

# South Central Action Area Caucus Group Caucus Meeting

Wednesday, November 6, 2019

10:30 AM – 1:45 PM

Tukwila Community Center – Executive Conference Room

12424 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, Tukwila, WA 98168

## AGENDA

---

### Meeting Purposes:

- Determine NTA selection process or select NTA for \$100,000 direct funding award
- Continue shoreline armoring discussion and alignment with 2020 workplan
- Member updates

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead/Action</b>
10:30 – 10:40	Welcome & Introductions	Chair
10:40 – 10:45	Review and Approve Sept 25 Meeting Summary	Chair <i>Decision</i>
10:45 – 11:45	Determine NTA Selection Process	Chair, Janne Kaje, Alexandra Doty <i>Information and discussion</i>
11:45 – 12:00	BREAK	
12:00 – 12:50	Shoreline Armoring Next Steps	Chair, Sydney Fishman (Department of Ecology) <i>Information and discussion</i>
12:50-1:20	2020 Work Plan	Chair <i>Discussion</i>
1:20 – 1:40	Good of the Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PSP updates</li><li>• Member updates</li></ul>	Chair, Janne Kaje, Alexandra Doty, Caucus Members <i>Information and discussion</i>
1:40 – 1:45	Wrap-Up & Adjourn	Chair

# South Central Action Area Caucus Group Meeting Summary

September 25, 2019 | 12:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Tukwila Community Center, 12424 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave S, Tukwila, WA

## Attendees:

### Members and Alternates

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Josh Baldi	King County	Kathy Minsch	City of Seattle
Doug Osterman	WRIA 9	Erika Harris	Puget Sound Regional Council
Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz	WRIA 8		

### Other Attendees

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Ruth Bell	Cascadia Consulting Group	Joe Burcar	Dept. of Ecology
Marie Novak	Cascadia Consulting Group	Maria Sandercock	Dept. of Ecology
Alexandra Doty	Puget Sound Partnership		

## Welcome and Introductions

Josh Baldi welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Josh introduced Ruth Bell and Caroline Burney who will be taking over LIO coordination and facilitation.

## Review May 2019 Meeting Summary

Members noted the following changes:

- Kevin Buckley is the representative noted on pg. 2 of the May 1 summary rather than Josh.
- “Rural” should be changed to “other” in the second to last bullet under ideas for LIO/EPA coordination on pg. 2.
- Under the first bullet under member updates, wording should be changed to “they would like to consider the entire jurisdiction be included in WRIA 9...” and would like Doug to assess “budget” impacts and cost “shares”.

Josh Baldi moved to approve the updated meeting summary, Kathy Minsch seconded, and all approved. The May meeting summary was approved as amended.

## LIO/EPA Engagement Update

Alexandra Doty provided an update on a memo from LIO Coordinators presented at the 8/15 ECB meeting requesting ECB support to advance a joint proposal to the Leadership Council to:

- Elevate the status of LIOs to enable greater influence/input in the Action Agenda
- Provide more capacity support
- Revise funding model to reflect 2014 proposal (similar to SRFB model with 70% watershed/30% regional funding split)

Members discussed the memo and shared that additional funding may not be necessary to address issues with LIO capacity. For example, King County is interested in leveraging connections between funding sources and regional recovery initiatives, such as land conservation.

Members discussed how to better integrate ongoing programs, such as streamflow, stormwater, and land acquisition. Several members shared the importance of EPA awareness of ongoing efforts, including salmon recovery, and breaking down the siloed nature of programs.

PSP is organizing a meeting for LIO leadership, EPA staff, and PSP staff to discuss the NEP funding model and LIO engagement on December 12. **Members should provide additional feedback on the NEP funding model to Ruth Bell and Josh Baldi in advance of the December 12 meeting.**

### 2019 NTA Selection Process

Marie reviewed the 2018 NTA direct selection process to provide context for this year's selection process. The LIO must submit their top three ranked NTAs to relevant Strategic Initiative leads by December 2. Josh presented several potential options for the NTA selection process:

- Select next unfunded project from the LIO's 2018 ranked list
- Solicit new committee of volunteers to re-review and rank NTAs
- Offer PWR-LIO the opportunity to select 2019 NTA

Several members expressed an interest in reviewing unfunded projects from last year's ranked list but not revisiting the full process to review and rank NTAs. Last year, some members expressed interest in revisiting the NTA Selection process. Members will finalize the selection process at the Nov. 6 LIO meeting.

