

Rank	Adj. Avg.	ID	Owner	NTA Title	Description	Cost Estimate	Do you have additional funding for this work and could leverage the \$100K?	If no other funding is available, what phases of the project would you accomplish with \$100K?	With no guarantee of future LIO funding, are you confident you could raise more funds to finish the work in the future?
1	4.8	032	Pierce Conservation District	Replicable Model for Depave and Low Impact Development Retrofits	Development of a Depave and Low Impact Development retrofits model and Technical Assistance Guide to allow easy adoption of the program throughout Puget Sound.	\$242,000	Yes, we do have additional funds to match some of the LIO money should this be awarded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We recently were awarded a Nature Conservancy grant for a Depave project, which happened this spring and they've just recently asked us to submit a request for additional funds for a project that would happen in March. o We have a pending grant request in to the Rose Foundation for a Depave project. o There are a number of other grants opportunities we will be applying for throughout the next few years to fund Depave projects. o The City of Tacoma Environmental Services has adopted the program to be part of their annual budget to fund 1 -2 two projects, the first of which is happening tomorrow. 	Since we've been quite successful in securing project implementation funds through other sources, the phase of the project that I would focus this LIO money on is the development of How To Guide which we would share throughout the Puget Sound Region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o When I wrote the NTA I was still part of our Water Quality team and Depave was one of my program focuses, so the plan was that I would write the guide book. I've since been promoted to our Admin team and so this phase of the project will need to be farmed out to a consultancy who would work in close coordination with our program staff. o We have already been working with regional partners and through a separate grant developed a Depave Puget Sound logo, so there is a foundation for the regional approach we outlined in the NTA. o Any additional funds remaining after paying a consultant to develop and print the guidebook, we would direct towards the most expensive of the projects, which is a public/private project that includes a permeable pavement retrofit. 	I don't think the lack of guaranteed future funds will hurt us with fulfilling the phases of this NTA, we've built a successful program in a short amount of time that both funders and regional partners are very excited about.
2	4.9	255	Futurewise	Phthalates Research for Source Control	Analysis of phthalates in external use products and in samples from publicly accessible locations in order to improve source control for phthalates in the stormwater pathway that may recontaminate sediment cleanup sites in Puget Sound.	\$176,900	Not at this time.	We could do a scaled back effort for \$100K.	No.
3	7.1	383	King County WLRD	Invertebrate supplementation as restoration action in select B-IBI basins	This NTA calls for facilitating the colonization of invertebrates in select basins where B-IBI scores are lower than expected. If B-IBI scores improve and remain high, no other restoration actions may be needed.	\$238,000		We would be able to accomplish the same project at a smaller scale. Instead of seeding 5 to 10 streams, we would seed 4 streams. Initial cost estimates were generated assuming we would seed 10 streams, and the cost projections have been scaled proportionately. For \$100K, we would be able to seed and survey 4 streams (and 3 control streams) for one year post-seeding and evaluate initial success, but we do not have any additional funding that could be leveraged for additional seeding or post-seeding monitoring. There are some cost-saving measures we could explore to ensure post-seeding monitoring was done (perhaps recruit volunteers for the collection), but most likely we would look and apply for additional grant opportunities.	We have been successful in securing external funding for other projects related to B-IBI, and given the modest costs we are confident we could find some additional funding for measuring post-seeding effectiveness.

Rank	Adj. Avg.	ID	Owner	NTA Title	Description	Cost Estimate	Do you have additional funding for this work and could leverage the \$100K?	If no other funding is available, what phases of the project would you accomplish with \$100K?	With no guarantee of future LIO funding, are you confident you could raise more funds to finish the work in the future?
4	8.0	343	King Conservation District	Urban Tree and Forest Canopy Cover Toolkit	Expand the KCD/SCA/Seattle/Bellevue/KC Tree & Forest Canopy Cover Initiative to implement urban forest health management and tree canopy cover programs in more King County Jurisdictions, neighborhoods and priority geographic areas.	\$153,500	No current funding for this initiative, but have submitted a \$500K proposal (\$250K of new funding, \$250K matching funds) to the Forest Service for a few components of the work, including an assessment of regional stormwater modeling to quantify tree canopy benefits and a handbook and technical report on the stormwater modeling tool.	If KCD doesn't receive the Forest Service grant but received LIO funding, they could scale the stormwater modeling piece to model locations in King County.	KCD is actively pursuing other funding opportunities for the various components of this NTA and are working with multiple jurisdictions in King County on urban forestry programs.
