

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

NTA#/Name	Ranking (Review Group)	Comments
High Ranking Proposals		
4 <i>South Slough Fish/Flood Project</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good proposal -Multi-objective flood storage/fish habitat • Does the city now have capacity to do this project? • What are the roles of partners?
8 <i>Free Trees Program</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good proposal for water and fish • How does the project relate to the changing indicators and regional priorities? Lots of other plans mention tree planting.
13 <i>Living with Beavers</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% agreement – excellent proposal
18 <i>Puget Sound Starts...at My School</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well done! • Clearly a regional effort but brought it down to the local level, should have a big impact in schools • State more clearly how expansion of prior efforts will be furthered with funding
19 <i>Richardson Creek Barrier Removal</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of Assessment to justify relative importance of this barrier. Assessment specifies species present and quality of habitat
20 <i>Arlington Stormwater Reduction</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More description of design infrastructure • Where will the flow go? Towards the river? • Will the current well be decommissioned? • Performance Measure A3 needs a numeric goal
22 <i>Financing Options for OSS</i>	High (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good job! • Clarify the project timeline. • Explain why Section #4d is not applicable to this NTA.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

24 <i>Eelgrass and Forage Fish Mapping</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring methodology Unclear • How does this fit with DNR and other Eelgrass monitoring? • Is this the right scale to be working at? Should this be done at a regional level?
28 <i>Removing Derelict Vessels</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sequence of actions on derelict boats that effectively treat the root cause of the problem now and into the future • Strategy for Creosote Pilings not fleshed out. Consider funding the derelict boats only and phasing the Creosote Pilings for a future NTA solicitation
31 <i>Watershed Education</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well organized proposal with clear objectives • Page limit was 4 pages. Text was 5 pages with questions added as a sixth page • Tighten up the description as the PSP portal has length limits as well
38 <i>Pet Waste Reduction</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Novel approach, good project • Why are the focus areas chosen? (near dog park, apartment house or what?) • Don't think the data will be informative. Need to re-think the need to collect data and where it is going to come from.
41 <i>Balancing Fish, Farms, Flood</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehensive ag strategy is counter to habitat goals (drainage) • How will this link habitat to ag? • More detail on modelling effort is needed
42 <i>Natural Yard Care</i>	High (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great job! • In Section #3, explain how the NTA addresses all Vital Signs. For example, how will it affect Estuaries? To what degree? • In Section #4a, clarify who is responsible for what.
45 <i>Fisher- man's Harbor Stormwater Qual. Improve. Project</i>	High (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do regulations already mandate this? • Explain the role of specific partners to specific performance measures. Who is accountable for which measure? • Need to tie this effort to salmon recovery plan and/or some regional plan

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

54 <i>Latino Stormwater Outreach</i>	High (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good idea • Good budget • Be sure SWM is committed as a partner (see 4b and 7)
Medium Ranking Proposals		
1 <i>Olaf Strad Relocation</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good project. • Performance standards are unclear, and don't correlate well with the NTA description. Specifically state what will be measured. • The project timeline is unclear. • Clarify if the project will be phased, and which phase(s) the proposal covers. Is money being requested for Phase I (design) only? • Two project schedules are included. This is confusing. • In the project schedule, specify what the deliverables are for each phase. What percent design will be completed? 60%? 100%? • The 2020 target for bacteria reduction is mentioned, but no connection is made between the project and reduced bacteria. Clarify how the NTA will reduce bacteria. • Explain how the project can be designed to increase floodplain connectivity while ensuring zero flood rise.
7 <i>Integrated Floodplains Mgmt.</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This effort needs to have tangible work products (new reach scale plans, implementation plans for existing reach plans, etc) • How will this funding help reduce barriers to project implementation? • What new results will this funding achieve?
10 <i>Integrated OSS Plan for Tulalip Reservation</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how this ties into the Snohomish County Savvy Septic NTA. • Sections #2 and 3 do not adequately describe <u>how</u> the project aligns with regional or local priorities. • Performance measures should include specific targets (e.g., % of systems repaired). • In Section #6c, describe potential barriers to success. • The budget doesn't seem high enough to repair a large number of systems. • Is this a phased project? It's implied but not specifically stated. Does the proposal cover planning only?
11 <i>Floodplain Invasive Species Removal</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #3, focus more on describing how the NTA connects with local Priority Vital Signs and Pressures, and less on listing the areas where the project will be implemented. • Explain why knotweed is bad. Make the connections. • Talk about sequencing up front. Include a discussion of the role science plays in determining which areas are treated first.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #4b, describe current knotweed eradication efforts and organizational support for that work. Clarify if this work is ongoing. • In Section #6c, outline risks such as landowner opposition and knotweed regrowth.
12 <i>BMPs on Livestock Property</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Sections #2 and 3, the lists provided don't adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities. • Performance measures should include the % of landowners agreeing to participate after being engaged or receiving site visits. In other words, out of 150 landowners, how many agree to install BMPs? • In Section #6c, discuss risks and barriers (e.g., landowner participation, match, etc.). • Describe how the cost estimate was determined. • Provide a detailed breakdown of costs. How much money is allocated to outreach? Technical assistance? Design?
14 <i>Mountains to Sound</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does this effort relate and/or compliment other outreach efforts in the basin? • More detail on performance measures • Tighten up introduction and add more detail linking actions to pressures and vital signs
15 <i>NGPA Plantings in Priority Rural Areas</i>	Medium (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why only Snohomish Basin and not Stillaguamish also? • Didn't see how they are going to prioritize areas – are they going to use salmon plans to prioritize areas of basin or ? • Are you restoring 12 or 4 acres?
16 <i>PIC Phase 2</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an important project. • In Section #2 of the proposal, it would be better to describe how the NTA aligns with a 2016 Strategic Initiative – focusing on <u>one</u> primary sub-strategy – than to simply provide a list of sub-strategies. • Section #6 needs improvement. It's light on content. One-sentence answers don't convey adequate information about the project, or make the necessary connections. • In #6b, explain how sequence and timing were considered. • In #6c, describe how benefits and potential for success were analyzed. Add a discussion of barriers, uncertainties, and risks. • In #6d, make some connections to climate change. How could climate change (e.g., warmer temperatures) affect the project's implementation or ultimate level of success?

