

Topics for the LIO Executive Committee’s Discussion with PSP and EPA

September 27, 2018

Executive Committee members please review. We will follow the general structure of the topics below, starting with the LIO structure, but will not be going question by question in the meeting in an effort to have a free-flowing discussion. As we may not get to all the questions in this document, please pre-identify the questions that are most important to you to make sure those get answered.

TOPIC	SUBTOPICS
LIO STRUCTURE & VISION	<p data-bbox="440 489 943 520"><u>Level of Integration with Lead Entities (LE)</u></p> <p data-bbox="440 522 1455 905">The LIO has had continued concerns that pairing the Stillaguamish and Snohomish basins is inappropriate, given the differing cultures, vision, and characteristics of the two large watersheds. The Salmon Recovery LE efforts are divided by basin, and participants have noted that there may be opportunity to split the LIO into two separate entities and simply add stormwater and water quality strategies onto the widely supported salmon recovery plans. In 2016, we embarked on a year-long effort to respond to stakeholder concerns about our organizational structure. We have achieved an interim approach that fully integrates the LIO and LE in the Stillaguamish Basin. Questions remain about whether this approach is a good long-term alternative in the Stillaguamish as well as whether this approach is suitable for the Snohomish Basin.</p> <ul data-bbox="488 913 1446 1482" style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you share examples of other LIOs engaged in conversations about their structure (i.e. the Puyallup Watershed Council request to be a newly formed LIO)? • What are the benefits/added value Lead Entities are seeing that encourages them to take on additional functions (i.e. NTAs)? • If the LIO becomes part of the Lead Entity structure (i.e. form two separate LIOs), can you please articulate any implications that we should be aware of during our discussions? • Are there organizational pitfalls that would not be supported by PSP or EPA? • If a new LIO is formed in the Stillaguamish, will they be required to create a new Ecosystem Recovery Plan? • Understanding the watershed proviso recommendations, as well as the effort at the Partnership to establish an LE/LIO integration staff lead and the inclusion of LE/LIO collaboration within the Coordinator scopes of work, can you please provide an overview of where the LE/LIO integration effort is headed? <p data-bbox="440 1491 906 1522"><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO Feedback</u></p> <ul data-bbox="488 1530 1455 1875" style="list-style-type: none"> • The LIO has revised the operating structure to have the Stillaguamish Watershed Council serve as the Implementation Committee for the Stillaguamish basin. Preliminary reports from representatives are: integration hasn’t diluted the salmon recovery mission/focus, reductions in redundancy, reductions in meetings for stakeholders, complementary efforts between NTAs and SRFB projects, enhances the diversity of interest and expands SWC membership expertise. • Some concerns from LE partners are that the process requirements would be such that it would detract from the existing focus on salmon recovery efforts.

Topics for the LIO Executive Committee’s Discussion with PSP and EPA

September 27, 2018

Executive Committee members please review. We will follow the general structure of the topics below, starting with the LIO structure, but will not be going question by question in the meeting in an effort to have a free-flowing discussion. As we may not get to all the questions in this document, please pre-identify the questions that are most important to you to make sure those get answered.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criteria for an effective Sno-Stilly LIO structure are: efficiency, broad expertise, leadership, collaborative implementation, continuity. We would like to have a common understanding of any structural/organizational requirements prior to solidifying recommendations for alterations to the existing structure. • We would like to explore the implications of alternative structures so members better understand the implications of a given decision (see questions above).
<p>COLLABORATIVE DECISION-MAKING AND ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY COMMUNICATIONS</p>	<p><u>Ecosystem Recovery Communications</u> Communications with the public, especially private landowners, is a regional and local priority. There are ongoing efforts to better communicate both the scope of the problem we face as well as our efforts to be part of the recovery solutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can you describe regional efforts around communicating priorities to various audiences and how the LIO might provide input/assist with that effort?</i> • <i>Can you describe efforts to fund private landowner participation? How are NTAs that address communications/outreach and/or behavior change being prioritized for funding?</i> <p><u>Collaborative Decision-making & Engagement</u> Many of our Committee members participate in the SIATs, reviewed regional NTAs, and the Coordinator holds the LIO seat on the Action Agenda Coordination Group. Many of our Committee members also engage in Implementation Strategy development and attend the various PSP Board meetings (i.e. ECB, SRC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are there improvements we can make to how we engage regionally?</i> • <i>Are there other opportunities we haven’t taken advantage of?</i> • <i>How can this group accelerate Puget Sound recovery beyond NTAs?</i> <p><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to make progress towards recovery targets, private landowners (the public) needs to be better integrated into the planning/adaptive management, as well as project development, processes. The public/private landowners need to understand the scope of the problem (why they should care?) and how they are part of the solution (i.e. what we need from them and how it benefits them to be involved).
<p>ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY PLAN & FUNDING PRIORITIES</p>	<p><u>Addressing Gaps and Barriers to Progress</u> In addition to a robust list of local gaps and barriers, the Plan highlights areas where regional actions are needed to support local efforts. Those are: inconsistent and more nimble funding, monitoring (status and trends as well as funding for monitoring), and regulatory inconsistency/inefficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you describe efforts at the regional level to create more “consistent and nimble funding”? • Given that funding for monitoring is highlighted as a common LIO/LE gap, can you describe how monitoring NTAs will be prioritized for funding? • Can you describe regional efforts to develop a funding strategy or otherwise mobilize funding?