5	8.5	224	City of Tacoma	Permeable Pavement Standards Development Based on Lessons Learned	This project will field test new permeable mix designs and new material testing procedures, to further pavement durability and increase confidence in permeable pavements.	\$500,000	No additional funding at this time. The City of Puyallup is interested in partnering, but they currently don't have anything budgeted either due to biennial budget cycle. There might be others interested as well, but can't say for sure at this point.	Originally proposed to do asphalt and concrete testing, but at this point they would focus on asphalt. They could also potentially do the work in house as they have their own asphalt plant. The proposal numbers were based on bidding out the project, but they could do the project for much less by using their own asphalt plant.	See first response about potential partners.
6	10.0	146	WRIA 9	Duwamish Basin Steward	King County's WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Team would hire a part-time Duwamish Basin Steward to implement, advocate for, and track Duwamish habitat improvements that further local and regional salmon recovery efforts.	\$192,208	WRIA 9 received a grant for \$100,000 for Duwamish landowner outreach this year. The Duwamish Basin Steward could use it instead of the \$50K in the NTA budget. If the total cost for the salary and overhead of the half-time basin steward was \$142,208 for 2 years, and it was funded via the LIO, that would mean we would need to find \$42,208 for part of the second year. In talking to our grants coordinator, it sounds like there is a very good chance that we could find additional grant funds for the position next year.	The original proposal calls for the following: The yearly cost for a part-time (50%) basin steward, including benefits and overhead, was determined based on current costs for other basin stewards at King County. An additional sum (\$50,000) was added to pay for King County real estate services to conduct property outreach and research, appraisals, and negotiate purchases during the first two years. The cost for real estate services was based on recent experience with a King County purchase of a property along the Duwamish. Costs include: \$192,208 (for 2 years of a half-time basin steward, plus \$50,000 for real estate costs); and \$568,832 (for a half time basin steward for an additional 8 years, with no additional real estate costs).	At this time, I don't have ideas for the additional 8 years, but even having the position filled for two years would make an incredible difference in moving projects forward along the Duwamish River.
7	10.6	118	King County WLRD	Cold Water Refugia Prediction & Identification	Cold Water sources/refugia prediction and verification pilot project	\$125,000	Not at this time. If the funding was for field work to start in 2017 it would be very hard to find any matching dollars.	The original cost estimate had a high and a low cost that revolved around assumptions related to how quickly a crew of two staff could walk a stream while using the fast thermocouple devices. If the project budget was only 100K, I would reduce the number of streams targeted for sampling from 6 to 4, with the option to add the 2 streams back if the field work goes quicker (cheaper) than anticipated.	We think that would be unnecessary because we can reduce the total cost by reducing the number of streams and complete the entire project that way.
8	10.7	097	King County WLRD	Puget Sound Stormwater Infrastructure Framework	With a comprehensive map of its stormwater system a jurisdiction can maintain their system more efficiently. With a common regional mapping system, jurisdictions can work together, sharing information and resources, to better manage stormwater.	\$85,000			

Rank	Adj. Avg.	ID	Owner	NTA Title	Description	Cost Estimate	Do you have additional funding for this work and could leverage the \$100K?	If no other funding is available, what phases of the project would you accomplish with \$100K?	With no guarantee of future LIO funding, are you confident you could raise more funds to finish the work in the future?
9	10.7	327	King Conservation District	Marine Shoreline Technical Assistance & Project ID for Home/Landowners	Expand the KCD Marine Shoreline Improvement Program for Homeowners/Landowners by providing technical assistance and identifying marine riparian and bulkhead removal projects with private homeowners/landowners on the KCD site visit waiting list.	\$499,300	Currently have a staff person with .3 FTE dedicated to working with landowners but don't have funding for backlog of 300 technical assistance visits.	Site visits can be phased to whatever level of funding is available.	Once the backlog is cleared, other program funding would allow them to keep pace with new landowners who sign up for technical assistance visits.
10	11.0	382	King County WLRD	Next-phase protection and restoration plans for select B-IBI basins	This NTA calls for identifying stressors affecting B-IBI scores and developing basin-specific plans for 10 basins needing protection (to maintain excellent scores) and three basins needing restoration (to improve from fair to good).	\$510,700	We have no additional funding for this work currently, but we continue to look for funding opportunities and ways to partner with others who are planning restoration or protection actions for salmon recovery, stormwater management or flood control.	We would be able to accomplish a subset of the objectives we proposed originally. More than half of the original budget of \$510,700 was estimated for planning for the three "restoration" basins, and less than half for planning for the ten "protection" basins. For the "restoration" basins, the proposed work included gage installation, stressor identification and hydrologic monitoring, and for all 13 basins there would have been field surveys, macroinvertebrate collection and extensive mapping. There would have been some efficiencies in doing that work for all of the basins at one time, so unfortunately with only \$100K, we would be able to accomplish either, a) a restoration plan for one basin, or 2) a protection plan for five basins.	See first response.
