Alliance for a Healthy South Sound (AHSS) Executive Committee Meeting June 11, 2019, 10:00AM -12:00PM Conference Call



Executive Committee Members:

Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Tribe Kevin Shutty, Mason County David Troutt, Nisqually Tribe Derek Young, Pierce County Council Additional Attendees: Dan Calvert, PSP Thomasina Cooper, Thurston County

Tom Kantz, Pierce County Alex Paysse, Mason CD Karin Strelioff, Thurston CD Allan Warren, Pierce CD

Meeting Summary

I. Updates

- PSP Updates:
 - Puget Sound Day on the Hill will be held virtually this year.
 - State agencies have been asked to look at cost savings; PSP is examining cost savings around travel. PSP is strategizing for the upcoming leg session and considering how to do legislative outreach in light of COVID-19 restrictions.
- <u>NEP Funding</u>: The Habitat SIL has indicated that they accepted the Alliance for a Healthy Sound's recommendation to award \$100,000 in NEP funding to the <u>Mud bay Habitat Protection</u> NTA. This was the highest scoring NTA in the Technical Team scoring process this year, and the funding will allow Capitol Land Trust to complete the Mud Bay acquisition work and make a real start on restoration.
- <u>Action Agenda Planning</u>: Action Agenda planning for 2022-2026 has started. It appears that the new Action Agenda will be focused on priority pressure reduction. Instead of developing different strategies and actions, there will be effort to work throughout Puget Sound to identify priority pressures, drivers, and strategies. There will be actions/commitments, but there will not be same kind of solicitation as we have seen in the past.
- <u>South Sound GIS Updates</u>: Brian is almost done with the GIS updates, which includes updates on canned/prepopulated queries. We will see some exciting things come out of this in the next couple of months.

II. Shore Friendly Update

Karin Strelioff, Thurston CD, provided an update one the Shore Friendly work and success to date. Shore Friendly received local NEP funding in 2019 and 2018.

- The Shore Friendly initiative is focused on marine shoreline residential owners in Pierce, Thurston, and Mason counties. In the South Sound, there is over 380 miles of residential marine shore parcels. Almost half if this residential shoreline is armored. There are approximately 18 miles of shoreline armoring that have real impacts on feed buffers/critical habitats. The Shore Friendly collaboration is geared toward addressing these miles of shoreline armoring.
 - Priorities:
 - Protect and restore PS shorelines

- Avoid new armor installation on natural shorelines
- Remove existing armor where feasible and beneficial
- Guide homeowners towards low-impact waterfront management
- Focus on:
 - Natural shorelines
 - Low-risk armored shorelines with high ecological and coastal process value
- Pending mailings to south sound homeowners:
 - SFT: Watershed-specific to create local momentum/word of mouth: 509 people
 - SFM: Recent shoreline property byers will receive a mailing
 - All: prioritized armored sites using updated WDFW GIS Data access in July? (AHSS SS Strategy Mapping Tool)
- Shore Friendly South Sound collaboration has achieved the following progress to date:
 - In-person engagement
 - Key Peninsula workshop for marine shoreline landowners
 - Peer to peer education in Shelton
 - ORCA recovery day events with 150 volunteers at DeMolay Sandspit Preserve/West Bay Park
 - More to come as WA State reopening phases in
 - o Remote engagement
 - Local shore friendly webpages at each CD
 - Direct mailings to 1000+ shoreline homeowners
 - 5 new educational videos
 - A SS story map video project is in process
 - Shoreline guidance
 - Guidance materials adapted to each CD's local community
 - Topics span a range of homeowner concerns: low-impact living on coastal bluffs, native plants for marine environments, etc.
 - Homeowner Participation: 35 participants. Goal is 115 by 2022.
 - Site visits:
 - 23 in-person visits and 2 virtual visits
 - 14 people on wait list
 - Site visits are on hold for bit with COVID shut-down.
 - Technical Assistance:
 - Shoreline assessed:
 - 3.9 miles of natural shoreline
 - 0.5 miles of armored shoreline
 - 0.1 miles of new BH removal projects underway
 - Restoration Project Development
 - Goal: develop 4 bulkhead removal/restoration projects for construction in phase 2 of program
 - 3 of 4 projects are currently in development
 - o 1 in Thurston County, 2 in Mason County
 - There are 5 additional interested landowners in Pierce & Thurston Counties who want to explore bulkhead removal feasibility

