

## WRIA 8 ILA Renewal – Summary of Proposed Changes

### October 2014

Proposed Change	Document Reference	Considerations
<p><b>Add a series of “Whereas” statements to help document the rationale for the ILA and some history of the effort.</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: As of October 22, the WHEREAS statements include additional proposed statements re:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WRIA 8’s recognition that salmon habitat restoration increases ecosystem resiliency that helps address the likely effect of climate change</b></li> <li>• <b>Recognition of the importance of kokanee recovery and that WRIA 8 will seek to partner and coordinate efforts where priorities align with implementation of Chinook recovery</b></li> </ul>	<p>Preamble (p.1-2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps explain the impetus for establishing/renewing the ILA;</li> <li>• Documents history of the effort during the first 10 year period covered by the initial ILA;</li> <li>• Documents WRIA 8’s interest in regional and state recovery efforts</li> <li>• Recognizes the role salmon recovery actions plan in helping to address the effects of climate change.</li> <li>• Acknowledges the importance of kokanee recovery actions, and indicate WRIA 8’s intent to seek opportunities to partner where kokanee and Chinook recovery priorities overlap.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expand the eligible ILA partners to include public agencies other than cities and counties that affect land use decisions, such as tribes, port districts, utilities, etc.</b></p>	<p>Definitions – Eligible Jurisdictions (Section 1.1, p3)</p> <p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (section 4, p.6)</p> <p>Latecomers (Section 8, p.11)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadens potential ILA membership and coordination;</li> <li>• Spreads annual ILA cost share among more partners, reducing annual cost shares of individual partners</li> <li>• Salmon Recovery Council approves addition of any new ILA partners and the annual cost share for added partners;</li> <li>• Would likely require changes to the proportional/ weighted voting rules in Section 5.1.2;</li> <li>• Would allow entities other than cities and counties more influence in WRIA 8 decisions, but could also dilute the local governments’ decision making authority</li> </ul>
<p><b>Add description of WRIA 8’s role to annually recommend programs and projects for King County Flood Control District Cooperative Watershed Management funding</b></p>	<p>Purposes (Section 2.5, p.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More comprehensively documents WRIA 8’s integral role in selecting and recommending projects for Cooperative Watershed Management grant funding</li> </ul>
<p><b>Add description of WRIA 8’s role as the salmon recovery “Lead Entity” under state law to convene</b></p>	<p>Purposes (Section 2.6, p4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents WRIA 8’s formal designation and role as the salmon recovery “Lead Entity” in the watershed</li> </ul>

## WRIA 8 ILA Renewal – Summary of Proposed Changes October 2014

<p><b>local watershed-based technical and citizen’s committees to review, prioritize, and recommend projects for funding to the state Salmon Recovery Funding Board.</b></p>		
<p><b>Add additional emphasis on the use of monitoring and adaptive management to guide implementation of the WRIA 8 Plan</b></p>	<p>Purposes (Section 2.11, p.5)</p>	
<p><del><b>Change from annual to biennial budgeting</b></del>  <b>NOTE:</b> This earlier proposed change was removed based on King County legal review recommending to keep an annual budgeting process if any ILA partners still have annual budgeting.</p> <p>As WRIA 8 service provider, King County will provide a biennial budget projection to support the annual budgeting process.</p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.1, p.6)</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Many WRIA 8 ILA partners, including King County, have moved to biennial budgeting, so this would establish a similar budgeting cycle</del></li> <li>• <del>Doing biennial budgeting would need to not preclude getting budget information to ILA partners with annual budgeting processes</del></li> </ul>
<p><b>Incorporate the current practice of updating individual ILA partner cost shares more often than every three years when there is an annexation that changes the area and population calculation for affected jurisdictions enough to change their individual cost shares.</b></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"> <li>• Formalizes a common practice</li> <li>• Results in a less predictable cost share distribution, and requires tracking annexations more closely</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Add description of how the level of funding and resource obligation for public agencies other than cities and counties would be determined in communications with the Management Committee, which would develop a recommendation for Salmon</b></p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.2.1, p.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

## WRIA 8 ILA Renewal – Summary of Proposed Changes

### October 2014

<p><b>Recovery Council review and approval.</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires Salmon Recovery Council approval</li> <li>• Is not a predictable and clear cost share for potential ILA partners and existing ILA partners</li> </ul>
<p><b>Replace “shall” with “may” in section on service provider evaluation, which enables SRC to approve use of an annual anonymous service provider (currently King County) client satisfaction survey to meet the service provider performance evaluation requirement or to hire an outside consultant to provide a professional service provider assessment.</b></p>	<p>Organization and Nature of WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council (Section 4.2.2, p.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formalizes a current practice approved by the Salmon Recovery Council</li> <li>• Gives Salmon Recovery Council options for evaluating service provider and requires Salmon Recovery Council approval</li> <li>• Enables the Salmon Recovery Council to save costs by approving use of the annual anonymous service provider satisfaction survey when retaining an outside consultant to perform an assessment of service provider performance is unnecessary</li> </ul>

DRAFT