

WRIA 8 ILA Renewal – Summary of Proposed Changes

September 2014

Proposed Change	Document Reference	Considerations
Add a series of “Whereas” statements to help document the rationale for the ILA and some history of the effort.	Preamble (p.1-2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps explain the impetus for establishing/renewing the ILA; • Documents history of the effort during the first 10 year period covered by the initial ILA; • Documents WRIA 8’s interest in regional and state efforts
Expand the eligible ILA partners to include public agencies other than cities and counties that have land use jurisdiction, including tribes, ports, utilities, etc.	Definitions – Eligible Jurisdictions (Section 1.1, p3) Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (section 4, p.6) Latecomers (Section 8, p.11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadens potential ILA membership and coordination; • Spreads annual ILA cost share among more partners, reducing annual cost shares of individual partners • Would likely require changes to the proportional/ weighted voting rules in Section 5.1.2; • Would allow entities other than cities and counties more influence in WRIA 8 decisions, but could also dilute the local governments’ decision making authority
Add description of WRIA 8’s role to annually recommend programs and projects for King County Flood Control District Cooperative Watershed Management funding	Purposes (Section 2.5, p.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More comprehensively documents WRIA 8’s integral role in selecting and recommending projects for Cooperative Watershed Management grant funding
Add description of WRIA 8’s role as the salmon recovery “Lead Entity” under state law to convene local watershed-based technical and citizen’s committees to review, prioritize, and recommend projects for funding to the state Salmon Recovery Funding Board.	Purposes (Section 2.6, p4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents WRIA 8’s formal designation and role as the salmon recovery “Lead Entity” in the watershed
Add additional emphasis on the use of monitoring and adaptive management to guide implementation of the WRIA 8 Plan	Purposes (Section 2.11, p.5)	
Change from annual to biennial budgeting	Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many WRIA 8 ILA partners, including King County, have moved to biennial budgeting, so this would establish a

WRIA 8 ILA Renewal – Summary of Proposed Changes September 2014

	<p>Council (Section 4.1, p6)</p> <p>Section 4.2.1, p.7</p> <p>Obligations of Parties; Budget; Fiscal Agent; Rules (Section 7.1, p.10)</p> <p>Section 7.2, p.10</p>	<p>similar budgeting cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing biennial budgeting would need to not preclude getting budget information to ILA partners with annual budgeting processes
<p>Incorporate the current practice of updating individual ILA partner cost shares more often than every three years when there is a substantial annexation that changes the area and population calculation for affected jurisdictions enough to change their individual cost shares.</p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.2.1, p.7)</p> <p>Obligations of Parties; Budget; Fiscal Agent; Rules (Section 7.1, p.10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalizes a common practice • Results in a less predictable cost share distribution, and requires tracking annexations more closely • Need to define “substantial” (i.e. What threshold would prompt an update occur?)
<p>Add description of how the level of funding and resource obligation for public agencies other than cities and counties would be determined in negotiation with and approved by the Salmon Recovery Council.</p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.2.1, p7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a flexible mechanism to establish an appropriate, fair cost share for public agencies other than cities and counties that are approved ILA partners by the Salmon Recovery Council • Requires Salmon Recovery Council approval • Is not a predictable and clear cost share for potential ILA partners and existing ILA partners
<p>Add the use of an annual service provider (currently King County) anonymous client satisfaction survey as an option for meeting the service provider performance evaluation requirement</p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.2.2, p.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalizes a current practice approved by the Salmon Recovery Council • Requires Salmon Recovery Council approval • Saves costs associated with retaining an outside consultant to perform an assessment of service provider performance