### LIO Performance Measurement Integration & Work Plan

Alexandra shared updates on the Indicator Revision Project and the October 10 Vital Signs Revision Workshop. Members discussed how the LIO can integrate with and provide input on PSP's process. Josh discussed how to integrate PSP's updates into the 2020 work plan, including opportunities to engage with Shoreline Armoring and Land & Development Cover Implementation Strategy workplans.

Members discussed other ongoing efforts for potential LIO engagement, including:

- King County's Regional Water Quality Plan
- King County's 30-year Forest Plan
- Dept. of Fish and Wildlife LIDAR Study of Land Cover

### Shoreline Armoring Next Steps

Marie recapped presentations and discussion around Shoreline Armoring from the May 1 LIO meeting deep dive to provide context for continued discussion about opportunities for engaging with ongoing regional and local shoreline armoring work and member interest in prioritizing for the 2020 LIO workplan. Joe Burcar from the Dept. of Ecology discussed current efforts around shoreline armoring:

1. **New capacity to implement Orca Task Force Recommendations and Shoreline Management Act (SMA) Compliance** - Specifically related to shoreline armoring, the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance SEA Program at Ecology is currently recruiting for two shoreline compliance positions (see below). One of which will be dedicated to developing a shoreline armoring compliance and effectiveness program, the other position will be focused on developing a broader compliance program looking at all aspects of shoreline management on a statewide basis. Also, Ecology will soon be recruiting for several technical positions to develop guidance and provide technical assistance related to evaluating the need for hard armoring:

- The [Shoreline Armoring Planning Associate](#) is a new Environmental Planner 3 (in training) position that will be responsible for leading the development of a shoreline armoring compliance and effectiveness program consistent with the Puget Sound Shoreline Armoring Implementation Strategy.
  - The [SMA Compliance Program Planner](#) is a new Environmental Planner 3 Position that will be responsible for leading the development of a statewide Shoreline Management Compliance Program.
  - As Ecology develops the program structure, they are looking to engage with groups like the LIO.
2. **Puget Sound Soft Shoreline Web App** - [Sydney Fishman](#) with Ecology has created a [Soft Shoreline web app](#) that currently showcases over 40 projects (many within King County) and is working with sponsors to add 22 more. This will serve as a repository to highlight Puget Sound projects. Below are additional links to the project mapping tool and other Ecology outreach efforts related to this resource:
- [Link directly to the mapping web tool](#)
  - [Blog post example](#)
  - [Flickr album of before and after photos](#)
  - [Tweet about the tool and blog](#)
3. **Shoreline Stabilization Implementation Research** - Sydney Fishman is also finishing a research project cataloging similarities and differences in how several Puget Sound jurisdictions implement shoreline stabilization regulations in their updated SMPs with regard to handling emergency armoring requests, use of outreach materials, and evaluation of risk.
- The primary purpose of the project is to highlight opportunities for Ecology to best support local implementation of SMPs in alignment with regional priorities, such as the Shoreline Armoring Implementation Strategy.
  - Initial results from the research point to a need to further support education and outreach efforts, improved geotechnical analysis, and focused guidance on “repair”, “replacement”, and “emergency” shoreline stabilization actions.
  - There may also be an opportunity to share implementation success or improvement tips across similar jurisdictions.

**Other Shoreline Armoring Updates:**

- Multi-Agency Review Team (MART) is looking for locations to test barriers. This effort is led by Dept. of Ecology and Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, with commitment from other agencies.
- Comprehensive Plan updates to focus on shoreline stabilization regulations. Jurisdictions in King, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties are wrapping up a review of regulations and evaluating requirements for property owners to consider softer solutions.

Members discussed how the LIO may incorporate shoreline armoring as a part of the 2020 workplan and raised several key questions for future discussion:

- How proactive can the Dept. of Ecology be in requiring jurisdictions to restore nearshore ecosystem functionality in sensitive areas?
- Are there opportunities for ongoing engagement and education with jurisdictions around shoreline regulations, such as pre-application meetings with any development proposed on shoreline to communicate requirements?
- How to measure effectiveness? Net reduction in shoreline armoring?

- Ecology is investing in local partners to develop metrics. They've allocated \$4.5 million for shoreline master planning and are seeking to provide grant funding to local jurisdictions for implementation capacity.
- Are there opportunities to explore synergies across programs, e.g., salmon recovery, shoreline armoring, and habitat restoration?
- Will there be specific trainings for permit staff regarding implementation?
  - Currently trainings happen once a year training and have limited space.
  - Shoreline stabilization implementation research exposed that only a few jurisdictions have planners dedicated to shoreline planning. Typically, planners serve in multiple roles.  
This is a key barrier that could be addressed via additional training, and outreach and engagement from Ecology staff.

