

ALLIANCE COUNCIL MEETING NOVEMBER 12th, 2013, 1-3
LOTT CLEANWATER ALLIANCE BOARDROOM
500 ADAMS, OLYMPIA

1:00

Introductions + minutes approved

Attending:

Debbie Riley
Jen Hopper
Al Schmauder
David Jamison
Robert Johnson
Amy Hatch-Winecka (2 seats)
Karla Fowler
Dan Wrye
Andy Haub
Jack Havens
Sue Patnude
Dave Peeler
Justin Hall
Gabby Byrne
Tom Kantz
Stephanie Suter
Kim Gridley
Jim Wilcox
Chis Schutz
Greg Pelletiere
Mindy Roberts
Dani Madrone
Anise Ahmed
Bob Simmons
Jen Hopper
John Bolender
Alex Smith

1:10

Dissolved Oxygen Report Presentation – Mindy Roberts (WA Dept. of Ecy)

Actions: Give input on report

Mindy:

What we're sharing today is a condensed version of a talk in mid-October. The report tries to understand the dissolved oxygen content in Budd Inlet. Draft reports: Any comments to Andrew.Kolosseus @ecy.wa.gov

This is not a one-time engagement on findings. We do check in with advisory committees and if you're interested in being on the advisory committees – email Andrew.

For both of these water bodies we do have circulation models and where inputs are coming from.

Greg will talk about the water calibration and how that works. We'll introduce some of the scenarios and the computer models that do tests for us. We asked questions like what if we turned off human sources, what if we doubled the population etc

We're worried about dissolved oxygen and the nutrients related to the lack of dissolved oxygen. The relationship is that over time the algae bloom and settle and use oxygen. Bacteria at the bottom levels also draw down oxygen. Wind mixing can also occur at the surface. It's a mixed upper layer and an isolated lower layer. This is a natural process. The question is whether with more human population, more nutrient inputs, there's an impact? Understanding the differential is what we're trying to do.

Circulation is a big driver in the PS and Salish Sea. The tides go in and out, but the river input also floats along the surface and so over time there's a conveyor belt of secondary circulation. That is influential.

Our model shows estimates of both the watershed inflows (septic, stormwater, creeks etc) as well as point-source.

There are, in the watershed inflow, both natural and human oriented inputs. Sediment fluxes - for every pound of nitrogen a percentage will impact more than the pound worth over time.

Several point sources upstream are also captured.

How much low oxygen is due to natural conditions and how much is human? We needed sophisticated computer models to distinguish this.

Then the question is do we need human impact reductions? Do we need NPDES permit changes to meet water quality based effluent limits?

GREG
Calibration

The focus was on South Sound (south of the narrows) but does extend North through central Puget Sound up to Edmonds.

A couple years ago we ran a model on Budd Inlet and used that as a starting place for South Sound modeling. The model is predicting up to 20 variables. It took the better part of a year to do over a thousand model runs.

During the summer months there's very high DO on the surface (being produced by algae) then as that algae dies and decays at the bottom the DO is much lower.

Models show both DO fluctuations at the surface and at the bottom.

We had a CTD lowered from a boat, recording as it's lowered and raised. Data changes also reflect depth of the water (much more shallow in the South Sound). Circles represent the data collection points.

There's also the influence of hydrodynamics on DO. When the water flows out through the narrows or in through the narrows, there's elevated mixing. Water backs up in the east passage.

Fly-by "eyes over Puget sound" shows both algal and jellyfish blooms with more intense bloom in the smaller inlets.

ANISE:

We ran a number of scenarios

WQ Standards:

DO – part one is numeric for south and central. Inner Budd inlet = 5mg/L. The outer Eld, Elliot = 6/MG and for the rest of the sound it's 7mg.

303D listing is based on the Numeric criteria.

The second part is the DO under natural conditions. As compared with manmade DO impacts.

Currently, we've measured human sources:

- .32 in Carr
- .22 in Case
- .29 in Budd and
- .38 in Eld,
- .29 in Totten

Almost 6X more nitrogen into Central Sound compared to South Sound

Then we looked at impacts:

When waste water plants are turned off.

When rivers are turned off.

Looking at decreases in percentages (overall decrease in Nitrogen)

Looking at removing sources in Central Puget Sound – no changes in the finger inlets.

Conclusions were that human sources are causing DO violations and the wastewater treatment plants have bigger impacts than rivers, and sediment fluxes and adjustments influence the results.

South Sound human sources, central sound and other sources (conveyor belt circulations that are unknown) are all having impacts. South Sound is the most sensitive in the whole Salish Sea.

In the circulation report we have a couple plots that show we did a dye test in human sources. You can see sources emanate and disperse. We also did the different inlets. Residence time in Eld is the longest. They recently changed in Shelton to pump on the outgoing tide. These models don't reflect those changes, but this model is set up to be able to evaluate that.

There are big point sources further north, but what about atmospheric nitrogen? We have atmospheric load incorporated and it's only a tiny percentage. But South Sound is the most sensitive.

Mindy – Salish sea findings – condensed.

They ran future scenarios through the 2070s including rising population, warming air temps and water temps, land cover, rain dominated vs. snow dominated systems and declining oxygen trends in Pacific Ocean.

If you turn off and on all human sources – including Canadian cities, the South and Central sounds are still the most impacted. These are not directly applicable to State of WA water quality standards.

Wastewater discharge through 2070 including landcover changes – the area of South and central sound are most sensitive.

Ocean also has a declining trend, working over a 50 year period. They have not really determined why this is. But if the decline continues linearly, the impacts are huge. In South Sound impacts are more significant locally.

That's the big picture.

