

## ILIO TC Meeting Notes

### Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	February 2, 2016		
Meeting Time:	1:30pm - 3:00pm		
Meeting Location:	Law & Justice Bldg, Room 131, Coupeville		
Meeting Attendees	Suzanna Stoike (via webex)	Dawn Pucci	Keith Higman
	Lisa Kaufman (via webex)	Brian Wood	
	Todd Zacky (via webex)	John Levee	
	Jim Sunberg (via webex)	Jill Wood	
	Terica Ginther (via webex)	Karen Bishop	
	Lori Clark	Stan Walsh	
Meeting Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss 2016 NTA review process (lessons learned)</li> <li>Outline 5-year Plan Development</li> </ul>		
		Total Time:	90 minutes

### Minutes

Topic:	PSP Updates	Action Item Owner:	Suzanna
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	3 NTAs that were disqualified (City of Oak Harbor) will be allowed to submit and will receive an unbiased review, but they will not have the benefit of feedback.		
Follow-up Items:	Submit NTAs by 10:30 Feb 3 <sup>rd</sup> .		
Notes:	Suzanna: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final NTA submittals due Feb 3<sup>rd</sup></li> <li>NTAs which were in category 3 must be revised to be submitted.</li> <li>Submitting a ½ page memo avoids text box limits.</li> <li>MRC and Stewardship Program gave feedback.</li> <li>April is the public comment period on NTA process.</li> <li>LIO Coordinators meeting: Feb 10</li> <li>EPA stated that NEP dollars would be evenly distributed between the 3 strategic initiatives (no information on how this was decided)</li> <li>There will be a San Juan LIO meeting with EPA &amp; PSP Feb 3.</li> <li>There were more Cat 1 NTAs locally that scored well regionally.</li> </ul>		
Topic:	Discuss 2016 NTA review process (lessons Learned)	Action Item Owner:	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	none		

Follow-up Items:			
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Todd noted that process was not flexible and that biennial process excludes opportunities to act on new ideas and does not accommodate all project timelines. Suzanna responded that the 5 year plan offers another opportunity for projects that do not fit in biennial schedule.</li> <li>• Keith asked how do you vet sponsors who choose a given LIO, but do not have a relationship established with that LIO. Suzanna responded that if you are in scoping, but not in deliverable stage, you do not have to have the consent of named partners. Lori added that ILIO was contacted by NWSF regarding partnership, but no others. The ILIO generic response would be "if you are selected for an NTA, we would be happy to work with you." Stan added that the regional review is a check box and partnerships are just listed.</li> <li>• Karen asked if it is better to submit an NTA locally and/or regionally. Lori responded that it is better to submit projects regionally, if they address a regional priority. Karen also expressed frustration with the time spent with the NTA submittal process. She suggested tracking time invested.</li> <li>• Keith noted that NTAs had review teams of 2, with different reviewers within the same category. Suzanna shared that for resubmittal, the same person will review the NTA.</li> <li>• Suzanna said that NEP dollars are at risk because locals are not showing measurable progress. In the past, grant funders ran their own programs. Now we are getting consistency, but it is harder work. The money is not focused on local priorities, but regional. Next grant round we well have a better pace. Lori added that the 5 year plan will help, but the EPA must give us guidance soon.</li> <li>• Dawn shared that the 5 projects that are being submitted for the 2016 SRFB funding can also ask for NEP funds, but they must go through the same NTA process.</li> </ul>		
Topic:	5-year Plan Development	Action Item Owner:	Lori Clark
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	None		
Follow-up Items:	Provide feedback from NTAs Feb 29 <sup>th</sup> . Karen invited partners to review Conservation District's workplan		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lori will present to the COG in March to explain the role of the LIO EC and TC to the newly elected officials.</li> <li>• 5 year plan development may require more meetings and a smaller task force for developing the pieces prior to ILIO TC meetings.</li> <li>• Monthly meetings will continue. Soon the ILIO TC will have to develop a local process for rating NTAs.</li> <li>• The SITTs will have NTA feedback ready by February 29<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>• Suzanna shared that 5 year guidance is in final draft form and is well constructed. 5 year plan should be in place by September. No new initiative will be added at this time, only the three strategic initiatives: stormwater, shellfish and salmon (habitat).</li> <li>• Keith expressed concern about how to allocate resources without knowing what they will be. Lori responded that the way that local funding will be allocated is challenging, but there should be a process in place by June.</li> </ul>		

**2016 Action Agenda Update  
Near Term Action Review  
Triage Category Determination Process**

This document provides a brief summary of how Triage Categories were determined during the review of Near Term Actions (NTAs) for the 2016 Action Agenda update.