Sydney Fishman will present at Nov. 6 LIO meeting to share research findings and continue integration and engagement discussions with LIO.

### **Good of the Order**

#### **PSP Updates**

Alexandra will share updates from the Partnership via email.

#### **Wrap-up & Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm. The next meeting will be November 6 from 10:30 am to 1:45 pm at the Tukwila Community Center.

## South Central LIO NTAs

### 2016 – 2017 Action Agenda

2016 NTAs		
# of local NTAs	<b>80</b>	
Total NTA amount	<b>\$66 million</b>	
# of NTAs funded	Stormwater	9 <i>*7 from SIAT, 2 from LIO</i>
	Habitat	1
	Shellfish	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>
Funding awarded	SIAT	\$2,729,500
	LIO	\$200,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,929,500</b>

### 2018-2022 Action Agenda

2018 NTAs		
# of local NTAs	<b>113</b> <i>*116 submitted, 113 scored by LIO and included in Action Agenda</i>	
By Strategic Initiative (some NTAs selected multiple Vital Signs so there is some overlap)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31 Habitat</li> <li>• 4 Shellfish</li> <li>• 31 Stormwater</li> <li>• 1 Funding</li> <li>• 60 Chinook</li> </ul>	
Total NTA amount	<b>\$372 million</b>	
# of NTAs funded	Stormwater	3 <i>*2 from SIAT, 1 from LIO</i>
	Habitat	1
	Shellfish	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>
Funding awarded	SIAT	\$988,387
	LIO	\$100,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,088,387</b>

### 2016-2017 Action Agenda Funding Awards

#	ID	Title	Owner	Funding Source	Year Funded	Cost	Funded
1	2016-0004	Forbes Creek/North Rose Hill Basin Retrofit Planning	City of Kirkland	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 337,400	\$ 337,400
2	2016-0032	Replicable Model for Depave and LID Retrofits	Pierce Conservation District	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 242,000	\$ 242,000
3	2016-0035	Expand PIC Program and OSS Management in King County	King County	Shellfish SIAT	2017	\$ 500,000	\$ 380,000
4	2016-0099	Roadside Ditch Assessment	King County	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 149,750	\$ 149,750
5	2016-0203	Enhanced Stormwater System Maintenance for Mitigation	City of Tacoma	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000
6	2016-0224	Permeable Pavement Standards and Development	City of Tacoma	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000
7	2016-0255	<b>Phthalates Research for Source Control</b>	<b>Futurewise</b>	<b>South Central LIO</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>\$ 176,900</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>
8	2016-0315	Model Volunteer Program for Oil Spill Response/Assessment	WSU Extension	Habitat SIAT	2017	\$ 56,150	\$ 56,150
9	2016-0343	Urban Tree and Forest Canopy Cover Toolkit	King Conservation District	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 153,500	\$ 153,500
10	2016-0382	Next-phase Protection and Restoration Plans for B-IBI Basins	King County	Stormwater SIAT	2016	\$ 510,700	\$ 510,700
11	2016-0383	<b>Invertebrate Supplementation as Restoration Action in Select B-IBI Basins</b>	<b>King County</b>	<b>South Central LIO</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>\$ 238,000</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$3,264,400</b>	<b>\$2,929,500</b>

### 2018-2022 Action Agenda Funding Awards

#	ID	Title	Owner	Funding Source	Year Funded	Cost	Funded
1	2018-0636	Riparian/Land Cover Change Analysis and Decision Support System	Pierce County Lead Entity	Habitat SIAT	2018	\$195,000	\$195,000
2	2018-0708	Performance Evaluation of Engineered Hyporheic Zones for In-Stream Water Quality Improvement in Urban Creeks	University of Washington Tacoma	Stormwater SIAT	2018	\$243,387	\$243,387
3	2018-0769	<b>Commercial Property Engagement through Parking Lot Retrofits in Bear/Little Bear Watersheds</b>	<b>Snohomish Conservation District</b>	<b>South Central LIO</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>\$329,500</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>
4	2018-0792	Source Identification of Toxics Impacting Juvenile Chinook Salmon in Two Major Puget Sound Rivers	Dept. of Ecology	Stormwater SIAT	2018	\$550,000	\$550,000
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$1,317,887</b>	<b>\$ 1,088,387</b>

