

**Snohomish-Stillaguamish Local Integrating Organization**  
**Snohomish Implementation Committee Meeting**

Thursday, May 31, 2018, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Snohomish County, Drewel Building, First Floor, Public Meeting Room

**LIO-IC Members**

Ryan Williams, Snohomish Conservation District  
Valerie Streeter, Tulalip Tribes  
Karen Stewart, City of Everett  
Perry Falcone, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum  
Terri Strandberg, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
Joseph Old Elk, Snoqualmie Tribe

**Participants**

Elisa Dawson, Snohomish County Surface Water Management  
Erin Murray, PSP

**LIO Support Staff**

Jessica Hamill, Snohomish County SWM, LIO Coordinator  
Kit Crump, Snohomish County SWM, Stillaguamish LE Coordinator  
Alexa Ramos-Cummings, Snohomish County SWM

**1. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements**

Perry Falcone, one of the Co-Chairs, opened the meeting. The LIO Coordinator reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to request changes to the 3/14 meeting notes. No changes were requested and the notes were approved by consensus.

LIO Business

The Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator (ERC) provided regional updates:

- The 2-day NTA scoring retreat is to be held in early June. Some of our members are attending as reviewers. Final scores are expected by July. August 1<sup>st</sup> the procedural records will be published and the window to appeal scoring opens.
- There was a call for nominations to the Ecosystem Recovery Board. Ron Wesen, Skagit County Commissioner, was nominated to stay in his role. Bill Blake, Skagit Conservation District Manager, is the listed alternate. As Skagit doesn't have an LIO, there is some concern about LIO representation/priorities. The seat is normally held by an elected official. The ERC will keep us updated as this progresses.

**2. NTA Reflection**

The NTA Roll-Up was reviewed. A larger allocation to the Habitat Strategic Initiative is being considered due to the large amount of NTAs that are proposed in that category (high demand). There was a roundtable discussion about this round's solicitation process. Some members of the Stillaguamish Watershed Council felt that there were alignment issues with the Regional Priorities and a lack of sponsor knowledge about the regional priorities intent. There was also overlap and

redundancy among the Regional Priorities. There was an overwhelming number of Chinook priorities that seemed to be addressing issues related to a different strategic initiative or an aspect that wasn't being solicited (i.e. low flows) within the regional priorities. They also felt that there should have been a weighting to the criteria (1. Recovery 2. Alignment 3. Technical 4. Human). Several reviewers noted that there wasn't enough information provided to conduct a thorough assessment, hence why there was a large number of NTAs falling into Tiers 3 and 4. In lieu of tiering, a simple "in or out" of the Action Agenda determination would have been more appropriate. A thorough review against criteria might be better for funding decisions.

Others suggested that an example of a "Tier 4" project to refer to would have been helpful for NTA owners preparing proposals as well as reviewers trying to distinguish between a 3 and 4. A Committee member mentioned a lack of shellfish and stormwater NTAs was disappointing and we should take a more strategic approach to that in the future. The submittal tool itself was seen to be much more user-friendly this year. Another member acknowledged that our majority of NTAs falling into the 3 and 4 tiers isn't a bad thing since we are competing for regional funding. However, there seemed to be a pattern of capital projects receiving Tier 4 scores. This highlights the general bias towards projects that move dirt. It would be nice to find a way to elevate programmatic actions since NEP funding is flexible enough to be used for programmatic actions rather than fund capital work. Others also felt that it would be better to have more than 3 reviewers' eyes on each project. Another member commented that monitoring work is not being elevated; there is no good Regional Priority alignment for that work. The group agreed that they'd be in favor of locals having 100% of the scoring/decision-making and/or more than \$100K to allocate. If this process is only happening every four years, there was agreement that the LIO wants to continue to participate despite the time and effort needed to participate.

Now that there are two, basin-specific implementing bodies of the LIO, we agreed to alternate local funding awards annually by basin, but allow ourselves flexibility to fund cross-basin projects or multiple phases of an effort. The Snohomish basin received the last couple of awards so it would be fair to give the next one to the Stillaguamish. The group supported this idea.

### **3. Criteria for NEP Direct Award**

EPA is encouraging LIOs to select only 1 NTA to fund with the local award. If necessary, we could look into subcontracting to accommodate the request. The SI Leads are also considering funding outside of their Strategic Initiative. Allocating more funding to the Habitat SI is also being considered due to the large number of NTAs proposed.

If we select non-capital projects to prioritize then we'll need to provide more clarity about what is a "non-capital" action. Timing of projects could be a factor too. Also might want to consider whether there are other easily accessed sources of funding that would be a better fit. We could look at our gaps, including education and outreach. Jessica will draft and send out for review.

### **4. Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Projects**

In response to the Hirst Decision, ESSB 6091 calls for Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plans. WRIA 7's is due in 2021. There will be an RFP released in the Fall for \$15 M to support projects that mitigate for groundwater withdrawals.

### **5. Human Well-Being Integration**

The LIO Coordinator and OSU project leads gave an overview of the project to integrate human well-being and ecosystem services valuations into project implementation. Participation would include evaluating our current integration, creating and implementing tools to better integrate, and then re-evaluating how we integrate those aspects. The Executive Committee was supportive although they did voice some concerns and wanted to check-in on progress. The project lead explained the exercise will simply provide data that we can apply to decision making criteria however we want to apply this.

**6. Wrap-up**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.