

**Alliance Executive Committee Meeting**  
**April 24<sup>th</sup> 1:30 – 3:30, Kitsap County Commissioner’s Chambers**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Executive Committee Attendees:**

Commissioner Sandra Romero – Thurston County  
Commissioner Randy Neatherlin – Mason County  
Commissioner Garrido – Kitsap County  
Council Member Connie Ladenburg – Pierce County  
Executive Pat McCarthy – Pierce County  
David Troutt – Nisqually Tribe

**Guest Speakers:**

Justin Hall, Alliance Council Chair  
Dan Wrye, Pierce County

**1:30**

**WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**

**1:35**

**Alliance Council Update** – Justin Hall, Council Chair

*Decision Point:*

- *Does the Council have the authority to add seats?*

*Three potential options:*

*Voting seats, Non-voting seats, non-voting seats assigned to voting representatives*

The Alliance Council met on March 19<sup>th</sup> in Mason County. The Council communications subcommittee reported that they were drafting a communications plan. This outlines the development of Alliance visibility documents as well as several inlet based white papers that would talk about the positives of each and the challenges and what needs to happen moving forward.

The ecosystems services subcommittee reported that Bobby Cochran, the Executive Director of the Willamette Partnership had spoken with the subcommittee about the process they went through to develop ecosystem services points in the Willamette valley. Ecosystems services is the concept that the ecosystem provides, for example, clean water or carbon sequestration, such that it's more economically viable to provide healthy ecosystem's serving those important and needed functions, rather than paying for a built system to serve that function at a later time. The subcommittee is looking at the possibility of transferring that model to the South Sound.

The balance of the Alliance Council meeting involved reviewing projects/programs table that the Council technical committee established for the marine nearshore. That subcommittee has been developing an ecosystem recovery strategy that lists priority projects – to be drafted in May. The Council also talked about currently empty seats. Council members are approaching people to fill those seats. In addition, the Council doesn't currently have any provisions for expansion and

several requests for seats have been made. They would like to be able to add seats. In addition, They would like to bring forward some modifications and clarifications to by-laws.

### **Discussion:**

David Troutt recalled that the original thought was that rather than increasing the number of seats over time, that some of these groups form caucuses. It's great to have as many people as are interested but we also want to keep in mind the notion of balance and intent.

Commissioner Garrido suggested that caucuses would offer a broader level of accountability.

Commissioner Romero suggested the Council also look at gaps over time in seat representation and make recommendations. Balanced is important.

CM Ladenburg suggested adding designated categories – e.g.; for health department.

Several members of the committee remarked that while the intent was always to be inclusive, that it was nonetheless important to have a balanced approach in terms of jurisdictional seat numbers.

The Community Non-Profit asking for a seat on the Council is CLIPA (Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association). [www.savecapitollake.org](http://www.savecapitollake.org)

Commissioner Romero remarked that the CLIPA mission may be in conflict with the goals of the Alliance and asked that their representative share his views.

Jack Havens respectfully disagreed with the Commissioner's remark and stated that CLIPA is focused on the idea that the environmental effects of the lake should not be the focus, but rather the socio-economic costs of eliminating the dam.

Executive McCarthy suggested that the focus could be having a discussion or presentation, rather than establishing a new seat. She stated that Puget Sound health is the focus of the Alliance, though there are of course, ancillary things and that there can be an opportunity to express opinions.

The Council Chair suggested that recommending term limits for members might be another mechanism for including different voices over time.

### **Action:**

**Council Chair will bring back a proposal which will include amended by-laws as well as a proposal for adding Council seats and any specific seat addition recommendations.**

**1:50**

**Monitoring and Adaptive Management update**

The South Sound is again leading by example with collaborative funding programs. The pooling of funds for individual Recovery Chapters is being proposed to establish a contracted position, under the Alliance umbrella, for the development of a Regional Monitoring and Adaptive Management Strategy.

