

# Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO Activities Calendar/Restructure Subcommittee Meeting Summary

*Thursday, August 31, 2017*

*2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.*

*Skype for Business*

## **LIO-Subcommittee Members**

Valerie Streeeter, Tulalip Tribes

Morgan Ruff, Tulalip Tribes

Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Forum & King County

Ann Bylin (for Gregg Farris), Snohomish County Surface Water Management

Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish County Surface Water Management

Kit Crump, Snohomish County Surface Water Management

Ryan Williams, Snohomish Conservation District

Tamara Neuffer, Stillaguamish Tribe

Erin Ryan-Peñuela, PSP

## **LIO Support Staff**

Jessica Hamill, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner II/LIO Coordinator

Alexa Ramos, Snohomish County Surface Water Management

### **A. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda**

Jessica opened the meeting and introductions followed.

### **B. Feedback and Test Opportunities**

Jessica summarized the conversations with the Stillaguamish Watershed Council (SWC) and the Technical Advisory Group (TAG). Kit gave feedback on the June SWC meeting which was focused on the pending downgrade of shellfish beds. This topic brought in staff from agencies not usually in attendance (Health District, Dept. of Health, etc.).

Morgan asked about the coordination and administrative burden required to set-up this type of coordinated meeting. Kit said it didn't necessitate much additional administration beyond usual levels of effort. Agencies took on the responsibility of sending their appropriate staff to the informational meeting.

Jessica gave feedback on the Snohomish Forum's position. There are concerns around the timeline for making the decision. They did agree to enhance LE/LIO integration by reviewing habitat/salmon NTAs this round.

Jessica gave feedback on the Snoqualmie Forum's status. Preliminary conversations have not taken place yet. There may be an opportunity to get feedback from the Snoqualmie Forum in November.

Jessica gave feedback on the LIO's position on the restructure. They have questions about what a new model would mean, but they support increased integration. While Jessica did not hear opposition to splitting the LIO by watershed boundary, there were some concerns raised related to a mechanism for cross-basin coordination and addressing cross-watershed recovery issues. The Executive Committee discussed this at the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. There was no opposition to splitting the LIO by watershed boundary and some members voiced support for a reduced meeting schedule for both Committees while moving to utilizing work groups.

There was no other feedback from others on the call.

**C. Staff Recommendation**

Jessica reviewed the alternative structure models and timeline to refresh previous meeting content. The staff preferred Phase I scenario would be to test the Stillaguamish absorbing the LIO into the existing LE structure. Under this scenario, the Snohomish would remain in their current structure, but with enhanced integration where applicable/appropriate (i.e. Forum cursory review of NTAs and holding a joint Forum/LIO meeting). The goal would be to assess implementation after a year of testing this alternative structure. There are several alternatives that could accomplish this goal, one of which establishes two implementation committees (basin specific) rather than two formal LIOs. Phase II could consist of moving towards more formally recognizing the SWC as a separate LIO.

Jessica also reviewed conversations from 2010 regarding the Whidbey Basin preference for a particular LIO structure. Jessica noted that the preference in 2010 was to establish 4 separate LIOs in Skagit, Island, Stillaguamish, and Snohomish areas. The thinking in 2010 was that implementation would be easier at a basin scale as evidenced in the salmon recovery (Lead Entity) structure. For various reasons, that preference did not materialize and we ended up with a combined Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO, a separate LIO in Island County, and no LIO in the Skagit.

The conversation in 2017 is evolving similarly to what was initially proposed in 2010.

Jessica walked through the process for how staff set aside various alternatives. Staff put the alternatives into 4 tiers based on alignment with the criteria, then applied a socio-political filter to determine what scenarios would be unlikely to be implemented based on feedback from the LIO and LE groups. From there, staff set aside various alternatives based on scenarios that do not address the criteria (less than 3) and feedback from the LIO and LE groups about preferences. This analysis resulted in three remaining strategies. Jessica walked through the unique aspects of each approach.

Committee members suggested the following changes:

- a. The primary driver for the SWC is to have a basin specific focus, they are not necessarily advocating to have a formal LIO in the Stillaguamish. At present, the alternatives show two separate LIOs in the watersheds. To remedy this, show an option for the Stillaguamish to have a separate Implementation Committee (IC) but within one LIO.
- b. It does seem important to have an overarching, cross-basin Executive Committee to advance larger issues impacting both watersheds. Would be good to flesh out what the functions of the Executive Committee would be under various scenarios. They should not only serve as a “rubber stamp” function for the IC.
- c. There is support for the cross-basin coordination mechanism so good to leave that in as an example.

There was discussion about including the Status Quo (the existing LIO/LE model) as an alternative for the groups to discuss. Jessica pointed out that frustration with the status quo (particularly from some partners) is why we are having the restructure conversation. The committee approved proceeding with LIO/LE conversations utilizing a slightly revised set of alternatives. The committee decided not to meet again before taking these models to the LIO and LE committees for their feedback.

**D. Next Steps/Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m. Staff will draft a meeting summary for review.

**Action Items**

1. Make revisions to the structure models and provide a summary of the meeting
2. Take the models to the LE and LIO committees for discussion