Intent is to wrap up the modeling reports – comments to them in the next few days. We need to develop a more specialized model to add in sediment water exchange. Only Chesapeake Bay has done that level of refinement. That's slated for 2015. We have a lot still to learn. We've ruled out some impacts, but we know where the most sensitive impacts are.

Legislative Update and Input

- Task force recommendations, letter to EPA, other recommendations, bill

29th of October – Task force report presented report to the EC. They had asked for a more comprehensive review/package to move forward the legislative agenda. The report presents two options.

- 1) Moving forward with leg this session and getting sponsors
- 2) Distribute bill in anticipation of 2014 leg.

On 29th – EC took a hybrid. They decided to distribute the bill and while not moving forward, to still be open to opportunity. Task force proposed moving forward with a variety of conversations and tracking.

The Executive Committee recommended that the funding graphs be updated. The report also included a second proposal to realign LE.

Going through draft bill:

Goal was to get actual words out for people to see and react to – to give their feedback.

Review of “forum” versus “alliance”

Concept – two different types of LIOs. Alliance develops ERS that is reviewed by tech PSP team. Under section 5 – Action Agenda would incorporate ERS. Where Alliances are formed, ERS will be incorporated.

Page 9 Section 6 – new section

Sets forth the system for LIOs to be organized and funded for various purposes. Forums can give input. Alliances are formalized organized under an agreement or resolution or ordinance, with Executive Committee as a decision making body and a broader advisory council. Develop and implement ERS.

LIOs recognized as Alliances by the Leadership Council. All current LIOs are grandparented as Forums. Our Alliance is an “Alliance” for South Sound.

Regional Alliances will submit a draft Ecosystem Recovery Strategy (ERS) to PSP designed tech team for review and approval and to provide guidance on what the tech team would look at.

Review team comments within 30 days and the ERS must be incorporated in to Action Agenda

A regional allocation method to implement ERS at no less than 45% of total NEP (non-tribal) and Puget Sound recover funds. Also provide alliance EC with the ability to receive and distribute funds.

In deploying that method – they may pilot with South Sound Alliance.

Money that the partnership already makes available – 45% of that must go to regional alliances.

The Executive Committee is looking at comments and feedback.

Stephanie is attempting to schedule meeting with PSP leadership to get an in depth understanding.

Michael Grayum’s input

PSP over those years (2010 – 2013) received 10% of NEP funds. Bill says they get that 10%. EPA used 34% for what they call “priorities” for a wide range of things, NWIFC stays the same. After taking out the PSP and the NWIFC, what differs is that instead of the Lead Organizations distributing funds, the RCO would fill that role.

Conversation was that it could go through PSP or RCO. RCO won’t be using it to implement projects.

Bill specifics that 45% goes to Regional Alliances. But the bill does not specify the exact delineations (as spelled out in the flow chart).

The total amount is 146.11 million over 3 federal fiscal years (35-40 million a year).

4-5 million a year to the Alliance is the anticipated amount.

We are not currently seeking sponsors. We are open to the opportunity if a legislator picks this up. This is a way to start to have that conversation. There are some EC members that are very interested in moving quickly and others want to move slowly.

ACTION: The Council would like to have further discussion. Each member should take the legislation back to their organization and consider impacts. Bring those back to the Council for larger discussion.

2:20

Review of draft Near Term Actions (2014-2016) and request for input

PSP approved the Action Agenda and there’s now an opportunity to update and develop the details of our NTAs. We started with the Priorities and the tech team. Based on actions and priorities submitted previously, but we are looking for input.

If there is something in here that looks to be yours or you’re an owner – please give us your feedback.

Stephanie – there will be a 2014 update of the Action Agenda. The NTAs need to be within a two year time frame and have performance measures, can be tracked and have an owner linked through pressures and sub strategies on the action agenda.

On the NTAs – long term projects can be sequenced (e.g.; I-5 fill removal). When you're looking at projects you can think long term, but feasibility of the 2 year window for the first stage. Could be enhancements to current programs or projects that are already funded or that need funding. A mix of types of projects is good – so not all “funded” projects and not all “need funding” projects. We want to try and balance the list of projects between tracking and accountability for successes. in addition to getting additional funding.

Tom and the tech team – started with the interim priorities as a starting place. Tom Advised that Council members consider carefully the projects that you decide to include – there is a basic reporting requirement.

Reporting feature - Stephanie will show it at the next Council meeting. The budget numbers come in on the reporting tool (not part of the initial development of the NTA).

Each of the NTAs are linked with the pressures and sub strategies. Stephanie and the tech team can help with that.

We do not have yet performance measures – each “owner” needs to come up with their own performance measures.

These NTAs do not need to be ranked.

Dave – linked to Puget Sound vital signs and indicators. It might be helpful to think about how to link to the larger picture. What's the target or the relative obligation of the South Sound to the overall recovery of the Sound?

Stephanie: the Ecosystem Recovery Strategy will also do that. For the NTAs we're not asking for that level of detail.

The deadline for a near to final draft is by mid-Jan (Council meeting Jan 16th).... December 31st please get us your projects/edits etc.

Announcements and Sub-Committee updates:

Bob Simmons: The **communications committee** is working on white papers – they will be funding a grad student to pull that together based on inlets, including the main problems of each inlet, projects and solutions along with South Sound and inlet based talking points.

Michael Grayum has asked for the remaining city representative seat as Mayor of Dupont. He could also represent ex-officio state agency for the Partnership.

Justin will bring his letter of interest forward to the EC for a decision.

LE realignment proposal – on next agenda with David Troutt as lead.

Noted that Charlotte Garrido has left the EC. Kitsap has long been spread too thin, with interests in 3 separate LIOs. South Sound has only 10% of Kitsap County. Commissioner Garrido has trusted the other Executive Committee members to represent her interests for that small percentage of her county.