therefore is seen as a conservation area. Port Susan seems like Snohomish County to most of the people in Island County, so there's not much attention given to it by Island County government. There are many competing uses of the bay, for example salmon restoration may not be good for shorebirds and could result in a net loss of wildlife • Non-native Species: <i>Spartina</i> is identified as a threat which is improving through grass roots efforts and good management. California sea lions are displacing Steller sea lions (not non-native, but a shift in populations). • Water Quality: Poor water quality, particularly in northern part of Bay, limits shellfish harvest. Failing septic systems were mentioned by many of the interviewees. Fertilizers and excess nutrients in estuarine waters. Some of this is from cattle farming upstream. Waste following the fourth of July was noted as a source of pollution.

<p>What needs to be done in Port Susan?: There were a wide range of comments about specific actions to protect and restore Port Susan, as well as comments on what kind of overall process is needed. Responses have been summarized and sorted into categories. Each category contains the views of multiple interviewees.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control Sedimentation: Need to develop ways to retard siltation and sedimentation. Estuaries that have been filled in need to be restored. There are restoration opportunities, such as opening South Slough by removing aggregate. Need to take a holistic approach to reducing sedimentation, there may be trade offs. River dredging needs to happen on a regular basis. • Education and Outreach: Start with the schools for public education. Outreach is necessary if you do a strategic plan for PSB. More publicity is needed about what activities are taking place. Education must move past producing flyers towards better public involvement and leadership. Work together for a common good through better community partnerships and education. Individuals need to take responsibility for their actions. • Habitat Protection: Leave mud flats as is and protect bay from river sedimentation. Limit development of the shoreline and no new large developments. More information is needed before pursuing salmon work. Maintain bluffs by discouraging inappropriate development. Protect of wildlife habitat from development and logging. Protect forage fish beaches. Need to create firm boundaries and strong zoning to protect forests and unstable bluffs. • Improve Water Quality: Public needs to be advocates and good stewards—start by cleaning up septic systems. Utilize natural pollution collection points, like flood control districts, which can be used like constructed wetlands. Codes should allow for existing developments to use central treatment, rather than septic systems. More stormwater control needed. Treat Warm Beach stormwater. More protection could be provided by a Surface Water Management District, which could curb runoff and provide LID education. • Maintaining key existing uses: Maintain hunting and agriculture. Don't eliminate productive farmland with restoration, instead limit tree removal, don't permit houses near the beaches. Look for ways to gain new efficiencies in rules. For example, encourage joint use—habitat that works for both the ecology and agriculture. There's a need to recognize that farming and infrastructure are important to the area. • Process (there was a wide range of responses on this subject, as captured here): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need strong leadership, accountability and environmental watchdogs to save the bay—

	<p>consensus may not work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community leaders can serve as spokespeople for the Bay. Public education is needed, and any conservation planning process must include the ability for public input. ○ A collaborative effort to work with all stakeholders with the aim of accessing Puget Sound Partnership funding to protect and restore the Bay. ○ Need a community-based planning process, but concern that there's already multiple activities going on in Port Susan like this one. Planning processes need to include tribes ○ Take a macro approach to protecting the bay, rather than species by species. ○ The public needs to be involved because only collaborative efforts will work. Governments need to work outside the bureaucratic box by working with private and public organizations and agencies with power. ○ Improve coordination between the two counties and tribes, and improved connections between Camano residents and the Tulalip Tribes ○ A community-based planning process would be complimentary to existing programs led by Surface Water Management, the tribes, the MRC, and the Puget Sound Partnership. The challenge is to not duplicate effort ○ Must engage all interests, a proactive process is better than a reactionary one. Be fair to everyone involved ○ There is a need to look at all interests in the bay, not just focus on a single issue ○ Don't take five years to write the plan and don't reinvent the wheel ○ Need better community cohesiveness as well as education ○ The people that live in along the bay, rather than elsewhere should have the larger voice in decision making ○ Non-regulatory voluntary goals are best. Don't create a "preserve". ○ Invest more money in the field, less on studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public Access: Maintain public access for swimming and recreational activities. More public access to beaches, kayak access, continued bird watching and maintenance of scenic views. There's so much private property in Port Susan. The public needs to be involved in a solution for recreational, economic, and residential reasons. Maintain access for hunting and recreation. ● Respecting Cultural Traditions: Need to protect cultural and spiritual values in the bay. ● Restoration (a wide range, including "no need for restoration"): Focus restoration efforts on the estuary—remove Scotch Broom to protect native plants, consider dike restoration, locate livestock in suitable areas. Restoration strategies could include dredging the Stilly up to Florence, reforestation, and planting riparian vegetation. Dikes need to be maintained and raised over time to increase navigable waters for kayaking, canoeing, and fishing. Restore Christofferson Creek for salmon use. More tidelands restoration by TNC. Restore shellfish habitat by planting clams and restoring gravel.
--	---

