

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

September 1, 2016

TOPIC	SUBTOPICS
<p>FUTURE FUNDING MODEL</p>	<p><u>Allocations</u> Improving our ecosystem is all about doing the right projects. \$100K/LIO does not cover many projects. \$5 million per Strategic Initiative might not be the optimal allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will these funding allocations be subject to change in 2017? If so, can you tell us how that will be determined? This can determine how we prioritize future NTAs.</i> <p><u>Effect on Regional Coordination</u> Regional NTAs were submitted independently of local NTAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How will EPA and SI leads assure that organizations receiving funding will be coordinating their efforts with LIOs, where actions are implemented?</i> <p><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to see more money devoted to implementing projects. • We would like to be assured that local NTAs will be supported and funded, which will drive local participation and progress in recovery.
<p>STREAMLINE PROCESSES</p>	<p><u>Limited resources for participation (staff time, etc.)</u> Many LIO participants were already participating in other environmental planning processes, and the additional work undertaken to develop the 2016 NTAs and contribute to the ecosystem recovery planning was more than their respective organizations can sustain. This is particularly an issue for the smaller organizations, some of which have dropped out of the LIO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do you have a plan for streamlining the future 2018 NTA development process?</i> <p><u>Opportunity costs</u> The intensity of this local ecosystem recovery planning and NTA development processes have resulted in a delay of the regional Monitoring and Adaptive Management programs. Prioritization of the weaknesses in our ecological systems is based on accurate data, so we need up-to-date information on whether or not what we are doing is or isn’t working, and what else we need to focus on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will monitoring and adaptive management be incorporated as a required element of the Ecosystem Recovery Plan?</i> <p><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to see greater clarity on Final Ecosystem Recovery Plan expectations. • We would like to see the 2018 NTA submittal process clearly defined from the start. • We would like to retain the capacity to devote a consistent, on-going level of effort toward Monitoring and Adaptive Management (MAM). We understand the importance of MAM to inform future strategies; however, adequate funding and capacity are required.
<p>ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY PLAN</p>	<p><u>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How do you see the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plans contributing to or being used at the regional level?</i> • <i>What other funding agencies will use this plan?</i> <p><u>Continued relevance will depend on regular plan updates.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will LIOs be required to update these plans, and if so, when will that planning process begin?</i> <p><u>Snohomish Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the complexities of the process, the aggressive project schedule and participants’ limited time, the LIO has not been able to conduct an analysis that would help us achieve the level of detail and understanding needed to advance recovery.