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

17 <i>Portage Creek Barrier Removal</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs a formal or informal assessment to put this barrier in context with other barriers nearby and the importance of fish passage in this basin. • Are there any barriers upstream/downstream of this one? • Specify quality of habitat above this barrier • Specify ownership of barrier
23 <i>Sno-Camano EONet Local Implementation of Puget Sound Starts Here</i>	Medium (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear on benefit of having intensified local campaign -What is the benefit of doing this locally instead of regionally? • Why need another \$57,000 marketing plan when have all materials? Gave high score because they need to do something with this.
26 <i>Port Susan</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section #5 needs some work. Describe specific performance measures, instead of providing a schedule. • In Section #6c, discuss barriers. There are some serious ones with this type of work. • The cost estimate seems low for bulkhead removal. How many bulkheads does this represent?
29 <i>Enhancing Soils in Changing Climate</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is doing this work? • Not well aligned with NEP goals • Seems to be an ongoing effort • What does this new effort add?
32 <i>Stilly Riparian Planting</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #2 of the proposal, it would be better to describe how the NTA aligns with a 2016 Strategic Initiative – focusing on <u>one</u> primary sub-strategy – than to simply provide a list of sub-strategies. • Section #5 needs improvement. Who is responsible for what? • Discuss barriers and risks in Section #6c. How will barriers be addressed? Will the project be less likely to succeed if planting doesn't occur on contiguous parcels? • More fully describe the scientific rationale for the project. • Provide a more detailed cost estimate.
34 <i>Woods Creek Barrier Remov</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More context on how projects could be prioritized and sequenced.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

<p>35 <i>Working Buffers</i></p>	<p>Medium (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #2 of the proposal, it would be better to describe how the NTA aligns with a 2016 Strategic Initiative – focusing on <u>one</u> primary sub-strategy – than to simply provide a list of sub-strategies. • Section #3 needs improvement. Make a stronger connection to Vital Signs and Pressures. • Is the project ongoing? Is it phased? • Clarify staff roles and responsibilities, as well as organizational capacity. • Provide more information in Section #6. What is the scientific rationale for the project? Why now? How will sites be chosen? How will work be sequenced? • In Section #6c, describe barriers to the project. There are many (e.g., state buffer regulations). How will these barriers be addressed? • It seems that working buffers would <u>increase</u> some Pressures. This issue should be addressed in the proposal.
<p>37 <i>Keep Port Susan Healthy</i></p>	<p>Medium (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Measures need refinement • Needs a more targeted and strategic approach with well-developed goals and objectives
<p>39 <i>Stormwater Prioritization</i></p>	<p>Medium (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems like other ongoing work. Is this needed? • Not clear what new effort is being proposed
<p>40 <i>Tolt River Mouth & Frew Levee</i></p>	<p>Medium (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget needs work – not explicit • Could enhance discussion on barriers • Performance measures are not near-term • How this addresses regional priorities is left to my discernment
<p>43 <i>Snoqualmie Hydrology</i></p>	<p>Medium (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #4a, provide detail on who is responsible for what. • In Section #4c, better explain how past experience and capacity would make success on this project more likely. • Section #5 needs improvement. Provide specific performance measures rather than a list of milestones. • The cost estimate would benefit from more detail.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

