

Topic: LIO evaluation of structure and effectiveness - *Continuation from last meeting*

Background:

In November of 2016, representatives from the Stillaguamish and Tulalip Tribes, Puget Sound Partnership (PSP or Partnership) King County, Snohomish County, non-governmental organizations, and the watershed groups (Snoqualmie Forum, Snohomish Forum, and the Stillaguamish Watershed Council) met with Snohomish County Executive, Dave Somers, to discuss the issues surrounding the organizational structure of the LIO. The specific issue discussed was whether or not to split the LIO by watershed boundary as opposed to the current combined approach.

Advocates of splitting the LIO feel strongly that a split will increase implementation effectiveness as the existing watershed body is equipped (or could be equipped) to address other ecosystem components through a salmon recovery lens. Other representatives expressed concern that splitting the LIO would reduce coordination between the two watersheds and are concerned about a proposal to fold the LIO into existing watershed structures (primarily, the Snohomish Forum and the SWC) diluting the salmon recovery focus. At the November meeting, all representatives agreed to evaluate the organizational structure of the LIO over the next year to come up with a recommendation.

The LIO Activities/Structure Subcommittee was formed in the beginning of 2017. The subcommittee includes representatives from the Stillaguamish and Tulalip Tribes, Puget Sound Partnership (PSP or Partnership) King County, Snohomish County, WSU Extension, and the watershed groups (Snoqualmie Forum, Snohomish Forum, and the Stillaguamish Watershed Council). The subcommittee has met three times. Initial meetings were focused on development of a draft vision, objectives, and goal categories to be presented to the Implementation Committee (IC). These informed the workplan that was approved by the IC (refer to the *Vision and Workplan* Briefing Document).

For Discussion (Seeking feedback to share with the IC as they review the alternatives):

Draft Criteria and Interim Approach Proposal

- The May subcommittee meeting was focused on review and discussion of highlights from other LIOs, refinement of draft criteria for an effective organizational structure, and reviewing organizational structure alternatives with that criteria in mind.
- The draft criteria are copied below.
 - Broad Expertise
 - Ability to address any aspect of ecosystem recovery.
 - Leadership
 - Broadly involves and engages leadership (management and elected officials) at the local level.
 - Collaborative Implementation
 - Regional and local feedback and support loops (federal, state, and local).
 - Continuity
 - People and Spatial attributes: membership adaptable over time and independent of geographic boundary.
 - Efficiency
 - Commiserate level of input relative to anticipated outcomes/goals.
- The subcommittee found it challenging to recommend removal of certain alternatives without vetting the full suite of alternatives within their respective groups. They recommended using tiers to prioritize the alternatives.
- There was also discussion around adding the draft interim approach proposal to the tiered set of alternatives.
- Members of the subcommittee are vetting these alternatives with their respective organizations over the next few months.
- The subcommittee will meet again in August. The next step is to test a couple of alternatives and continue to engage the LIO and Lead Entity Committees. We will also explore a staff recommendation.