

MEETING SUMMARY
ALLIANCE FOR A HEALTHY SOUTH SOUND
MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
APRIL 19th, 2012 2pm – 4pm
Mason County Public Works

Executive Committee Attendance:

Jeff Dickison (for Andy Whitener) – Squaxin Island Tribe
Pat McCarthy – Pierce County Executive
Sandra Romero – Thurston County Commissioner
Charlotte Garrido – Kitsap County Commissioner
Lynda Ring Erickson – Mason County Commissioner
Stan Flemming – Pierce County Council

Others in Attendance:

Chris Schutz – Pierce County
Dan Wrye – Pierce County
Tom Kantz - Pierce County
Debbie Riley – Mason County/Shellfish Protection District
Loretta Swanson – Mason County
Rich Doenges – Thurston County
Sue Patenude – People For Puget Sound/Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team
John Bolender – Mason Conservation District
Amy Hatch-Winecka – Salmon Lead Entity, WRIA 13 and 14
Tristan Peter-Contesse – Puget Sound Partnership
Gabrielle Byrne – Alliance for a Healthy South Sound

Welcome and Introductions

Following introductions around the table, Commissioner Ring-Erickson welcomed everyone on behalf of Mason County.

Update on the Puget Sound Partnership’s strategic initiatives, sub strategy ranking and next steps

Gabby Byrne opened discussion with a broad overview of PSP updates and changes in the Action Agenda for 2012 – specifically the changes to the strategic initiatives and a review of the issues and proposed resolution of problems with the survey that led to sub strategy ranking.

Strategic Initiatives were changed from their preliminary categories of Rural Run-off, Urban Run off, and Habitat Acquisition Protection to Protection of Habitat and Removal of Barriers to Salmon Recovery, Prevention of Pollution from urban stormwater run-off and Recovery of Shellfish beds. This has been tweaked third time to Habitat Protection, Prevention of Pollution from urban stormwater runoff and recovery of shellfish beds.

Dan Wrye noted, for the ECB that the Partnership is required by statute to prioritize strategies and actions. The JLARC (Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee) review faulted the PSPS

for not prioritizing in the last report and directed them to do that. There's a big institutional push to do that. They proposed a strategy for prioritizing what they called sub strategies through an intensive online survey tool. They asked for nominations for technical and science organizational representatives to do this survey. In the technical group, there were about 40 people, about half from state agency, a quarter from county and about the same for tribal representatives. The other group were made up of about the same number of policy folks.

The results of that online prioritization went to a special ECB meeting in early April. Upon reflection on these 73 sub strategies it was determined that it wasn't a balanced list. For water quality only one was in the top twenty and 24 of the bottom priorities were water quality. There was concern about both representation and attrition because of the length and intensity of the survey. The PSP director heard those concerns and decided that despite the Legislature and JLARC push to have priorities, they decided not to publish the priorities now. They have a short and long term objectives. They will try to get qualified support of the Action Agenda without the priorities and then pull in the scientists and technical people to review issues with the survey and they look for ECB review in late summer.

Copies of the Action Agenda "Book 1" Update, have been emailed to the Executive Committee

The update draft came out only a few days before this meeting of the Executive Committee. The PSP Leadership Council is scheduled to make a decision on the adoption of the Action Agenda Update on April 26th.

Concern was expressed about the amount of time given by PSP to review and give feedback on the Action Agenda Update.

A commitment had been made by PSP to have an additional policy review of the rank order in July or August. The Office of Financial Management has asked for a single rank order list in September in preparation for the next administration's budget proposal. This means that the ranking order will have budgetary implications.

Major concerns expressed by stakeholders about the ranking of sub-strategies included, that the list made more sense broken out than as one list, representation and attrition of those taking the survey, important definitions not understood consistently by the survey-takers, and the weighting for the survey needing review. There has been a commitment to address these items in the coming months. AHSS strategic initiatives nest nicely in the PSP Strategic Initiatives.