## NTA Direct Funding Selection Process Summary

- This process will select an NTA for direct funding this year (2018) but not necessarily be the list the LIO selects from for the next four years.
- Cascadia developed survey for NTA owners with proposals between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 with the following questions (did not ask NTA owners with proposals less than \$100,000, as they were automatically considered):
  - o Whether you are interested in being considered;
  - o What you could accomplish with this level of funding, especially if you haven't been or aren't able to secure additional funding (i.e., is it possible to scale and/or phase the project so that \$100,000 would move the project forward and what could you achieve)?
- Process:
  - o Cascadia compiled NTA information and owner responses into a spreadsheet and provide to committee volunteers.
  - o Committee reviewed their selected NTAs (in their personalized spreadsheet) against the criteria (see below) to develop a short list.
  - o Committee met Oct 25 to agree on a short list of NTAs that met those criteria (no set number for the short list, however last time the LIO completed this process, it was 13).
  - o Once agreed upon, committee members took that short list and ranked NTAs 1 - n, recusing themselves from NTAs for which they had a conflict of interest.
  - o Cascadia averaged rankings to develop a final ranked list.
  - o Committee members met one final time to review and approve final ranked list.
  - o Top ranked NTA was recommended for direct funding to the full LIO at the Nov 7 meeting and submitted to the relevant SI lead.

## Criteria for NTA Selection

1. **Critically important for advancing ecosystem recovery by -**
  - o Helping us learn something new
  - o Taking an ongoing effort to the next level
  - o Resulting in future action(s) that wouldn't have otherwise occurred
  - o Filling a knowledge gap

### Secondary criteria

- Cross-jurisdictional or cross-watershed benefit
- Likelihood of success of outputs and ecological outcomes
- Multiple benefits/targets affected (e.g., some projects may offer benefits for stormwater, habitat, shellfish, etc.)
- Impact for dollar spent (bang for the buck)
- Geographic equity within the LIO (for future rounds of NTA selection)

**Additional criteria for 2018:** scalability and what the project can accomplish with the available funding (i.e., what their additional information includes)

Rank	NTA ID	NTA Title	Objective	Owner	RPA	Activity Type	Strategic Initiative	Cost	2018 Funding Secured
2	2018-0876	Acceleration of shoreline armoring removal in Central Puget Sound priority reaches	Accelerate the removal of shoreline armoring on private property in prioritized areas along the Central Puget Sound nearshore.	Mid Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group	CHIN7.1	1.1 Ecosystem Management & Restoration	Chinook	\$911,900	
3	2018-0371	Flow and Water Quality Monitoring of Pilot Polishing Layer for the Swale on Yale Water Quality Project	1. To evaluate the performance of the new polishing layer in limiting nutrient export from the default bioretention soil mix (BSM) in one stormwater biofiltration swale. 2. Compare data to earlier monitoring of adjacent cell without polishing layer.	City of Seattle	TIF2.1	3.4 Research	Stormwater	\$250,000	\$150,000
4	2018-0432	Marine Shoreline Technical Assistance	This action accelerates and expands KCD marine shoreline protection and enhancement work to identify and plan marine riparian enhancement and bulkhead removal projects on private property.	King Conservation District	SA3.1	1.1 Ecosystem Management & Restoration	Habitat	\$300,000	
5	2018-0217	Smith Cove Park Shoreline Restoration	Remove the rip rap, expand the beach area, transition to logs to support the slope and add native riparian plantings to the shoreline of Smith Cove. This project is identified in the WRIA 9 4-year work plan as being beneficial for Chinook salmon.	City of Seattle	CHIN7.1	1.1 Ecosystem Management & Restoration	Chinook	\$100,000	
7	2018-0805	Green-Duwamish Problem Design Lab; Meeting Academic Standards in the Secondary Classroom in Context of Improving Puget Sound Vital Signs	1. Use Vital Signs as a living textbook for problem-based learning in the secondary classroom in at least five WRIA 9 school districts. 2. Empower students to map, track and report data-driven improvements related to Regional Priority CHIN7.1	WRIA 9 Lead Entity	CHIN7.1	2.1 Behavior Change - Awareness Raising (Education)	Chinook	\$350,000	\$205,500
10	2018-0130	Howard Hanson Dam Downstream Fish Passage Facilitation and Coordination	Facilitation and coordination of Howard Hanson Dam downstream fish passage for stakeholder and public involvement and design input.	WRIA 9 Lead Entity	CHIN7.1	1.1 Ecosystem Management & Restoration	Chinook	\$250,000	
11	2018-0518	Chemicals of Emerging Concern (CECs), including endocrine disrupting compounds (EDCs), in marine and freshwater fish in King County	To evaluate CECs (including EDCs) in marine and freshwater fish by expanding King County's existing tissue monitoring program. To assess ecological and human health risks from observed CEC concentrations through a literature review of toxicological data.	King County	TIF5.1	3.5 Monitoring & Evaluation	Stormwater	\$115,000	
12	2018-0597	A comprehensive survey of salmon habitat in nearshore areas of WRIA8 and WRIA9	Build and distribute comprehensive information on critical nearshore salmon habitat (eelgrass and kelp), for assessing the effectiveness of management actions along the most intensively developed shorelines of Puget Sound (WRIAs 8 and 9).	Department of Natural Resources	CHIN1.3	3.5 Monitoring & Evaluation	Chinook	\$251,728	
14	2018-0766	Monitoring and management of piscivorous fish populations in the Lake Washington Ship Canal	Work with fisheries co-managers to devise and implement a predator monitoring (and ultimately management) program to improve the survival of juvenile salmon through the Lake Washington Ship Canal.	WRIA 8 Lead Entity	CHIN3.2	3.5 Monitoring & Evaluation	Chinook	\$100,000	