*Decision Points:*

- *Does the Executive Committee support moving forward with this proposal?*
- *Does the Executive Committee approve the draft project description for the position?*
- *Who will be the fiscal agent for this contracted position?*

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Neatherlin expressed concern about money being designated for planning efforts rather than specifically for implementation of on the ground projects.

David Troutt offered background on this collaborative planning effort. He stated that Puget Sound Partnership were supporting watershed groups in the development of a recovery plan – a legal requirement for endangered Chinook recovery. The money that is being made available is specific to Chinook recovery monitoring and adaptive management planning efforts and cannot be used for any other purpose. The initial choice would be to accept the funds for planning or to turn it down.

Dan Wrye stated that Chinook recovery is based upon salmon recovery chapters on a chapter by chapter basis – each one has a unique recovery strategy. There is, however, a common need for an adaptive management strategy. The Puget Sound Partnership announced its intent to use EPA National Estuary Program funds to develop these strategies. If split into the salmon recovery chapters, this would mean 40K for South Sound Chapter, 40K for Nisqually and for Chambers/Clover. That meant three independent plans.

In looking at that opportunity – David suggested that three separate plans didn't make sense. He suggested that in collaborating and combining those pieces, there could be a consolidated plan for the region. All of the Lead Entities have approved that idea. In addition all of the Lead Entity Citizen Advisory Committees also gave their approval for this consolidation. All are in support of the consolidation. There are also other species (beyond Chinook) and consolidating would allow us to address Chinook recovery specifically, but other species in addition, at the same time at a regional level.

Dan Wrye shared that there are two relevant documents (given out at meeting). The first is the collaboration proposal and the second is the basic job description for the contractor that would fill the role of developing this regional monitoring and adaptive management strategy.

Commissioner Romero asked why Thurston and Kitsap counties weren't being considered as fiscal agents for the position.

Executive McCarthy replied that consideration was made in terms of trying to both consider and balance the availability of and draw on the resources of Alliance members.

In addition, as Pierce County and Squaxin Island staff are leading the Council technical committee development of the Recovery Strategy, either of those members could provide needed continuity as well as expertise.

Council Member Ladenburg asked if the money was one time funding or if it would continue.

Dan Wrye stated it was one year funding.

David Troutt asked to address Commissioner Neatherlin's initial point. When NOAA adopted Chinook recovery plan under Endangered Species Act (ESA), they identified the adaptive management part of the plan was extremely weak. The response from the shared strategy of the region was that we will develop that adaptive management piece. But that hasn't been developed. The partnership was able to work with EPA to develop funds to address this last element of the Chinook recovery plan. So, it's a requirement under law. The funds are directed specifically for this purpose to meet this objective. The discussion has been that although here in South Sound we've embraced a multi-species recovery objectives, but the focus of this money is Chinook and meeting our ESA requirements. Whatever we can do beyond that is great, but the minimum deliverable is that adaptive management framework - South Sound strategy.

The main problem has been that in the South Sound there is no single person or entity accountable for implementing the Chinook recovery Chapter. Part of this work would be potentially proposing a structure that would allow for greater accountability. The Nisqually is putting forward all of it's money for this purpose. The funds are vital, important and specific to this purpose.

Executive McCarthy recalled that approval was given by all five of the salmon recovery groups. She asked whether one individual could accomplish the work and whether it was focused on synthesis of data. Can one person do this job?

Dan Wrye replied that this project is the development of a framework. The Puget Sound Partnership is sequencing the work and that a second round of funding would then be anticipated. A scientist (natural resources) is the right choice for filling that role.

David Troutt stated that The Salmon Recovery Council has developed a technical tool – using open standards. Each of the sixteen chapters have money to convert their plan into this common tool. Main work for this person is the South Sound with Nisqually and Puyallup integrated. David – yes, one person can do this.

Commissioner Romero stated that monitoring is really expensive. Are we going to have any money, after the strategy is developed, for implementation of the monitoring itself.

Tom Kantz responded that – what we have is money for developing a plan. There isn't money yet for implementation of that monitoring plan. We don't know yet how the state is looking at

funding the implementation of these plans. We do know that Puget Sound Partnership has a monitoring program and is actively determining how to do not just salmon monitoring but a whole suite of monitoring for a wide range of targets.

