

ALLIANCE COUNCIL MARCH 19th, 2013 MEETING

ATTENDING MEMBERS

Tom Kantz, Chris Ellings, Stephanie Suter, John Bolender, Karla Fowler, Debbie Riley, Jack Havens, Marco Pinchot (Jennifer Hopper), Amy Hatch-Winecka, Jodi Helea (sp?), Al Schmauder, Gabby Byrne, Justin Hall, Sue Patnude, Bob Simmons, Andy Haub,

COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

At the last meeting the Council decided to establish a communications strategy and a communications committee. Members of the sub-committee were Bob Simmons as lead, Gabby Byrne, Jennifer Hopper, Karla Fowler and David Jamison. Presented was a very rough draft. We have a lot of questions that need to be clarified before we go down any particular pathway. Re: purpose statement – basically to support the work that we’re doing here. The mission came right out of the operations of the last minutes – and the need to message consistently across members. Our strategy should take into account what the PSP is doing as well as taking into accounts the Eco-nets. At this first meeting the group brainstormed the communication issues that we feel the strategy should address. Two potential foci for the communications are:

- 1) Build awareness of the Alliance and what we’re doing and why – we’re the only organization looking at South Sound as a whole. Addressing restoration and protection from the bottom up. People need to know who we are and what the members are accomplishing. We want to build support through a variety of audiences – funders, legislators, public. Understanding of the problems and solutions that we’re trying to tackle. Also building support for discrete projects as that becomes an issue
- 2) Education is most meaningful when it relates to our home place. We could characterize each of the South Sound inlets, to speak to jurisdictions/legislators etc. and build communications on the inlet basis. Education then would use member’s strengths, accomplishments and needs.

A potential basis for that education – development of white papers on an inlet basis:

Characterization, on map, land cover, ecological conditions and interesting features, certain populations or species unique to that inlet, ecological problems that we know about, solutions, gaps, successes, what people can do. Identifying what organizations are doing and putting it in a larger context (issues that affect South Sound as well as the Sound entire). Potentially involve MES students to develop those papers with guidance from Gabby and the Council. Develop a template and then work through that, with guidance from the technical committee.

Next step would be to develop specific information for each audience.

Comments

- The messaging itself would evolve through the white paper. Council will need to review those and put it/them through internal vetting.

- Some of that has already been developed – through the core advisory group and the south sound profile. The first step would be synthesis of the information that we have.
- We really need to engage and use the eco-nets.
- Potentially may need to schedule a communications team talk with the Executive Committee.
- Council should consider looking at issues that South Sound wide – larger picture of South Sound – not just the inlets. There should be an intro to south sound – as part of each of the inlet. South Sound is so unique.
- **The South Sound is the beginning of Puget Sound – that should be a banner and tout the uniqueness.**
- Use fact statements about the problems, e.g.; our fish can't get through the Puget Sound.
- Eco-nets might be able to collectively identify regional education gaps.
- Contact watershed councils to help identify specific issues. If the Alliance can funnel people to the watershed groups, then were properly nested.
 - WAC 412 – 1996 Watershed Councils established by law? **As an Alliance we could support establishing those in areas where they don't currently exist.**
- Sub-committee can get to work on the matrix and on developing the audiences. Will need to determine who might be the best deliverer of those messages. Committee can develop a straw man and get feedback on that from the Council maybe via email.
- Pull from Econets and from PSP
- Work with the Executive Committee
- Inquire of the Econets whether they can be the conduit for communication of information about the Alliance. We can generate messages and ask them to broaden their scope. It will be important not to replicate. And certainly there are simple partnerships and it should be an iterative process.
- Funding via Ecology pollution fines channeled to Alliance projects and activities.
- Funding also might be possible from community foundations
- Communications sub-committee would like to have a technical subcommittee person for feedback.
- **We're talking about how larger (regional issues) affect issues on a local level. Begin with the larger regional white paper and then break it out into watershed/inlets as time allows – maybe a pilot inlet.**
- Success stories will be part of the overall communications strategy.

ECOSYSTEM SERVICE POINT FEASIBILITY SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE:

Bobby Cochran, Executive Director of the Willamette Partnership is coming to speak with us on the 29th of this month at the LOTT Cleanwater Alliance building 2:30 – 4:30 to share their program.

The technical committee is developing an ecosystem recovery strategy. First draft should be ready at the end of May. It will take each of the ecosystem recovery targets as identified by Puget Sound Partnership. Those targets will go through a South Sound filter and talk about what needs to happen within each inlet/island to recover those targets. Then, if the actions here are implemented, about how much

recovery comes from those actions and what the gaps are. The idea is to provide a framework to identify additional projects that need to happen in South Sound and in a readable format that offer the types of impairment and what needs to be done- essentially as a working document. In May, the Council will be asked to review that document and provide feedback in the June/July framework.

Technical team will definitely need input from the larger Council. We'll email the draft out and share with the Council prior to that meeting. Current technical team members are Tom Kantz, Chris Ellings, Scott Steltzner and Gabby Byrne.

