

## Snohomish-Stillaguamish Local Integrating Organization (LIO) 2016 Survey Responses – Implementation Committee

Total number of responders = 14

**1. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.\***

**a. The objectives of the LIO have been clearly communicated to me.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
0%	50%	21%	21%	7%

**b. The role of the LIO Implementation Committee (IC) is well-defined.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
0%	29%	36%	29%	7%

**c. The role of the LIO Executive Committee (EC) is well-defined.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
0%	21%	43%	29%	7%

**d. Most of the topics covered in meetings are relevant to the stakeholders I represent.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15%	31%	31%	15%	8%

*\*Due to rounding, percentages will not always total 100%.*

**2. Comments on statements [#1a-d] above**

- While the goals and objectives of the LIO is clear, the process by which we seem to be trying to get there is rather convoluted.
- Newly appointed
- The role of the LIO's as defined is not what is occurring. The group does not include decision makers addressing controversial challenges faced in the recovery of Puget Sound.

**3. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.\***

**a. I receive enough information on important topics to prepare me for meeting discussions.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8%	50%	17%	25%	0%

**b. I feel that my participation in the LIO allows me to meaningfully contribute to ecosystem recovery efforts.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
0%	38%	23%	38%	0%

**c. The IC and EC adequately represent the stakeholder groups that need to be involved in the LIO.**

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
0%	46%	31%	15%	8%

*\*Due to rounding, percentages will not always total 100%.*

**4. If you somewhat or strongly disagreed with statement [#3c] above, which additional stakeholder group(s) do you think should be invited to participate in the LIO?**

- All Federally-recognized Tribes with Reservations within the boundaries of an LIO's geographical area should be represented on both the IC & the EC; this should be supported by all LIO partners and members (including PSP which uses Federal dollars to run its programs), and LIO members should not simply defer to former EC chairperson's statement that, "It's up to the Tribes to work that out," essentially locking out the Tribe in question (Snoqualmie Indian Tribe).
- Need to include more cities in the IC and EC. Right now, only Arlington and Stanwood participate. A separate meeting with city representatives to discuss the LIO objectives would be helpful.
- In regards to [#3b] and [#3c] the LIO adds more meetings that take away from local coordination at a basin level with staff limited stakeholders that need the greatest levels of support to implement actions.

**5. The LIO committees meet:**

Too frequently = 27%

About the right number of times = 64%

Not often enough = 9%

**6. The time allotted for discussion during meetings has been:**

Too little = 25%

About right = 50%

More than necessary = 25%

**7. The e-mails that I receive from LIO Support Staff are:**

Informative = 77%

Not all that informative = 8%

Longer than necessary = 15%

### **Comments on question #7 above**

- not informative and longer than necessary
- Almost too much information!

### **8. The LIO web page is (check all that apply):**

Useful = 23%

Not all that useful = 8%

Difficult to access = 8%

Something I rarely/never use = 77%

### **9. What goals do you hope to achieve for the stakeholder group you represent by participating in the Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO?**

- Meaningful progress toward salmon recovery goals, e.g. getting on track with the 2005 Salmon Recovery Plan targets.
- Coordination and interaction with partners, project funding
- More participation/involvement from local governments
- Provide funding for proposals (NTA's) that best help achieve the three Puget Sound Strategic Initiatives, and the objectives and focus on Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO 5-Year Ecosystem Recovery Plan-First Elements priority vital signs for these watersheds
- Well integrated and coordinated projects that improve habitat and environmental conditions.
- Get fast and robust support, either financial or legislative, for the action items we submit that are targeted for the recovery of Puget Sound
- Clearly articulate the actions necessary to support PS recovery. Secure funding to support the implementation of projects and NTAs. Coordination of actions and activities.
- Promote organized discussion of watershed problems, prioritize them, promote coordination and overlap, try and figure out and guide where the whole LIO process is going
- To prevent the extinction of wild salmon

### **10. Do you have any suggestions for how the LIO could be more efficient and effective?**

- Clearer, expedited route toward funding projects and accelerating progress towards PS recovery; less convoluted process for developing and vetting projects (e.g. the NTA instructions have been harder to read and understand than necessary; not all aspects of the process clear on how they contribute to evaluation).
- I am not sure what "problem" the LIO process is solving. It seems to be a lot of extra work without a clearly defined reason. The extensiveness of the process puts a significant financial burden on our nonprofit since any time spent attending meetings and submitting NTAs is unfunded time. If I knew at the outset of this process how much time it would take that we do not have grant funding for our organization may have opted to not participate.
- Additional discussions on the relationship of the LIO with the watershed groups, FbD, SLS, and the PSP's Action Agenda.
- I think the work would be better coordinated at a Basin Level as our LIO is too large and diverse to work together as a community with common purpose. The reality is we only have one elected official that regularly participates, and that representative is from a City. Additional elected officials could provide direct benefit to their constituents and may choose to participate if

working at the more localized level. The focus should be supporting grassroots level action requests that need greater community coordination and support.

- Once we move to the next phase, it will be great to really dig into priority actions and strategies to implement them.
- Need more guidance from PSP and EPA.
- Email with clear messages