The Committee was also referred to RCW: 98 71 310 (f) which states that the Partnership is required to provide prioritized actions identified through the assembled proposals from each of the action areas. It is their legal obligation.

Action Item: Whether to update the AHSS Strategic Priorities to align with changes in the PSP Strategic Initiatives

The Executive Committee determined that the AHSS Strategic Priorities should be left unchanged for the time being, with review again in the future, if needed.

Action Item: Whether to comment on the sub-strategy ranking process

The Executive Committee determined that a simple letter to share again the AHSS Strategic Initiative and Interim Priorities, unchanged, is all that is required at this time.

Review of the First Council Meeting and Next Steps

Gabby opened discussion with an overview of the first AHSS Council meeting. Seats still needing to be filled include the citizen seats from Mason, Pierce and Kitsap counties, Kitsap County Chamber of Commerce as well as city of Shelton, Mason County Economic Development Council and JBLM.

General Collins will be recommending someone from JBLM (via CM Stan Flemming)
Debbie Riley will assist with gaining seat for City of Shelton
John Bolender will assist with gaining seat for Mason EDC and Mason citizen

The Council members are receiving large amounts of background information in preparation for the next meeting in early May.

Concern was expressed by Commissioner Ring-Erickson that the AHSS Council not re-invent the wheel with a science plan. Specifically, that the work of other science panels and committees should be used to have a consistent methodology. The Partnership should be able to provide guidance in this area. Her concern is that South Sound not be left out of funding opportunities if the comparisons of priorities are not using similar methodology/comparisons.

Jeff Dickison expressed support for a South Sound Regional Strategy independent of the Partnership. Restoring South Puget Sound is a long term commitment that we will need to be the primary providers of that plan and output. Weighing that against the regional nature of issues, the issues that drive us in South Sound are going to be different than in other parts of the Sound. It is incumbent upon us to recognize and identify our priorities and develop a Science Strategy that is based on that. We don't need to work in a vacuum and consistency among the regions will be important. We do, however, need to approach it from a South Sound perspective. In many ways South Sound leads the strategies and priority setting.

It was suggested that any sub group working on a Science Implementation Strategy for South Sound might include someone from the PSP science panel. This would help assure alignment, but also protect the South Sound autonomy.

Commissioner Garrido supported asking the Council to layout an approach to the science plan and/or performance measures. She also recommended that the Council start with our mission and vision to adopt or tweak.

Action Item: Approval or changes to Council Agenda draft

Executive Committee agreed that a discussion item for the Council should be the potential inclusion of PSP science team members to help assure alignment.

Executive Committee asked that the current AHSS Mission and Vision be provided as guidance to the Council in establishing their mission and vision.

Executive Committee approved the AHSS Council Agenda

Overview of the South Sound Science Symposium

Rich Doenges presented an overview of the South Sound Science Symposium and the plans for the 2012 Symposium.

Focus for this year is *New Findings, Collaborative Actions, Positive Change*. Executive Committee member Jeff Dickison is one of the founding fathers of this effort. The focus of the symposium is science and synthesis of science specific to the South Sound. The Symposium is on October 30th, 2012 and hosted by the Squaxin Island Tribe.

Local government is often is on the cutting edge in terms of science applied to regulations and ordinances. The steering committee that is planning the symposium has asked for a topic that presents the local jurisdictional perspective. Audience for this symposium consists of researchers and implementers from local, state and federal as well as academic and NGOs – the South Sound science and technical community. It is a very well received and well attended conference that really helps synthesize and translate local science for the local community.

Action Item: Determine topic and potential presenter/s

The suggestion was that a proposal be put together by Rich/Tom/Gabby for Symposium Steering Committee review, including the following potential topic suggestions:

- The politics of environmental science - how we use and/or find science for what we're doing.
- Why is science needed in making regulations/ordinances?
- Hood Canal case study – here's what happened to us, and here's what we did about it.
- Commissioner Romero showed support for having a local Government presenter, particularly a planner that could speak to the local jurisdictional perspective.