## **LIO Engagement in the Puget Sound Management Conference Ecosystem Coordination Board Management Brief**

November 13, 2019 – Topic # **1**

### **TOPIC:**

Local Integrating Organizations' Engagement in the Puget Sound Management Conference

### **MEMO CONTACT:**

Erin Ryan-Peñuela, Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator, 360-522-0546, erin.ryan-penuela@psp.wa.gov

Tristan Contesse, Boards Program Manager, 360-584-5328, tristan.contesse@psp.wa.gov

### **PRESENTERS:**

Erin Ryan-Peñuela, Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator

LIO representative(s)

### **TYPE OF PRESENTATION:**

- Oral presentation for a decision
- Oral presentation for discussion
- Oral presentation for information only
- Written briefing only

### **ISSUE/QUESTION:**

The Partnership, in coordination with the Local Integrating Organization (LIO) Coordinators, developed specific policy recommendations that address two of the three objectives presented at the August 2019 Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) meeting:

1. Elevate the stature of LIOs to enable greater input in decision-making, and provide clarity around roles and responsibilities in Action Agenda development and implementation.
2. Provide LIOs with more capacity to meaningfully participate in the Action Agenda process through broader collaboration and expanded partner engagement.

Partnership staff and LIO Coordinators are asking the ECB to discuss and endorse the proposed recommendations outlined in the "Analysis" section, in preparation for a presentation of these objectives to the Leadership Council in December 2019.

### **BACKGROUND AND KEY CONTEXT:**

In August, LIO Coordinators came to the ECB with a suite of specific and urgent objectives to help increase capacity and opportunities for more meaningful engagement in the Puget Sound Management Conference. Following a presentation of these objectives – as well as potential example solutions – the LIOs asked the ECB for a general endorsement of the proposed objectives. While the ECB did not elect to endorse the objectives, it did request that the Partnership develop a response and come back to the ECB with a status update in November.

Since August, Partnership staff have been actively working to develop proposed solutions to the objectives raised by the LIO Coordinators.

The memo presented to the ECB in August is included as Attachment 1, and an excerpt from that memo is in italics, directly below, for additional context.

*The current NEP funding model lacks meaningful and effective input from the Local Integrating Organizations (LIO) and the elected officials, agencies, Tribes, and other key Puget Sound recovery participants that they represent. LIOs request that the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) support LIOs in their quest to be meaningfully engaged in the development and implementation of the Puget Sound Action Agenda, to create a more effective Puget Sound recovery system. LIOs further request that the ECB express support for the following LIO objectives, to advance a joint proposal to the Leadership Council.*

*LIOs seek ECB support for the following specific objectives:*

- 1. Elevate the stature of LIOs to enable greater input in decision-making, and provide clarity around roles and responsibilities in Action Agenda development and implementation.*
- 2. Provide LIOs with more capacity to meaningfully participate in the Action Agenda process through broader collaboration and expanded partner engagement.*
- 3. Revise the funding model to reflect the LIOs' and Tribes' 2014 proposal to EPA in order to optimally leverage the members' vast expertise and the trust of their communities. The proposed funding model, which was similar to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board model, takes advantage of local plans and LIO expertise in influencing NEP funding investments towards Puget Sound recovery.*