David Troutt added that while it won't give us money for monitoring, but that this frame work will prioritize and give a game plan for that monitoring and allow so we can leverage current projects.

Commissioner Neatherlin stated that contracting is fine but that his main concern is will the position continue on, potentially eating up project money by overhead and all that.

Charlotte added that Kitsap offers a tremendous amount of data. Burley – Minter data should be considered. A map of the region should be in front of us all the time.

Commissioner Romero suggested that some GIS data could be used to produce that map.

**Action:**

**Executive Committee asked Gabby to provide a map.**

David Troutt returned to Commissioner Neatherlin's point, stating that when the members began the Alliance, they wanted to have their own science. His view and the view of some others – is that the Alliance have capacity to direct and house our own science. The intent is that it not be a one-time funding effort. If we have no the people to implement or the science to prioritize, then there are no projects. We've picked a lot of low hanging fruit, but we need to local based science to drive priorities.

Executive McCarthy concurred. There was a lot of passion about whether we needed an administrative person or a science person. We were only offered funding for one position. This is an opportunity to build that authenticity. We should fill the current need as see where it takes us.

Commissioner Romero stated that the current decision is about a one-time contract.

CM Ladenburg asked whether it was likely that there will be funds for implementation.

Dan Wrye replied – yes, and if that if the Alliance doesn't move forward, that money is likely to go elsewhere.

Executive McCarthy suggested that at some point it might be wise to talk to our county legal staff. As a federated board – we want to make choices that are in the best interest of this body. We'll come back to the group with a plan (via email) to move forward with the input on that.

**Action:**

**Commissioner Romero moved that the Alliance hire a natural resource science contractor based on legal advice and that Pierce County would be the fiscal agent for that contract and that the position would be housed at Pierce County.**

**David Troutt seconded and added that it will be important to have the right person moving forward so that options for the future aren't limited.**

**2:20**

**Alliance 2014 Legislative Strategy Discussion – Dan Wrye, Pierce County**

A legislative strategy for the 2014 session is being proposed which will amend Chapter 90.71 RCW, Puget Sound Partnership to encourage recovery within Action Areas. A line item funding appropriation is also proposed.

*Decision Points:*

- *Does the Executive Committee support moving forward with this legislative strategy for the 2014 session?*
- *What are the next steps?*
- *What role does each Executive Committee member and the Alliance Council play in moving the agreed upon steps forward?*

Dan Wrye, Pierce County, presented the legislative strategy proposal for consideration:

As background, Dan shared that each jurisdiction resolved to form the Alliance with similar language. The Pierce County resolution read:

- Whereas, the lack of a formal regional coordinating body for South Puget Sound results in unnecessary and counterproductive competition for funds among local governments and Tribes of South Sound that is both wasteful and does not assure state and federal funds go to the most important needs of the region; and
- Whereas, the lack of a formal regional coordinating body for South Puget Sound results in federal or state entities setting priorities for the South Sound; and
- The State of Washington will derive specific and measurable benefits from the regional coordination and collaboration of the South Puget Sound Council therefore, the State must assume a financial responsibility by providing operational support for the Council and that support is hereby requested.

There are four parts to the strategy. The first two parts are complete or in development.

- 1) Regional priorities – already adopted
- 2) Ecosystem Recovery Strategy for South Sound – in development by the Council's technical subcommittee and based on the lead entity model. This strategy is critical for ensuring progress and demonstrating capacity.

The third and fourth parts are new.

- 3) Policy authorization in the form of 2014 amendments to Puget Sound Partnership Law (Chapter 90.71 RCW) to include: Direct recovery at Action Area level, Establishing

structures like Alliance for a Healthy South Sound, Authorizing Action Areas to accept and distribute funds, Direct establishment and implementation of Action Area – specific recovery targets and recovery strategies, and Direct state agencies to accept Action Area priorities.