Triage Categories were defined in the Regional NTA Solicitation released on 9/21/2015 as:

- **Category 1:** NTA may benefit from minor revisions or does not need revision.
- **Category 2:** NTA would benefit from substantive revisions.
- **Category 3:** NTA has serious concerns that must to be addressed before the NTA can advance into the final review process.

The following table includes the instructions and guidance used by the Transition Team reviewers to rate Overall Quality of Proposal and Overall Fit to Strategy. Each proposal was rated by up to three reviewers.

Field Name	Overall Quality of Proposal	Overall Fit to Strategy
<b>Instructions to Reviewers</b>	Consider the overall quality of the proposal – rate it high, medium, or low	Consider the overall fit of the proposal to the main sub-strategy (other identified sub-strategies) and the Strategic Initiative – rate it high, medium, or low
<b>Guidance to Reviewers</b>	Important considerations for evaluating the quality of the proposal would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsiveness to the submittal requirements (see <a href="#">Annotated Submittal Form</a>)</li> <li>• Clarity</li> <li>• Completeness</li> <li>• Focus</li> <li>• Readiness</li> </ul>	Important considerations for evaluating the fit to strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with a regional priority</li> <li>• Alignment with the main sub-strategy</li> <li>• Strong connections to other sub-strategies identified in proposal (not lots of loose associations with sub-strategies)</li> <li>• Alignment with priority pressures</li> <li>• Alignment with a Vital Sign</li> <li>• Alignment with a recovery target</li> </ul>

Overall Quality of Proposal and Overall Fit to Strategy were rated independently and the final scores were calculated as follows:

1. Reviewers rated each proposal they reviewed with:
  - a. A high, medium, or low rating for Overall Quality of Proposal; and
  - b. A high, medium, or low rating for Overall Fit to Strategy.
2. High ratings were then given a value of 3, medium ratings were given a value of 2, and low ratings were given a value of 1.
3. The values for Overall Quality of Proposal were then averaged and the values and the Overall Fit to Strategy were then averaged.
4. Those average values were then indexed to a scale from zero to one using the following formula to create a final score for Overall Quality of Proposal and Overall Fit to Strategy:
 
$$y = \frac{x-1}{2}$$
 where x is the average value from step 3 above and y is the final score

NTA_UniqueID	NTA Name	Owner Organization - Pre-populated	Contact Name - Pre-populated	Contact Phone - Pre-populated	Contact Email - Pre-populated	Strategic Initiative - Pre-populated	Sub-strategy - Pre-populated
2016-0001	Shoreline Armoring Reduction Porject	Northwest Straits Foundation	Joan Drinkwin	360-733-1725	drinkwin@nwstraitsfoundati on.org	Habitat	B2.3
2016-0012	Feeder Bluff Shore Armor Removal	Northwest Straits Foundation	Joan Drinkwin	360-733-1725	drinkwin@nwstraitsfoundati on.org	Habitat	B2.3
2016-0030	Assessing Changes in Marine Water Quality Related to Vessel Maintenance	Washington State Department of Ecology	Dale Norton	(360) 407-6765	dnor461@ecy.wa.gov	Stormwater	C1.1
2016-0044	Puget Sound benthic index revision, validation, adoption as Vital Sign	WA State Dept of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program	Margaret Dutch	360-407-8021	margaret.dutch@ecy.wa.go v	Habitat	A1.2
2016-0047	Accelerate Stormwater Actions	The Nature Conservancy	Jessie Israel	(206) 436-6233	jessie.israel@tnc.org	Stormwater	C2.1
2016-0049	Online application and database management tool for HPAs	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Pat Chapman	360-902-2571	pat.chapman@dfw.wa.gov	Habitat	A1.3
2016-0053	Commerce - Bldg Green Cities	Washington State Department of Commerce	Heather Ballash	360-725-3044	heather.ballash@commerc e.wa.gov	Stormwater	C2.3