## **ANALYSIS:**

### **Objective #1:**

The desired approach by the Partnership and LIO Coordinators to address Objective #1 includes the following actions to empower local decision-making:

- Rotate Management Conference board meetings – especially of the Ecosystem Coordination Board and Leadership Council – around Puget Sound for at least the following two specific purposes:
  - Invite and engage local decision makers, including elected officials who don't regularly participate in the Management Conference, for structured conversations that elevate the stature of LIO and Action Agenda priorities; and
  - Identify ways in which the Management Conference can support those elected officials in issues of land use, permitting, and other barriers.
- Empower local/regional coordination around decisions by working directly and deliberately with EPA and the SI Leads to develop specific coordination tasks within and between SI Lead and LIO contracts. These tasks will address ongoing challenges related to transparency, timeliness, and collaboration around priority setting and funding decisions.

- Example: seek consistency across SI Lead processes.
  - Example: SILs should utilize LIO Plans for priority setting.
- Deliberately continue efforts to assess whether change(s) in statute to recognize LIOs would be beneficial and/or would outweigh potential risks of opening the Partnership's founding statute.

### Objective #2:

The desired approach by the Partnership and LIO Coordinators to address Objective #2 includes:

- With the understanding that capacity needs for LIO coordination vary across the region, the Partnership will continue to advocate for increased funding for LIO Plan updates and other capacity needs, as was done in the state legislative process for the 2019-2021 biennium.
- If more National Estuary Program funding becomes available – through the passage of the Puget SOS Bill, reauthorization of the NEP, or other mechanisms – the Partnership recommends to EPA that a high priority for those additional funds is to increase capacity funding for all ten current LIOs.
- In parallel with the efforts above to increase the overall amount of funding for LIOs in the recovery system:
  - Request that SI Leads consider “underwriting” LIOs, equitably, for tasks that specifically involve coordination with the SI Leads, including developing geographic specificity around Implementation Strategies and Action Agenda priorities, participating in the Action Agenda Coordination Group, and serving on the three Strategic Initiative Advisory Teams. The Partnership could provide capacity funds from the SILs through the LIO coordination grants that support this involvement.
  - Provide increased capacity funding to LIOs for more meaningful participation in regional pilot and continuous improvement (*e.g.*, Kaizen) type projects, as well as other activities that are locally important to specific LIOs' recovery plans and particular geographic interests.
- Engage and involve the LIOs in the development or improvement of Implementation Strategies that are important to LIOs' recovery plans and specific geographic interests. The current LIO involvement in the ECB Land Use Subcommittee and SILs' pilot projects are good first steps.

### Objective #3:

- This memo does not address the third objective set forth by the LIOs in August, as this will be addressed as a separate agenda item during the November ECB meeting.
- Also, Partnership staff and LIO Coordinators are analyzing potential recommendations to EPA on the funding model to help inform an upcoming meeting between EPA, LIO leadership, and the Partnership in mid-December.

LIO Coordinators and Partnership staff have worked diligently to develop potential solutions to the objectives discussed with ECB in August. With the understanding that increased capacity funding could help substantially in opening up opportunities for increased LIO participation in multiple facets of Action Agenda development and implementation, the Partnership will continue to advance efforts to mobilize additional funding for the recovery system and advocate strongly that a high priority for any increases in NEP funding should be to support LIO capacity.

Partnership staff are eager to begin shifting meeting locations within Puget Sound and providing structured opportunities to raise the prominence of LIO and other Action Agenda priorities with local elected officials and representatives from LIO member organizations. This change is an immediate improvement that we can begin to make in 2020 to support the LIOs' desired objectives, regardless of whether more funding is available.

ECB endorsement of the recommendations proposed above would help make a strong case for Leadership Council endorsement in December.

**FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPACTS:**

Financial and administrative impacts will depend on many factors, most notably on whether additional funding is available to support LIO capacity.

**NEXT STEPS:**

If the ECB endorses the recommendations detailed above, representatives of the ECB, LIOs, and the Partnership will co-present the recommendations to the Leadership Council for endorsement in December 2019. Assuming Leadership Council endorsement, Partnership staff will advance work on the recommendations in 2020.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment 1 – August 2019 memo from LIO Coordinators to ECB