LIO Funding Allocation

Gabby opened discussion with a review of the letter written by Commissioners Romero and Ring-Erickson to the Puget Sound Partnership regarding allocation of LIO funds, as well as the Partnership's response to that letter. The current understanding is that, although the EPA

originally termed the LIO funding allocation formula preliminary, that there will not be any changes in the coming year.

Jeff Dickison shared that the funding discussion has broadened to include the idea of reallocation of funds across multiple agencies and funding sources. LIO would be better served to begin thinking through that issue in more detail and determine if there is a South Sound perspective on that issue. For this year, it's clear we won't have success in altering the funding. There is, however, pending potential significant change in the funding landscape. We should instead prepare for that, educate ourselves about that and have a position.

There has been a suggestion raised (in the broader environmental community) regarding efficiencies in spending – that the funds should be reorganized in some way. This notion is sometimes used as a justification for cutting funds in the name of efficiency, but potentially this is a way to collect funds in a more collaborative way.

Dan Wrye referred to a letter from the Resource Conservation Office, funding entity, asking for the Partnership and the Salmon Recovery Council to find efficiencies in the Lead Entities. RCO suggested a potential consolidation of lead entities. Partnership responded that they would like to broaden the topic of efficiencies to include the salmon recovery tier 2 and 3 reviews for the state. Dan further suggested to Jeanette Dorner to broaden further to include the PSP's decision to fund 10 LIOs instead of the original 7 LIOs. PSP wants to focus on how LIOs like this one can be put into the position of deciding where state grants go to. The LIO would have the decision of where funds would go, rather than pursuing an addition LIO capacity amount. The idea would be that EPA Region 10 choices about spending would go directly to the LIO. This would be an opportunity we haven't had before.

Action Item: Does AHSS want to send another letter to PSP (and/or EPA) asking that LIO funds be allocated based on evidence of community support, cohesions, demonstrated achievement etc.?

There is no current need for another letter, but we should prepare ourselves for the potential changes in funding positioning and background as well as the efficiencies background/briefing. Tristan will work with Gabby on this and provide background information. This should also be shared with the AHSS Council.

LIO “Champions” Program Nominations

The Champions Program presented by the Puget Sound Partnership is an annual program in its first year. The LIO is charged with choosing a nominated project for one of each of the following categories: habitat restoration, habitat protection and pollution prevention. The “Champions” in each category will be recognized by the PSP Leadership Council at an upcoming meeting in May/June. There was only one nomination for the habitat restoration category – Kristin Williamson from the South Sound Salmon Enhancement Group. The nominators spoke briefly about their nominations. In habitat protection, the Nisqually Reach Nature Center for their role in the development and nomination of the Nisqually Aquatic Reserve and George Walter, President of the Nisqually Land Trust for his long career and successes in

protecting shoreline. In the category of Pollution Prevention there were multiple nominees: Earth Friendly Products out of Lacey Washington, Erin Ewald from Pierce Conservation District, Pierce County Stormwater inspectors and Oakland Bay Clean Water District.

Action Item: Choose Nominations to move forward to the Partnership

Habitat Restoration: Kristin Williamson, South Sound Salmon Enhancement Group

Habitat Protection: Both nominees were moved forward (Nisqually Reach Nature Center, George Walters of Nisqually Land Trust)

Pollution Prevention: Multiple nominees were moved forward (Earth Friendly Products, Erin Ewald, Pierce County Stormwater Inspectors Team, Oakland Bay Clean Water District)

Those nominees not chosen as “Champions” will be recognized with a letter by the LIO.

Next meeting of the AHSS Executive Committee is June 21st from 2- 4

Gabby will check to see if Squaxin Island Tribe is able to host on that date and time.