

Notes from PSP Local Government Meeting
September 28, 2011

NOTE: Additional comments can be provided to Martha by October 7

Overview/discussion

- PSP would like the Near Term Actions (NTAs) to be much more specific, with a work plan and quarterly milestones
- Funding strategy will be a separate document
- Perhaps the AA can set interim milestones for local government that are achievable, rather than ONLY “reach” goals
- Consider dual/different targets for rural and urban areas
- PSP can help by acknowledging existing regulations and programs as making progress towards restoration
- Regarding the desire by the PSP to have “no surprises”, this process is moving very fast which makes that difficult
- It’s very long and daunting; can the document be winnowed down and smaller?
- There is a lot of emphasis on local governments being reviewed for being consistent, but very little attention paid to state and federal agencies in the same way – this should be applied at all levels
- The tone of the Action Agenda implies that local governments are not doing many of the things called out as needed.

Priority A

- Local governments are already doing a lot of update work related to their mandates for GMA and SMA, and now trying to meet requirements under the Action Agenda is a new requirement overlaid on top of that
 - Many of these updates are so new that we don’t yet know if they are achieving the desired goals of protection and restoration
 - It would be useful to know if there is something that specifically needs additional updating, rather than general statements about updated CAOs and SMPs
- FEMA Bi-Op and levee management issues are very problematic for local governments right now, confusion around how to meet requirements and making progress
- Support for A.1.3 NTA 1 and 2
- Useful role for PSP would be to help educate public regarding need for compact growth patterns; experiencing resistance to increasing densities in UGAs
- Issue of making compliance with GMA a requirement in grant programs; jurisdictions not compliant need the help more
- One issue for cities is roads are a local general fund responsibility, but stormwater problem is hard to fix using general fund
- A.4.2 calls for PSP and Commerce to secure legislative approval for tax increment financing; this has been a city priority for several years
- Standards for roads from WDOT are not in sync with building better roads
- Improving the flexibility of enterprise funds would be helpful. Local governments can raise the funds.
- TIF is a priority and should stay on the list, but it is hard to do and longer-term.

Priority B

- Needs more detail
- Support item B.1
- B.2.2 probably will need a statutory change
- Need an incentive to get people to remove single-family bulkheads
- PSP staff asked about support for eliminating the exemption in SMA and HPA for single-family bulkheads
 - Discussion focused around the exemption being from permit requirements but not from the policies of the SMA and SMP; the exemption is not perceived as the issue
- B.2-6. Would be helpful if Ecology commented when permits first come in (which they came), not just at the end.

Priority C

- It would help for the Action Agenda to include comments/information on finfish net pens; one county tried to prohibit but Ecology not going to allow prohibition
- C.3.1 is a controversial aspect of the NPDES permit
- Retrofit requirement in C.3.3 should be contingent on additional funding
- Would be useful to have guidance to cities on where to start on stormwater
- C.3.4 NTA 2: Help Ecology increase the number of their inspectors, that is useful for local governments
 - Some overlap exists between Ecology and local governments here
- C.3.3 is this public or private?
- C.4.1 – elephant in the room

General concluding comments

- Marc Daily asked if there are more opportunities to meet with local governments and get this information out; opportunities include
 - WSAC conference in mid-November
 - Commerce quarterly planners' meetings
- Several comments were made about the Action Agenda being much smaller; that's a major concern, just having fewer things that we have to do
- In general, overlap exists – try and reduce that overlap. The Action Agenda looks like another layer to manage. It might not be, so be clear about what is the added part of the AA for Puget Sound.
- Examples of top priorities
 - More money, protect existing money, flexibility with funds we have, guidance on best ways to spend money