

Topics for the LIO Implementation Committee's Discussion with the SI Leads

(DFW, DNR, ECY, and DOH)

January 5, 2016

The goal is to have a free-flowing discussion between the Committee and the SI Leads. The topics and subtopics below merely represent possible discussion topics as well as questions/comments that have been raised by Committee members. As the agenda shows, there should be sufficient time to cover items other than the topics listed below.

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. We understand that EPA makes decisions on allocations. Where possible, we would appreciate any information you have related to the following question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>An allocation formula based on critical regional factors and weightings for each strategic initiative would help justify a lack of geographic parity and may ultimately serve the purpose of ecosystem recovery better than the current competitive approach or simply allocating equal amounts to each LIO.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Effect on Regional Coordination for 2018 Action Agenda Update</u>                      Regional NTAs were submitted independently of local NTAs. This resulted in a substantial award going to areas that do not have an LIO as well as duplication of effort for NTA owners submitting to the region and the LIO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How will SI leads assure that organizations receiving funding will be coordinating their efforts with LIOs, where actions are implemented?</i></li> <li>• <i>Brainstorm ways SI Leads and SIATs can ensure that LIOs are rewarded for their participation in the process.</i></li> <li>• <i>Will there be a local and regional solicitation?</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It was great to see more NEP funds go to funding NTAs submitted through the LIO. However, we would like to see more funding come directly to the LIO. We recommend an allocation formula or a higher amount that would allow us to more easily compare projects across 3 strategic initiatives.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>
<p>STREAMLINE SOLICITATION PROCESSES/COORDINATION</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"> <li>• <i>How do you plan to use the current list of 2016 NTAs that have been provided by the LIOs (many of which have not been funded)?</i></li> <li>• <i>Can the unfunded NTA's be considered for future NEP funds? Can unfunded NTAs be repackaged to respond to a focused solicitation intended to fill critical regional gaps?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will the 2016 solicitation process be repeated for 2018? If not, can you talk about some proposed changes to the 2018 solicitation process?</i></li> <li>• <i>Do you have a plan for streamlining the future 2018 NTA development process or is that dictated by EPA?</i></li> <li>• <i>What processes do you feel are duplicative of other efforts and which processes provide the best results on the ground?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is there a proposal to do a simple RFP process based on Action Agenda criteria?</i></li> </ul>

Topics for the LIO Implementation Committee’s Discussion with the SI Leads

(DFW, DNR, ECY, and DOH)

January 5, 2016

	<p><u>Regional-Local Feedback Loop</u></p> <p>The scoring and ranking criteria seemed to change at different points throughout the process, resulting in frustration and confusion. Based on feedback that was provided to NTA owners, it was clear that the SIATs did not always understand local conditions and mischaracterized the current conditions and/or trends associated with local areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will there be LIO Committee members represented on future SIATs?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is there an opportunity for a local-regional feedback loop as NTAs are being reviewed?</i></li> <li>• <i>What role will the LIOs play in the 2018 NTA solicitation process?</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to see greater clarity/consistency on the criteria by which NTAs are ranked. We would like to see the 2018 NTA submittal process clearly defined from the start.</li> <li>• We suggest establishing a regional/local feedback loop to help ensure regional priorities include local priorities and vice versa.</li> <li>• We suggest LIO Committee members be invited to participate on future SIATs.</li> <li>• We suggest streamlining the solicitation process such that NTA owners only have to apply once, either through the region or the LIO. Consistency with the LIO 5-Year Ecosystem Recovery Plan is critical for actions occurring in an LIO.</li> </ul>
<p>ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY PLAN</p>	<p><u>Long-term significance</u></p> <p>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. We are developing a funding strategy for our LIO in order to more strategically target existing funding sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Do you have any recommendations/suggestions for funding strategy development?</i></li> <li>• <i>How do you see the LIO Ecosystem Recovery Plans contributing to or being used at the regional level (i.e. by the SIAT/SI Leads)?</i></li> <li>• <i>How would the LIO’s like the Plans to be used?</i></li> <li>• <i>How can the LIO Recovery Plans best integrate work going on at the regional level?</i></li> <li>• <i>Do the SI Leads or SIATs plan to review the Recovery Plans? If so, do they intend to provide us with feedback that could strengthen the Plan?</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO feedback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to ensure our funding strategy is broad and focused on addressing both regional and local priorities. We welcome feedback from the SI Leads on how best to accomplish that goal.</li> <li>• We would like to assure our LIO Plan integrates regional goals and priorities as they are developed. We are also interested in helping to develop those regional goals and priorities so that they include our local priorities as well.</li> </ul>

Thank you for visiting the Snohomish-Stillaguamish LIO Implementation Committee!