

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

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

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

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

*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"> <li>• Good idea</li> <li>• Good budget</li> <li>• Be sure SWM is committed as a partner (see 4b and 7)</li> </ul>
<b>Medium Ranking Proposals</b>		
1 <i>Olaf Strad Relocation</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a good project.</li> <li>• Performance standards are unclear, and don't correlate well with the NTA description. Specifically state what will be measured.</li> <li>• The project timeline is unclear.</li> <li>• Clarify if the project will be phased, and which phase(s) the proposal covers. Is money being requested for Phase I (design) only?</li> <li>• Two project schedules are included. This is confusing.</li> <li>• In the project schedule, specify what the deliverables are for each phase. What percent design will be completed? 60%? 100%?</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Explain how the project can be designed to increase floodplain connectivity while ensuring zero flood rise.</li> </ul>
7 <i>Integrated Floodplains Mgmt.</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This effort needs to have tangible work products (new reach scale plans, implementation plans for existing reach plans, etc)</li> <li>• How will this funding help reduce barriers to project implementation?</li> <li>• What new results will this funding achieve?</li> </ul>
10 <i>Integrated OSS Plan for Tulalip Reservation</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify how this ties into the Snohomish County Savvy Septic NTA.</li> <li>• Sections #2 and 3 do not adequately describe <u>how</u> the project aligns with regional or local priorities.</li> <li>• Performance measures should include specific targets (e.g., % of systems repaired).</li> <li>• In Section #6c, describe potential barriers to success.</li> <li>• The budget doesn't seem high enough to repair a large number of systems.</li> <li>• Is this a phased project? It's implied but not specifically stated. Does the proposal cover planning only?</li> </ul>
11 <i>Floodplain Invasive Species Removal</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Explain why knotweed is bad. Make the connections.</li> <li>• Talk about sequencing up front. Include a discussion of the role science plays in determining which areas are treated first.</li> </ul>

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Section #4b, describe current knotweed eradication efforts and organizational support for that work. Clarify if this work is ongoing.</li> <li>• In Section #6c, outline risks such as landowner opposition and knotweed regrowth.</li> </ul>
<p><b>12</b></p> <p><i>BMPs on Livestock Property</i></p>	<p>Medium (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Sections #2 and 3, the lists provided don't adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities.</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• In Section #6c, discuss risks and barriers (e.g., landowner participation, match, etc.).</li> <li>• Describe how the cost estimate was determined.</li> <li>• Provide a detailed breakdown of costs. How much money is allocated to outreach? Technical assistance? Design?</li> </ul>
<p><b>14</b></p> <p><i>Mountains to Sound</i></p>	<p>Medium (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does this effort relate and/or compliment other outreach efforts in the basin?</li> <li>• More detail on performance measures</li> <li>• Tighten up introduction and add more detail linking actions to pressures and vital signs</li> </ul>
<p><b>15</b></p> <p><i>NGPA Plantings in Priority Rural Areas</i></p>	<p>Medium (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why only Snohomish Basin and not Stillaguamish also?</li> <li>• Didn't see how they are going to prioritize areas – are they going to use salmon plans to prioritize areas of basin or ?</li> <li>• Are you restoring 12 or 4 acres?</li> </ul>
<p><b>16</b></p> <p><i>PIC Phase 2</i></p>	<p>Medium (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an important project.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• In #6b, explain how sequence and timing were considered.</li> <li>• In #6c, describe how benefits and potential for success were analyzed. Add a discussion of barriers, uncertainties, and risks.</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>

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

<b>17</b> <i>Portage Creek Barrier Removal</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Are there any barriers upstream/downstream of this one?</li> <li>• Specify quality of habitat above this barrier</li> <li>• Specify ownership of barrier</li> </ul>
<b>23</b> <i>Sno-Camano EONet Local Implementation of Puget Sound Starts Here</i>	Medium (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear on benefit of having intensified local campaign -What is the benefit of doing this locally instead of regionally?</li> <li>• Why need another \$57,000 marketing plan when have all materials? Gave high score because they need to do something with this.</li> </ul>
<b>26</b> <i>Port Susan</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section #5 needs some work. Describe specific performance measures, instead of providing a schedule.</li> <li>• In Section #6c, discuss barriers. There are some serious ones with this type of work.</li> <li>• The cost estimate seems low for bulkhead removal. How many bulkheads does this represent?</li> </ul>
<b>29</b> <i>Enhancing Soils in Changing Climate</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is doing this work?</li> <li>• Not well aligned with NEP goals</li> <li>• Seems to be an ongoing effort</li> <li>• What does this new effort add?</li> </ul>
<b>32</b> <i>Stilly Riparian Planting</i>	Medium (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Section #5 needs improvement. Who is responsible for what?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• More fully describe the scientific rationale for the project.</li> <li>• Provide a more detailed cost estimate.</li> </ul>
<b>34</b> <i>Woods Creek Barrier Remov</i>	Medium (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More context on how projects could be prioritized and sequenced.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

<p><b>6</b> <i>Climate Resiliency in Snohomish River Floodplain</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Sections #2 and 3, the lists provided don't adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities.</li> <li>• The goal of the project is unclear. Make a better connection to agriculture.</li> <li>• In Section #5, provide specific performance measures rather than a list of activities.</li> <li>• In Section #6, explain how the project connects to existing plans and programs. Also describe specific barriers and risks.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9</b> <i>Haystack Creek Barrier Removal</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections #2 and 3 do not adequately describe <u>how</u> the NTA aligns with regional or local priorities.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Explain why the project is not considered part of an existing program, if it's included in the 5-year plan.</li> <li>• Include more information in #6d. Is modeling being done for the expected lifetime of the culvert? What assumptions are being made?</li> <li>• Provide a more detailed cost estimate.</li> <li>• Tie everything together. How does the project support targets in the salmon recovery plan?</li> </ul>
<p><b>36</b> <i>Beach Watcher Spill Preparedness Program</i></p>	<p>Low (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Says that LIO did not choose as a high priority program</li> <li>• Not sure beach watchers is the best program for oil spill response</li> <li>• A fair amount of this is not realistic (people will not be allowed near oil spill).</li> <li>• Some components good – i.e. convening panel.</li> <li>• MRC did not sign on to be a partner – key problem; MRC has to be involved</li> </ul>
<p><b>44</b> <i>Bigelow Creek Rechannelization</i></p>	<p>Low (3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Red flag: you can't discharge stormwater to a wetland.</li> <li>• Section #5 needs improvement. Provide specific performance measures rather than a list of milestones.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Provide a much more detailed cost estimate.</li> </ul>



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

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