<p>46 <i>Armor Removal</i></p>	<p>Medium (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good project. • In Section #4, detail NTA roles and responsibilities, rather than list job titles. Also describe organizational experience with this type of project. • Section #5 needs improvement. Provide specific performance measures rather than a list of activities. • Describe in more detail the scientific rationale for the project. In Section #2 of the proposal, it would be better to describe how the NTA aligns with a 2016 Strategic Initiative – focusing on <u>one</u> primary sub-strategy – than to simply provide a list of sub-strategies.
<p>47 <i>Assess feasibility Priest Point</i></p>	<p>Medium (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Didn't phase budget • Need to expand climate piece • Flesh out performance measures; what is here is not really a performance measure
<p>51 <i>Urban Tree Inventory</i></p>	<p>Medium (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does this address priority pressures? • Is the tree inventory software the right tool for this effort? • The parcel scale seems too small to evaluate impacts at the UGA level • Is species composition at the parcel scale needed to validate the effectiveness of the tree ordinance? • Needs a more direct connection to vital sign(s) and strategic initiative(s)
Low Ranking Proposals		
<p>2 <i>Snohomish County Climate Resilient Agriculture Strategy</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't think proposal has a strong connection to habitat, may be better with water quality • Not on current work plan • Good idea but misses the mark • Mirrors what King County proposed , 3rd leg of the stool (fish, farm, flood) • Agrees that this is very focused on agriculture • Doesn't mention coordinating with Technical Committees • Where is the technical expertise going to come from? • Are there funds to pay for that expertise? • What are the partner roles?
<p>3 <i>Drought Resilience in the Urban Landscape</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LID techniques; a little vague • 2 strategies were Tier 2 • Didn't make good link between drought and runoff (should say directly) • If apply for funding, should link it to a higher priority. This is more of a water quality proposal. • Missing a lot of details on what actually will be done: Who are the partners? Connect performance measures to desired outcomes? What is the goal? Explain how the project addresses regional priority.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

<p>6 <i>Climate Resiliency in Snohomish River Floodplain</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Sections #2 and 3, the lists provided don't adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities. • The goal of the project is unclear. Make a better connection to agriculture. • In Section #5, provide specific performance measures rather than a list of activities. • In Section #6, explain how the project connects to existing plans and programs. Also describe specific barriers and risks. • Although the project seems limited in scope, it has a high cost attached to it. The cost estimate should include enough detail to explain why this is the case.
<p>9 <i>Haystack Creek Barrier Removal</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections #2 and 3 do not adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities. • In Section #4, provide more details on how the project will be supported. Will staff time be allocated? Is the project a priority for the organization? Also provide more details on experience and capacity. • Explain why the project is not considered part of an existing program, if it's included in the 5-year plan. • Include more information in #6d. Is modeling being done for the expected lifetime of the culvert? What assumptions are being made? • Provide a more detailed cost estimate. • Tie everything together. How does the project support targets in the salmon recovery plan?
<p>36 <i>Beach Watcher Spill Preparedness Program</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says that LIO did not choose as a high priority program • Not sure beach watchers is the best program for oil spill response • A fair amount of this is not realistic (people will not be allowed near oil spill). • Some components good – i.e. convening panel. • MRC did not sign on to be a partner – key problem; MRC has to be involved
<p>44 <i>Bigelow Creek Rechannelization</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section #2 of the proposal, it would be better to describe how the NTA aligns with a 2016 Strategic Initiative – focusing on <u>one</u> primary sub-strategy – than to simply provide a list of sub-strategies. • Red flag: you can't discharge stormwater to a wetland. • Section #5 needs improvement. Provide specific performance measures rather than a list of milestones. • In Section #6c, incorporate a thorough discussion of risks and barriers. Address permitting and site condition risks and how those risks could impact the project budget and probability of success. • Provide a much more detailed cost estimate.

Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee
 NTA Tech Review Subcommittee Comments on NTA Full Proposals

<p>50 <i>Supplementing Inventory and Analysis of Shoreline Conditions</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to tell if regulatory requirement or not • Don't mention coordinating with salmon recovery technical committees • How does the proposal address regional priorities? • How does supplemental data address indicators? • Performance measures are weak • Budget is high
<p>53 <i>Initiatives to Support Infill</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much discussion about protecting habitat in UGAs – wondering if this is the right funding source for this effort • This seems important but performance measures are missing and budget seems high