	<p>Place woody debris in pockets and channels. Remove more derelict fishing gear. Restoring habitat to historic or prehistoric levels may be unrealistic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species Management: Close crabbing for two years to help restore crab populations.
Direct Quotes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It would be a shame if the health of Port Susan Bay is lost” • “The bay is in relatively decent shape” • “Don’t try to fix things when you don’t understand it all and don’t sacrifice one thing to benefit another”—on potential negative effects to sturgeon caused by salmon restoration activities • On the ability of the bay to support fisheries: “We’ve hit bottom and are now working our way up”. • “You can’t knock down a cabin and build a 5,000 square foot home on an old septic system” • “You need to learn to live off the water because some time you may need to bring food to the table for your family”. • On the fourth of July and fireworks waste: “We treasure [the bay] 364 days a year and trash it on July 4th” • On the need for public support: “The public has to see a problem before it is willing to consider supporting solutions”. • On working together with hunters, farmers, birders, and fishers: There is value in collaborative work including all interests” • “Collectively, there is abundant knowledge in the community and when the public is involve and heard, then things seem to move forward”. • “I wouldn’t eat the fish or shellfish from Port Susan Bay because they are polluted”. • “Educate before you regulate” • “Build on what you got” by using Beach Watchers and Shore Stewards • “Everyone needs to take responsibility for their own actions” • “Don’t tell but help teach”—on the government’s role in engaging the public • “Achieving a better future for Port Susan Bay requires changing human values”. • “The more science you have the easier it is to narrow down the problems”. • “Preservation is not just saving it, but allowing for future use”. • “Look at the warning signs and rely on science to show what’s needed”. • “Yes, people need a place to live, but it would be wrong to lose the flavor of what we have in PSB” • “We are winning the battle with invasive <i>spartina</i>”

**Northwest Straits Foundation
List of Interviewed Stakeholders
Port Susan Bay Marine Stewardship Area Stakeholder Interview Project
August 20, 2008**

Interviewee and Affiliation

- Bernie Horton, Warm Beach Resident
- Carolyn Barnum DiLorenzo, Owner of Barnum Point Inn
- Chris Hilton, Whidbey/Camano Land Trust
- Chuck Hazelton, Long-time Resident and Chair, Stillaguamish River Flood Control District
- Cindy Ridgeway, Shore Steward and Beach Watcher
- Dianne W. White, Mayor of Stanwood
- Ed McDowell, Director of Warm Beach Christian Camp and Conference Center
- Herman Williams Sr., Tulalip Elder and Shoreline Land Owner
- John Dean, Island County Commissioner
- John Koster, Snohomish County Councilmember
- Martha Jordan, Pilchuck Audobon
- Mary Margaret Haugen, State Senator
- Ray Fryberg, Director of Tulalip Tribes Fisheries
- Rone Brewer, Public Access and Hunting Advocate
- Ruth Milner, WDFW Shorebird Expert
- Shawn Yanity, Stillaguamish Tribal Chair and Fisheries Manager
- Skip Ingraham, Long-time Camano Resident
- Tom Eisenberg, Shore Stewards and Friends of Camano Island Parks
- Tristan Klesick, Small-scale organic farmer

Interview Guide for Port Susan Bay Targetted Stakeholder Interviews

Interviewee:

Interviewer:

Date:

Location:

Project Research Question:		
Question Themes	Specific Questions	Notes
Theme #1: Basic Information	1: Where do you live/work on Port Susan Bay? 2: What is your occupation?	
Theme #2: Past Experience: What kind of place do you remember Port Susan Bay being in the past?	1: How long have you lived/worked in Port Susan Bay? 2: Can you describe your earliest memories of Port Susan? 3: How has Port Susan changed since then?	Establishing timeline Establishing a baseline How has the baseline shifted?
Theme #3: Place Meaning: What kind of place is Port Susan Bay today?	1: Can you describe Port Susan today? What kind of a place is it? 2: What are some of your favorite locations in and around Port Susan Bay? Why are these places important? Bay, uplands, river? 3: How do you most often "use" Port Susan Bay? 4: How do you perceive the environmental health of Port Susan Bay? 5. Do you think Port Susan is adequately protected?	Trying to get at a subjective geographic description of PSB--Are Port Susan and the uplands linked in people's minds? Hot spots: Areas to target for protection--Likely to be areas that people are strongly attached to, big changes in these areas will likely create conflict. Trying to get the interviewee to articulate their opinion of the highest and best uses of the bay. What are the uses, how might these conflict with other interviewees? What would a potential MSA address Does interviewee percieve PSB as improving or declining.

Question Themes	Specific Questions	Notes
Theme #4: Future: What kind of place would you like Port Susan to be?	<p>1: What places or conditions would you like to see protected in Port Susan?</p> <p>2: What places or conditions would you like to see restored in Port Susan?</p> <p>3: What activities or uses of Port Susan would you like to see maintained?</p>	<p>More specific geographical focus.</p> <p>More specific geographical or physical focus</p> <p>Helps gauge whether interviewee has more environmental (habitat, etc.) focus or activities (fishing, recreation, etc.) focus</p>
Theme #5: How can a better future for Port Susan be achieved?	<p>1: What do you think needs to be done to bring about the kind of future for Port Susan that you have articulated?</p> <p>2: Does the public have a role in protecting Port Susan Bay? If so, what is it?</p> <p>3: What do you feel is the best way to engage the community in bringing about the future for Port Susan that you have articulated?</p> <p>4: Are you willing to participate in a community-based planning process?</p>	<p>Probes for specifics</p> <p>Value of public involvement versus government action</p> <p>Is interviewee interested in a planning process or perhaps simply education or monitoring.</p> <p>Is interviewee interested in investing time and effort.</p>
Theme #6: Is a Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area appropriate?	<p>1: Are you familiar with the established Marine Stewardship Areas in Island and San Juan Counties?</p> <p>2: Is the concept applicable to Port Susan?</p> <p>3: Would a Port Susan MSA complement or conflict with the Lower Stillaguamish Strategic Planning Initiative?</p>	<p>Provides opportunity to discuss ideas.</p> <p>Is an MSA a non-starter for PSB.</p> <p>How can future efforts be coordinated.</p>

Additional Post Interview Notes: