

# Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO

## Activities Calendar/Restructure Subcommittee Meeting Summary

*Thursday, March 16, 2017*

*1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.*

### **LIO-Subcommittee Members**

Bill Blake, City of Arlington, Stillaguamish Watershed Council

Valerie Streater, Tulalip Tribes

Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Forum

Janne Kaje, King County

Pat Stevenson, Stillaguamish Tribe

Chrys Bertolotto, WSU Extension

Gregg Farris, Snohomish County Surface Water Management

Ann Bylin, Snohomish County Surface Water Management

Ryan Williams, Snohomish Conservation District

Dan Calvert, Puget Sound Partnership

### **LIO Support Staff**

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

Alexa Ramos, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Planner

Gretchen Glaub, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner II/Snohomish LE Coordinator

Kit Crump Snohomish County Surface Water Management, Senior Planner II/Stillaguamish Co-LE Coordinator

### **1. Welcome, Introductions**

Jessica opened the meeting and introductions followed. Jessica reviewed the agenda for the meeting and set the expectations. The focus of the meeting is to discuss and agree upon the foundational elements of the LIO organizational structure, including but not limited to a draft vision, objectives, and goals for the LIO.

### **2. Current Context**

- **Vision/Mission** - Jessica reviewed the historic mission statement, extracted from the LIO Bylaws, with the group. She also noted that there hadn't been a vision established for the LIO, but that there was a vision for the Ecosystem Recovery Plan.

As part of the historic vision and mission of the LIO, it was noted that the Tulalip Tribes had advocated for the LIO to address regulatory gaps and barriers related to land use as development and associated degradation is out-pacing our restoration/protection efforts. Several members of the subcommittee noted that the topic of regulatory harmonization/inefficiency is very broad and it would be helpful to be more specific about the land use related issues that need to be addressed.

- **Drivers for Change** – Jessica reviewed the change drivers with the group, noting that most of that information was derived from a survey that was sent to the IC back in October 2016. The change drivers are summarized below:
  - Process and planning heavy
  - Signs of integration within established watershed groups
  - Meeting redundancy
  - Competition rather than support
  - Lack of funding for implementation
  - Lack of elected official engagement

- Not effective

The group had the following observations related to the drivers for change:

- The planning effort curtailed work towards the LIO's mission
- There was a lack of buy-in on regulatory land use changes, partially related to a lack of understanding about the specific issues related to land use regulations
- The focus was too broad
- Communication is needed on all levels (top down and bottom up) to achieve political will
- The effort is in need of incentives and/or sanctions to mandate actions for a sense of legitimacy

The Snohomish Co-Lead Entity Coordinator noted that there are other ways to look at LIOs that involve catalyzing on positive attributes.

### 3. Goals and Requirements

- **Synthesis**
  - i. *Basic LIO Functions*: Jessica reviewed the basic functions of the LIO, which are outlined in our bylaws and capacity grant. The group noted a saying: "When the going gets tough, the tough get planning." The saying implies that we should have a critical eye over the amount of energy and time we spend on planning in the future.
  - ii. *Role of the Committees*: Jessica reviewed the role of the IC and EC as outlined in the bylaws. The committees are experiencing planning fatigue. The IC has been a planning body for since the inception of the LIO and isn't actually implementing anything beyond ranking the NTAs. Communication, education and outreach are needed to communicate the work being implemented in both watersheds.
  - iii. *Added Value*: The LIO can add value by inserting the local perspective into regional priority setting for the Action Agenda, breaking down siloes, directing regional funding toward local priorities, and being more effective at integrating actions to achieve local benefits. Going forward, we should ask the following questions: 1) What is the unique contribution of the LIO? and 2) Does the LIO break down siloes in a way that is meaningful? Additionally, funding sources can be a driver for siloes. There are even siloes within organizations (size being a contributing factor). The LIO can create opportunities for internal and external coordination.
- **2017 Vision/Mission** – Jessica reviewed the draft 2017 vision and objectives that were developed based on a review of the basic LIO functions, role of the Committees, and added value. The draft vision statement, with revisions, is copied below.

*"Implement priority actions, identify additional actions to address gaps, and continue to integrate additional goals and priorities (local and regional) that have been identified in the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan."*

The vision is consistent with Sheida Sahandy and Peter Murchie's comments at the September 2016 LIO EC meeting, with feedback from the IC, and with the focus of the 2018 Action Agenda update. This vision is guided by the following organizational principles:

- Use existing structures where available and avoid duplicative processes;
- Add value and clearly enhance capacities to implement the Action Agenda;
- Be sensitive to staff time/resources and to redirecting efforts from other actions;
- Have clear purpose, benefits, and deliverables;
- Ensure time commitments are commensurate with potential benefit; and
- Remain flexible and responsive to member and stakeholder interests.