Discussion

- David Troutt: How can the Executive Committee be more supportive and helpful to this work?
 - Karin: In all 3 counties, a key factor is having strong relationships with permitting and planning staff. The Executive Committee could affirm that this relationship is important. Permitting is an excellent touch point to intervene with homeowners to stop installation of hard armor/structures that have negative impact. Permitting offices could also connect people to the Shore Friendly program.
 - Allan: Executive Committee could also consider how to leverage Shore Friendly dollars with additional local dollars.
- Derek Young: In Pierce County, there are a lot of shoreline property owners, many of whom are very connected to and concerned about the Sound. Many care about Sound, but do not recognize their own impacts. Programs like Shore Friendly are important because they connect the dots for landowners; once landowners are informed they seem very open to making changes in personal behavior/properties. If property owners know this information and we have the right resources, we could get a lot of things done.
 - Councilmember Young noted that we need a stable, larger funding source for the Shore Friendly work. The ECB board has talked about potential funding sources; there are property owners (specifically railroads) that we know won't be de-armored. ECB is exploring the idea of charging rent to the railroad to pay for de-armoring activities. This is probably a state law issue that we could talk about.
 - Karin agreed that this there is often an information gap, and that once people know they care about protection/mitigation.
- Jeff Dickison: Congratulated the Shore Friendly project on this great effort. Jeff noted we need to sustain this program and look for additional funding sources. It is important to accelerate the removal of bulkheads; percentage of harden shoreline is unsustainable and the ecosystem will not work as is.
 - Jeff asked Shore Friendly if they have seen assessments outlining the potential for sea level rise to overtop some of the existing bulkheads. Jeff also wondered if there is an opportunity to look at retrofit design of hardened bulkheads. Are there alternative designs that could restore some beach function over time for bulkheads that cannot achieve removal.
 - Karin shared that alternative designs for hardened bulkheads has been an interest of hers for several years. Karin submitted a grant 3 years ago with engineers to receive seed money to start studying ways to retrofit bulkheads to gain function from habitat perspective. However, this grant wasn't funded. Karin has brought this same question up in a number of contexts and has received a fair amount of push back along the lines that it is enabling/incentive to retain armor/etc. There are miles of armor that we can't remove, and we can't just throw up our hands. There does need to be willingness on permitting and regulatory world that it is a good idea to revisit and put funding to innovate/creative design. Karin encouraged the Executive Committee to bring this up in other contexts because it is so critical.
 - Allan noted that the Shore Friendly initiative is doing GIS prioritization for targeted outreach and GIS data is getting integrated in this. They are looking at parcels most at risk to sea level rise.
- David Troutt: Asked how local governments can provide support and funding (not just access to competitive funding, but predictable year-to-year funding). David thanked Karin and Allan for all the work they have done. David asked about results from communication and outreach efforts on natural shoreline, if Shore Friendly has been able to avoid hardening armoring, and examples of where Shore Friendly wasn't success and lessons learned?

 Karin shared that landowners who received tech assistance/site visit almost always came away from this with a deeper understanding of what is causing erosion and decided against hard armor. Karin could think of one site from pre-Shore Friendly work that decided to install hard armor.

III. AHSS 2020-21 contract and optional task to tailor LIO coordination to support unique vision and goals of LIO

- Elizabeth McManus provided the following overview of the decision needed by the Executive Committee.
 - Select priority work for the 2020-21 LIO contract with PSP in light of the increased capacity funding available for next year. Choose *two or more* additional "tailored enhanced" subtasks from a menu provided. Deadline is August 12, 2020.
 - In addition, it would be helpful for the Executive Committee to send an initial signal as to whether it is comfortable with Thurston County continuing as the fiscal agent for this work and if it wants to see options for capacity support in 2020-21 (I.e., consider other contract or staffing options).
 - Capacity funding increasing to \$125,000 (from \$75,000) for next contract year.
 - Tasks which were optional becoming mandatory
 - Also opportunity to select some LIO priority tasks (task 5)
 - AHSS has about \$30,000 (estimate) for the LIO priority tasks once the mandatory tasks are accounted for
 - Yearly decisions about fiscal agent and staffing also needed
- The Task 5 options are:
 - $\circ~~$ 5.01: Regional planning and coordinating group participation
 - 5.02: Engage with local decision-makers and elected officials
 - 5.03: Provide seed money to NTAs*
 - 5.04: Reactivate the ECO Net
 - o 5.05: Contribute to barriers removal via continuous improvement project
 - 5.06: Pursue funding for NTAs*
 - 5.07: Structured decision making
 - * indicates that the Executive Committee had previously expressed interest in funding these types of activities.
- Timeline:
 - Now-August 12, 2020: LIOs determine which Task 5 subtasks to select.
 - August 12, 2020: Deadline for LIO SOW and budget to be returned to the Partnership for processing. Grant agreements will be returned by the Partnership to fiscal agents seeking final signatures no later than four weeks after receipt of final agreed-upon budget and SOW.
 - \circ $\,$ October 1, 2020: Expected beginning of next LIO coordination grant.
 - September 30, 2021: All funds of FFY 2021 LIO coordination grant expended, final deliverables and progress reports submitted

Discussion

• The Executive Committee expressed interest in retaining Thurston County as the fiscal agent if Thurston County is willing to continue this roll.

- David Troutt: Recalled that when the Alliance was first formed, there had been interest in creating a South Sound science institute that could be a science arm to support policy. David wondered if this might be a good time to invest in something like this.
 - Jeff Dickison: Shared that potentially what David is recalling is the idea that there could be an independent/non-profit associated with the South Sound work that could grow not only into a science institute but also develop additional outside sources of funding that the Alliance may not otherwise be eligible for. This would take more than additional \$30,000. It's unfortunate the Partnership has strict guidelines around what the additional money should be used for.
 - David suggested that we support a fundraising strategy. This could initiate seed money for developing future funding for projects. This could help the Alliance expand from what the Partnership wants to dictate so that the South Sound can implement projects that are regionally relevant.
- Ross Strategic will schedule a meeting in early August for the Executive Committee to select funding tasks.

IV. Wrap up and Next Steps

Please be in touch with Elizabeth McManus (<u>emcmanus@rossstrategic.com</u>) with any questions or suggestions for future agenda topics. A follow-up Executive Committee meeting will be scheduled before the August 12 deadline to determine options for the Task 5 of the 2020-21 LIO contract.