

ILIO TC Meeting Notes

Meeting Information

Meeting Date:	February 15, 2018		
Meeting Time:	9am-10:30am		
Meeting Location:	Law & Justice Building, Room 131 1 NE 6 th Street, Coupeville		
Meeting Attendees	Lori Clark	Kathryn Wells (via WebEx)	
	Alexandra Doty (via WebEx)	Anna Toledo	
	Kelsey Loch	Todd Zackey (via WebEx)	
	Keith Higman	Stan Walsh (via WebEx)	
	Dawn Pucci	Joe Waldrup	
	Matt Zupich	Kim Hinds	
Meeting Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review project factsheets and identify areas that need improvement or clarification to improve the proposed NTAs. This recommendation will be provided for ILIO Executive Committee consideration on February 28th. 2. Review the regional NTAs for any potential conflicts with the ILIO Ecosystem Recovery Plan. 3. Review the 2018 NTA Review Policy ~ Conflict of Interest/Appearance of Fairness 		
		Total Time:	90 minutes

Minutes

Topic:	Updates	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	none		
Follow-up Items:	none		
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 11 local 2018-2022 NTAs and 14 regional 2018-2022 NTA factsheets that are proposing an active role in the Island watershed. The ILIO will be reviewing and scoring these projects with the ILIO approved rubric on April 17th. • The ILIO TC meeting on April 17th may need to be extended to accommodate the review/scoring process for these NTAs. • Final NTA submissions are due March 30th. 		
Topic:	2018 NTA Review Policy ~ Conflict of Interest/Appearance of Fairness	Action Item Owner:	Lori
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILIO Technical Committee recommends the ILIO Executive Committee moves to approve the 2018 NTA Review Policy, Conflict of Interest/Appearance of Fairness. 		
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILIO EC will review the recommendation on February 28th. • Lori will send the COI policy to Kelsey Loch. • 		
Notes:	We want to ensure that the scoring/evaluation of the NTAs is as objective and defensible as possible.		

		Action Item Owner:	Lori
Topic:	Review project factsheets and identify areas that need improvement or clarification to improve the proposed NTAs.		
Decisions Made and Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ILIO TC provided comments for consideration at the ILIO Executive Committee meeting on February 28th. 		
Follow-up Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lori will provide recommendations as discussed below to the NTA owners to strengthen the NTA and increase the likelihood of success in Island watershed and may also provide suggestions for meaningful partnerships with local partners. Lori or Matt will attend the March 1st Water Resources Advisory Committee meeting to gauge their interest on partnering on this NTA for the LID outreach events. Lori will work with IC Planning to see if this NTA could be strengthened by referencing language and including an explanation on how the work compliments the CAO. 		
Notes:	<p>See attached sheet for comments on the regional NTAs. Below are additional comments on the local NTAs.</p> <p>2018-0091-Oak Harbor Marina Stormwater Improvement Project</p> <p>2018-0092-Oak Harbor Marina Water Shading Reduction Project</p> <p>2018-0093-Oak Harbor Marina Beach Soft Armoring Project</p> <p>The City Oak Harbor will partner with Marine Resources Committee on outreach and monitoring for these projects.</p> <p>2018-0099-Crescent Harbor Creek Restoration</p> <p>This project was pulled from the 2018-2022 NTA list.</p> <p>2018-0137-North Whidbey Island Water Quality Outreach & Best Management Practice Assistance</p> <p>No further comments.</p> <p>2018-0224-Daylighting Brookhaven Creek: Feasibility Study</p> <p>The creek may be habitat for resident cut throat.</p> <p>2018-0324-Coupeville Outfall Study</p> <p>No further comments.</p> <p>2018-0326-Penn Cove Water Quality Improvement -Coupeville Sewer Extension</p> <p>Residents would have 5 years to connect into the sewer extension.</p> <p>2018-0637-Island County Stormwater Technical Assistance and Outreach Network Island County Stormwater Technical Assistance and Outreach Network</p> <p>WICD changed the name as recommended.</p> <p>Recommend to coordinate with the Water Resources Advisory Committee to partner on LID outreach events.</p> <p>2018-0779-Implementation of Best Available Science relating to salmon recovery and watershed restoration into local planning processes</p> <p>This project was moved to a regional NTA.</p> <p>2018-0836-Enhancing soil health in a changing climate for hydrologic, habitat, and agricultural benefits</p> <p>No further comments.</p> <p>2018-0841-Working buffers for water quality, wildlife habitat, and agricultural resilience on agricultural lands</p> <p>NTA could be strengthened by referencing language and including an explanation on how the work compliments the CAO.</p>		

2018-0843-Sound Horsekeeping - controlling mud and manure on horse properties in the Snohomish and Stillaguamish River watersheds

No further comments.