11	11.6	086	Seattle 2030 District	Reducing Stormwater Impact from Downtown District of Seattle	The Seattle 2030 District Green Stormwater Program will work with building owners and developers in the downtown area of Seattle to manage stormwater peak discharge by 50% below the District baseline by 2030, with an incremental target of 20% by 2020.	\$360,000	Yes, we have a contract with King County Wastewater Division Capital Fund through 8/2017 and are exploring continuation of this funding beyond that date. We also have a stormwater proposal for 2017 funding (will hear back in October), and another proposal to provide additional stormwater funding in 2017 if successful. Expected budget: Current funding through August 2017 \$60,000 Possible continuation of these funds for 2017-18 \$80,000 Anticipated grant funding for 2017 \$50,000 Possible other stormwater funding for 2017 \$10,000	We would move forward on all elements of plan in first phases, as they are all needed to catalyze other actions, and leverage work of partners to conserve funding. Revised budget if no other funding were available: Feasibility study on public/private partnership: \$25,000 Communication & collaboration tools: \$20,000 Conference on GSI as a regional collaborative effort: \$5,000 Outreach, research, & site visits: \$50,000	Yes, in addition to having current funding that can be leveraged and two proposals in the works with high likelihood of getting funded from current partners, there are other promising developments in the region and in the 2030 District network. There is growing interest in Network about stormwater work, as we are the first District to tackle a combined potable water/stormwater management goal. Our work has the potential to serve as a model and this is attractive to funders. The growing regional interest in managing stormwater with GSI gives us more potential for collaborative funding within those networks. We have useful tools to offer these efforts, including the Stormwater Calculator, Stormwater Game, and GIS mapping. Finally, we have strong public and private relationships, the most important of those being our relationships with our member building owners, managers, real estate developers, and the professional community that supports those members.

Rank	Adj. Avg.	ID	Owner	NTA Title	Description	Cost Estimate	Do you have additional funding for this work and could leverage the \$100K?	If no other funding is available, what phases of the project would you accomplish with \$100K?	With no guarantee of future LIO funding, are you confident you could raise more funds to finish the work in the future?
12	12.4	029	Pierce County Lead Entity	Riparian/Land Cover Change Analysis and Decision Support System	Development of a riparian and land cover change analysis and decision support system for WRIA 10 Puyallup Watershed.	\$195,000	We revisited the rough cost estimate that was developed last fall/winter for the 2016-029 WRIA 10 Riparian Analysis Near Term Action (NTA) proposal. The proposed NTA is intended to support the development of a riparian and land cover change analysis and decision support system (DSS) for WRIA 10 Puyallup Watershed. Once developed, the DSS could be used in other watersheds throughout Puget Sound.	Since the NTA proposal was submitted, we've coordinated and collaborated with WDFW and attended their High Resolution Change Detection (HRCDD): Tracking Land Cover Change Training Workshop. Based on that learning, our coordination, and collaboration, the potential use of other existing modeling processes (e.g., VELMA), and the reduction of meetings, we were able to reduce the overall estimate to approximately \$128,000. We propose to move some of effort to a Phase 2 conducted when additional funding is secured. Proposed Phase 2 work includes field validation efforts for baselayers and model and meetings with local stakeholders and landowners to present and discuss findings, data gaps, next steps, etc. Project Tasks (Phase 2 Tasks in parenthesis) Task 1: Project Mgmt and Coordination Task 2: Develop Baselayers for Riparian Decision Support System (Field validation effort moved to Phase 2) Task 3: Develop Model for Riparian Decision Support System / Conduct Watershed Analysis (Field validation moved to Phase 2) Task 4: Reporting Task 5: Stakeholder Coordination (Stakeholder Coordination moved to Phase 2).	The remaining funding need would not be very great, and we would likely be successful using local dollars and partner organizations or other grant opportunities as a match. The work is supported by the Lead Entity Citizen and Technical Committees which are represented by local tribes, agencies, special purpose districts, and municipalities that are interested in this knowledge.
13	16.1	163	WSU Snohomish County Extension	Pet Waste Reduction through Veterinary Clinic Outreach	This project will change dog owner behavior to encourage scooping, bagging and trashing pet waste by initiating over 16,000 conversations between vet clinic staff and clients, potentially removing over 136,000 pounds of fecal matter in one year.	\$103,371			