Topics for the LIO Executive Committee's Discussion with PSP and EPA

September 27, 2018

Executive Committee members please review. We will follow the general structure of the topics below, starting with the LIO structure, but will not be going question by question in the meeting in an effort to have a free-flowing discussion. As we may not get to all the questions in this document, please pre-identify the questions that are most important to you to make sure those get answered.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• For NEP funds, can you provide any details about the amount and timing of release? If not, can you describe the challenges that impede transparency of this funding source?• Can you provide an update on the Common Indicators associated with Chinook recovery (or other sets of common indicators)?• Can you any ongoing regional efforts to evaluate regulatory consistency and efficiency? How are NTAs evaluating regulatory consistency/efficiency being prioritized? <p><u>Relationship to Implementation Strategies & Long-term significance</u> The LIO Committees have worked hard on recovery planning and on the plan itself, and would like to be assured that it will support local NTAs. It is encouraging to see that the LIO priorities were included in the 2018-2022 Action Agenda Regional Priorities. However, there is a disconnect between regional planning and implementation leading to uncertainty about how regional Implementation Strategies influence actions at the local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Can you please update the group on how the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plans are contributing to regional planning and/or being used at the regional level?</i>• <i>How will the LIO Plan content be better integrated during the next NTA solicitation/Action Agenda Update?</i>• <i>How are implementation strategies being used regionally? How should Implementation Strategies be used at the local level? Is there an opportunity to combine regional and local efforts to accelerate progress toward implementing the goals of these strategies?</i>• <i>Given the effort that has gone into utilization of Miradi for a common framework (i.e. M&AM), can you please provide an update on how Miradi outputs are being used at the regional level to create a common framework?</i> <p><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both LIO members and M&AM project participants noted concern that the regional vision on how products would be used was neither well developed nor oriented toward the longer term (beyond the next funding cycle). Recent planning has involved a significant amount of effort, but there is considerable uncertainty about next steps and the actual impact of the planning efforts. This was a disincentive for engagement on behalf of organizations and elected officials because there was skepticism that the products would meaningfully affect funding or local priorities. As such, there is less local motivation to orient actions toward the regional recovery goals.• Both the LIO and LEs struggled with the lack of regional guidance around specific metrics and protocols that should be used to ensure consistency across watersheds. The need for regional guidance is important, as there are many different entities collecting data (e.g., Snohomish County, King County, Tulalip Tribes, and Snohomish Conservation District). This need is also important because the metrics are the basis for goal statements.
--	--

Topics for the LIO Executive Committee's Discussion with PSP and EPA

September 27, 2018

Executive Committee members please review. We will follow the general structure of the topics below, starting with the LIO structure, but will not be going question by question in the meeting in an effort to have a free-flowing discussion. As we may not get to all the questions in this document, please pre-identify the questions that are most important to you to make sure those get answered.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status and trends information is currently available for eelgrass, estuaries, floodplains, and land development and cover. By June 2017, there will be additional information available for shoreline armoring and freshwater quality (the Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity). Where possible, the LIO should use a scaled-down version of this information to track local Vital Signs. Currently, there is not a close enough connection between the Implementation Strategies and individual LIOs.• There are frequent questions about the amount and timing of awards. Many LIO members and stakeholders feel like there is not a lot of transparency related to the timing and amount of EPA funding.• The other gap associated with monitoring is funding. Currently, there are varying levels of support being provided to monitoring across both watersheds. This results in limited data-rich areas but an inability to report consistently across the entire LIO. Often, monitoring does not appear to be a top priority for funding.• As we have just finalized the Plan in 2017 (last year), we would like to keep Plan updates to a minimum and focus on strategies to fund the robust body of NTAs that have been proposed within the LIO.• Although the LIO Plan content was included in an appendix along with the Action Agenda regional priorities, it was clear that many NTA owners neither referenced the LIO Plan consistency/alignment nor understood the relationship between the regional priority approaches and the LIO Plan consistency.
--	---