REVIEW TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE TABLE AND DETERMINE POTENTIAL COUNCIL ROLE FOR EACH PROJECT/PROGRAM

The Executive Committee adopted a list of interim priorities (with associated targets). Those actions are in a spreadsheet. In addition, there are columns for who the project lead is (if there is one), what the implementation and funding status is, what recovery targets were addressed (Puget Sound Partnership recovery targets), action type – restoration/regulatory etc., and then, what the potential Council role might be for each of those actions. The Council should decide what its role should be. There are not a lot of details available for the individual projects.

If individual members have more information about any of these actions, they can send it either to Gabby Byrne or to Tom Kantz.

There are a number of blanks in the columns and some of the actions are consolidations. There are physical documents associated with the priorities list of “conservation plans”.

Gabby will send around the Project Information Sheet so that individual members can fill it out for the projects they are involved with. Those information sheets should also identify link to the detailed document or web site if there is one and ask for regionally significant projects be identified. Gabby will also insert links to the conservation plans in the priorities on the Alliance web site.

The intent with listing these multiple-action plans was to say, the Alliance acknowledges the scientific – rigor of the plan and that the actions within the plan are prioritized. Each plan may or may not then be able to point to individual projects or programs within its watershed that have regional significance. Those regional projects would be our focus. There is an outstanding question about whether those significant projects would be limited to the nearshore.

Projects must be tiered when funding is limited. Our priorities are associated with the Action Agenda, which will be updated in 2014 and 2016. That may be the time to revisit the Alliance priorities.

The WRIAs can identify (through the information sheets) which projects they feel are regionally significant within their larger plan and provide data about what the plan as a whole would accomplish - if fully implemented.

There will be cases where the implementation of a plan as a whole is important to the region. Potentially there could be a map with each of the priorities is a point on the map – showing miles of

shoreline restored etc. But rather than embarking on a whole new data sharing effort, potentially within the Habitat Work Schedule, projects could be coded for regional significance.

The role of the Council is predicated on a better understanding of the projects and what they accomplish.

There is no Action Agenda based capturing of all the recovery targets – not just salmon focused – but in the same vein as habitat work schedule (with a more regional context). That would be a really good thing for both the technical and the education and outreach perspective. This is something the Partnership could develop – with input. How does the Partnership track (and show) what the LIOs are doing.

Econets should be invited to see how they can participate. They can identify projects of regional significance relating to education and outreach.

Looking at stormwater systems that are non-compliant – not sure what that means, and how to know what's non-compliant, within the context of four jurisdictions. Doesn't match as well with the listed strategic initiatives.

Do we go back to the Executive Committee and ask them to clarify?

A non-compliant project is not meeting the state requirements. Retrofitting implies that the system is not sufficient due to the age it was created. Some of these actions began as multiple actions but were then bulleted and condensed. This is one of those.

Improve stormwater practices for aquatic habitat and water quality would capture all of these. But the NPDES permitting is also a specific topic. Potentially the Alliance focus would be on cross-jurisdictional consistency.

There will be a short list of projects too, that have no owner or that will need to identify a lead.

The projects should, at some point, point to specific targets and each project should represent a % recovery for South Sound (and Puget Sound as a whole) in the overall South Sound strategy.

COUNCIL SEATS

Filling missing seats, adding seats and terms/member attendance were discussed.

Open seats:

Citizens for each county – using county process. Kitsap, Mason and Pierce citizen seats are open.

- **Debbie Riley will work on the Mason citizen seat.**

Mason Economic Development Council seat is open.

- **John Bolender will approach MEDC.**

- The Shelton City seat is open – Bob Simmons will approach the Council in Mason.
- Gabby will talk with Kitsap contacts to find a Kitsap business related seat.
- JBLM – touch base with David Troutt
- PLU – Al Schmauder will follow up with his contact there.
- Gabby will send out the Alliance Council information sheet and Council seat role out.
- Leadership Council (at Partnership) seat is empty. Stephanie will look into this – perhaps Jeanette Dorner or Jim Bolger.
- State Agency seat is open. PSP is already present. Can explore the idea of other state agency seats later.

Do we have terms on our seats or do we add seats?

Different subjects will draw different angles at different sides. There's jurisdictional balance through the original seats. A non-exclusive approach is important. The diversity of opinions is important. For example – a health and human services person on the communications subcommittee would be great. We just maintain our baseline.

If folks are not participating, do we fill their seats?

We don't want to drop people off the list. Gabby will call individual Council members and ask them to assign alternates (and keep them informed).

Justin, as Chair, will propose at the next Executive Committee meeting that the Council be allowed to increase its seat number at will. They will determine whether those seats are voting or non-voting seats or whether there will be some system of representation. Potentially there could be a voting subcommittee. Keeping in mind that anything the Council moves forward are recommendations to the Executive Committee.

Next meeting is 1:00 – 4:00 on May 28th – in Tacoma.

Adjourn.