- 4) A funding allocation ask that would include 10 – 14% of non-tribal National Estuary Program/Puget Sound Geographic Initiative allocation, Centennial Clean Water Funds or other funds with a Biennial goal of \$4 - \$5 million dollars. This block grant redistributions would go to regional priorities.

The line item appropriation is essentially 1/7<sup>th</sup> of the funds – divided equally into the seven legally mandated Action Areas – going directly to the Alliance for implementation (4-5m). Those funds would then be available to the Executive Committee for distribution, based on the Alliance's regional recovery strategy.

In talking with each of the Executive Committee members, several themes came to the fore:

- Partnering with PSP and with others is important.
- The original sponsors of the PSP bill should be informed.
- Other actions areas are also interested and that outreach should be included.
- We should all be in this together. PSP, the Governor and EPA should have first right of refusal – seeking their support and help them find a way to be involved. We know the PSP has some needs and we think we can help them meet their needs and accomplish our goals also.

Regarding EPA. A response to the Chair's letter was received from Dennis McLerren. His response was that while local areas are important, they are committed to the LO approach and have gotten positive feedback. EPS wants to clarify the role of the LIOs (Alliance) and indicated interest in how to integrate local priorities with the larger scale priorities.

### **Discussion:**

Commissioner Garrido commented that she likes the idea of first approaching the Partnership to get their support.

Executive McCarthy noted that we're relying on our Alliance to help determine what our priorities are and the local priorities are the scale that makes sense.

Commissioner Romero thanked staff for the full briefing prior to the decision and is in support.

CM Ladenburg agreed that PSP should be involved. She noted that while at first blush, it looks like we're competing, that's not the intent.

David Troutt noted that the Partnership had talked about the legislation needing revisions. He put forward that a single well-supported request is more likely to succeed rather than a series of requests.

He also stated that he is not satisfied with the current funding arrangement and contends that the LO strategy is *not* working. The Tribes have asked EPA on number of occasions to change the system now, not in 3 years. He recommends that the Alliance suggest to EPA that we fully expect that in 3 years, the basis for the implementation of the Action Agenda will be the local voice.

Commissioner Neatherlin noted that the LO process is not working and is in complete support.

Executive McCarthy noted that Puget Sound Partnership is a fairly new organization, but recalled that when the PSP started to divide into more action areas than the seven determined by law, there was frustration about the dwindling funds.

#### **Actions:**

- **Executive Committee supports the authorization of a legislative strategy.**
- **Engage with Puget Sound Partnership and work to involve them in the development of the strategy and on changes to the law.**
- **Incorporate the messages from the members**
- **A small group will meet with EPA (Dennis McLerran) to discuss reasons for and ways to move forward. At present that group is David, Dan, Charlotte and Gabby.**
- **Bring the drafted strategy to the next meeting of the Executive Committee for approval and share with stakeholders.**
- **Engagement with other stakeholders should occur after the strategy is developed.**
- **The Alliance Council is directed to review the Ecosystem Recovery Strategy in development by the Council technical subcommittee for referral to the Executive Council.**

**3:20**

#### **Establishing an Alliance process for electronic requests for support**

Given potential opportunities for Executive Committee members to legislatively support individual member projects or programs which are tied to regional priorities, a clear process for seeking support is needed.

#### *Decision Points:*

- *Does the Committee support a Fall policy retreat during which the policy priorities of each jurisdiction would be shared and discussed to establish an Alliance list of supported legislative priorities for projects/programs?*

The idea of a Alliance retreat to discuss a policy-related member priorities. Gabby will begin planning for at least a half day in August before the legislative committee weeks in September. One of the goals would be to review each member's Puget Sound related capital budget priorities such that other members or the Alliance as a whole could offer their legislative support.

One of the benefits of this retreat would be a series of small victories which would raise our visibility up and give exposure to the Alliance.



**Action:**

**Gabby will begin planning an (at least a half day) retreat before the legislative committee weeks in September.**

**3:30**

**Adjourn**

**NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING – MAY 29<sup>th</sup> 2-4, IN TACOMA**