Revised (10/24/17)

Criteria	Categories				
	BEST (4)	(3)	(2)	LOWEST (1)	
Alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the owner demonstrated that the NTA will contribute to achieving the desired outcome? Has the NTA owner addressed the relevant proposal guidance? If applicable, has the NTA owner demonstrated alignment with the local context? 	Outstanding (perfectly aligned) This NTA will achieve the desired outcome(s) and will result in a meaningful, timely contribution to Puget Sound recovery. The relevant information requested in the proposal guidance is fully addressed.	Good (aligns in all but one way) This NTA will partially achieve the desired outcome(s) but does not fully address all aspects listed in the desired outcome. The relevant information requested in the proposal guidance is not fully addressed.	Acceptable w/ Revisions (adjustments needed) This NTA will not achieve the desired outcome(s) without modifications to the project design. The relevant information requested in the proposal guidance is not addressed satisfactorily.	Poor (poorly aligned) This NTA will not achieve the desired outcome(s), AND relevant information requested in the proposal guidance is not addressed.	Justification required if result is Category 2 or 1
Likelihood of success: human <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the NTA owner and partners provided justification that they have the right expertise to complete the NTA? Are all the necessary partners engaged for successful implementation? If applicable, did the NTA owner coordinate with relevant LIOs? 	Highly Likely (right expertise, right partners) NTA owner and partner(s) have directly applicable expertise or have successfully implemented similar projects. Partners have been appropriately engaged in the development of the NTA and are committed to the NTA's success.	Likely (ambitious, stretch of expertise/ partners, but probable success) NTA owner and partner(s) display some experience or have supported or led other similar projects. Partners have been engaged but unclear to what extent.	Difficulties Expected (wrong expertise or wrong partners) NTA owner and partner(s) have minimal applicable experience. Listed partners are adequate, but further collaboration or coordination may be desirable prior to proceeding.	Unlikely to Succeed (wrong expertise/ wrong partners) NTA owner and partner(s) have no applicable experience or have failed at similar projects. The list of partners is not appropriate for the type or scale of project proposed.	Justification required if result is Category 2 or 1
Likelihood of success: technical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the performance measures appropriate to achieve the desired outcomes? Is the timeframe reasonable for the proposed actions and outputs? Is the proposed cost justified by the scale of work? 	Highly Likely (achievable goals per timeframe, right capacity, right resources) The project outline clearly defines the methodology, the resources, and schedule in a manner indicating that the objectives will be accomplished.	Likely (ambitious, but possible) The project outline indicates challenges may be encountered.	Difficulties Expected (likely lack of time, resources, or capacity) There is a question about whether the methods, timelines, and resources are adequate to accomplish objectives.	Unlikely to Succeed (stated goals are unlikely to be achieved in timeline with available resources and capacity) The detail in the project outline is not adequate to allow a determination that the objective will be accomplished.	Justification required if result is Category 2 or 1
Contributions to Recovery Ecosystem and Human <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the owner demonstrated ecological, economic, and social project benefits in relation to the desired outcome(s)? Is this in a key geography for the Vital Sign target? Will the NTA make an impact on the Vital Sign target? 	Outstanding (key geography, large potential ecological uplift, including prevention of loss toward recovery targets if implemented successfully) This NTA clearly articulates how it will help to make timely and substantive progress to improve Puget Sound and associated Vital Sign(s). If the NTA will not have a direct effect on a Vital Sign target, logic is presented that links the NTA to a broader recovery strategy. If applicable, the NTA will make a large contribution in a key geography.	Strong (immediate restoration or loss prevention in key geography OR large potential future ecological uplift or gains towards recovery targets) This NTA will improve Puget Sound and associated Vital Sign(s). If the NTA will not have a direct effect on a Vital Sign target, logic is loosely presented that links the NTA to a broader recovery strategy. If applicable, the NTA is not in a key geography or does not make a large contribution within a key geography.	Intermediate (immediate gains in less-critical geography OR moderate potential future gains toward recovery targets) This NTA will make some gains to improve Puget Sound and associated Vital Sign(s). If the NTA will not have a direct effect on a Vital Sign target, logic is poorly presented that links the NTA to a broader recovery strategy. If applicable, this NTA is in a less-than-critical geography.	Minor (small, limited, or diminishing gains, such as geographically inappropriate, OR gains likely to be lost within 20 years) This NTA will make minor gains to improve Puget Sound and associated Vital Sign(s). The link between this NTA and a broader recovery strategy is not clear.	Justification (reference scientific literature or report) required if result is Category 2 or 1