The group wanted to add the following to the objectives: accelerate recovery, communicate to stakeholders, and local representation at the state level. **The group decided to circulate the draft Vision, with refinements, to the rest of the LIO IC to confirm agreement.**

The draft objectives, with requested refinements are copied below:

- Be more strategic about targeting existing funding opportunities
  - Communicate our goals and priorities to stakeholders and decision-makers with the goal of bringing more resources to the LIO
  - Accelerate implementation of our recovery strategies
  - Examine alternative structure models that integrate the LIO with other watershed forums and state agencies
- 
- **Goal Categories** – Jessica reviewed the primary goal categories that were developed based on the surveys, basic LIO functions, as well as the draft vision and objectives, and the gaps and barriers to implementation. Jessica noted that most of the strategies across the two Salmon Recovery LEs had a high degree of overlap with the LIO recovery strategies. The salmon recovery strategies were presented in a higher level of detail than corresponding LIO strategies, but still could be nested within the LIO strategy intent. The most notable, and expected, finding was that the LIO covered several topics outside of the LE purview including on-site septic system management, non-point source pollution identification, and stormwater retrofits. These correspond to issues and impacts largely outside of the 2005 salmon recovery approach, including shellfish and stormwater.

The four primary categories of goals (with revisions) are listed below, along with a summary of actions.

- Strategic Implementation
  - i. Action Agenda/Local priority setting (**required**)
  - ii. Implementation Strategy alignment with LIO recovery strategies (NTAs)
  - iii. Funding Strategy development & grow local sources (gap/barrier)
  - iv. Implementation of strategic capital and operational changes necessary to improve Puget Sound Vital Signs (NTAs)
- Integrated Planning
  - i. Approval of Final Recovery Plan (**required**)
  - ii. Bylaw review and elections (**required**)
  - iii. Review gaps and barriers table (**required**)
  - iv. Integrated planning case studies (supports NTA development)
  - v. Integrated monitoring indicators (effectiveness monitoring correlates with implementation)
- Vital Sign Integration
  - i. High priority Vital Sign sequencing (barrier)
  - ii. Goal setting for floodplains, summer stream flows, shoreline armouring, marine water quality, shellfish beds, and toxics in fish (gap)
  - iii. NTA gap analysis (gap)
  - iv. Setting/aligning stormwater goals (gap)
  - v. Integrated monitoring-common indicators (gap)
- Education and Outreach
  - i. Ensuring behaviour change results (supports NTA development)
  - ii. Regional evaluation of bi-annual sound stewardship practices (NTAs)
  - iii. Implementation strategy alignment (supports NTA development)

- **Relationship to Structure and Guiding Questions** – The draft vision, objectives, and goal categories are the foundation of the organizational structure. The group can begin setting the criteria for the organizational structure. Some guiding questions are: 1) What are the missing elements needed to accommodate our vision, goals, and objectives? 2) How can the IC be restructured to focus on specific implementation areas?

The gaps appear to correlate with the work that other groups are doing towards the LIO goals. Education and Outreach to stakeholders and broad communication is missing. The level of effort is a topic that necessitates further discussion.

In order to explore the opportunities for integration within existing watershed groups, the group agreed to refine the guiding questions that would set the stage for that discussion. It is important for existing watershed groups to understand the basic functions of an LIO before we can explore opportunities for integration within the organizational structure.

**4. Organizational Alternatives**-tabled until next meeting.

**5. Action Items and Next Steps**

- Unpack the proposed survey questions, remove Question 3, and provide more background information for those not familiar with the LIO. Then send it to Stillaguamish and Snohomish Lead Entity groups.
- Postpone pilot combined meeting with the WRIAs for now.
- Circulate draft vision and objectives to LIO IC for review and comment at 4/20 IC meeting.
- Look at the model organizational structures from other LIOs.
- Ask the WRIAs for ideas on outreach and communication.
- Send Doodle Poll to schedule next subcommittee meeting (late April/early May).
- Schedule informational meeting with SWC so they can learn about the LIO.

**6. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held sometime in late April/early May. A Doodle Poll will be sent out to schedule the next meeting.