

Action Agenda Book 2

Combined NTA Amendment Forms

July 2, 2012

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Neal Jander
2. Agency or Affiliation: Snoqualmie Tribe
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 425-292-0249 ext. 2100 Email: njander@snoqualmienation.com
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
A1.1 NTA 2 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for (low impact) development.
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
By December 2012, the Puget Sound Institute will work with the Puget Sound Partnership and other state, federal, **Tribes**, local, and academic partners to develop a web-based tool to improve and support spatial landscape data collection, sharing, and analysis to improve the ability of agencies to make land use decisions based on watershed assessments and other local characterizations.
7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.
N/A

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The Snoqualmie Tribe is interested in improved support for spatial landscape data collection, sharing, and analysis. Northwest Tribes work on the ground to implement habitat improvement projects and have a growing need to prioritize grant proposals based on watershed assessments and of the local characterizations. Funding sources are not unlimited as we all know and making sure that the projects we propose will effect real and tangible change is more important than ever before.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

I anticipate that all Northwest Tribes would be interested in utilizing and contributing to a Web-Based Data Tool to Support Land Use Decisions.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Tribes working on the ground in various watersheds around Puget Sound will not have the decision support tools necessary to apply for funding in a grant funding environment that is growing ever more complex. Furthermore habitat improvement projects that are of high value on tribally owned land may not get funded because Tribes were not able to share environmental data to the web-based tool.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Cindy Spiry

2. Agency or Affiliation: Snoqualmie Tribe

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 425-292-0249 ext. 2102

Email: cindy@snoqualmienation.com

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

5. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

A3.1 NTA 2 Landowner Incentives for TDRs and Ecosystem Markets. Ecology and Commerce, in coordination with DNR and the State Conservation Commission, will provide technical support and fund local projects to identify and implement landowner incentives, including Transfer Development Rights (TDRs) and ecosystems services market.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

A3.1 NTA 2 Landowner Incentives for TDRs and Ecosystem Markets. Ecology and Commerce, in coordination with DNR and the State Conservation Commission, will provide technical support and fund local projects to identify and implement landowner incentives, including Transfer Development Rights (TDRs) and ecosystems services market. **Include more information about this. Is there a funding source?**

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

N/A

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

It seems unclear how this will work. If this is an established program with a funding source, that should be identified.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

No

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Confusion about what it means

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Cindy Spiry
2. Agency or Affiliation: Snoqualmie Tribe
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 425-292-0249 ext. 2102 Email: cindy@snoqualmienation.com
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing

5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

A3.1 NTA 3 Forest Watershed Services. DNR will support pilot market transactions for delivery of watershed services from private forest landowners to downstream water beneficiaries in at least the Snohomish and Nisqually watersheds.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

A3.1 NTA 3 Forest Watershed Services. DNR will support pilot market transactions for delivery of watershed services from private forest landowners to downstream water beneficiaries in at least the Snohomish and Nisqually watersheds.

Include more information about this. Is there a funding source? What sort of services?

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

N/A

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

It seems unclear how what this means. Does DNR pay the private forest owner for something? Please explain.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

No

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Confusion about what it means

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

11. Name:

12. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Habitat Strategic Initiative

13. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

14. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

15. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

A5.1: Improve data and information to accelerate floodplain protection, restoration, and flood hazard management.

NTA1: Floodplain Protection and Policy Team Actions. PSP will advance floodplain protection and restoration by facilitating actions, policy changes, and program changes necessary to meet the floodplain recovery target by June 2013.

16. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 1: Floodplain protection and policy team actions. PSP will advance floodplain protection and restoration by facilitating actions, policy changes, and program changes necessary to reduce critical barriers to habitat protection and restoration. Funding will be focused on the places that have the greatest potential to recover floodplain functions.

17. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

18. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This NTA has been reworded to focus on the importance of removing barriers to restoration, and focusing funding toward efforts to determine floodplains by process rather than by parcel.

19. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This NTA had the support of The Nature Conservancy, WDFW, EPA, WRIA 7, WRIA 8, WRIA 9, and tribes (Lummi Natural Resources).

20. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Bob Carey
2. Agency or Affiliation: The Nature Conservancy
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 360-419-9825 Email: bcarey@tnc.org
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
5.1 NTA 1 (and 5.2 NTA 1)
I recommend merging these substrategies because the NTA covers both and is actually more focused on the outcomes envisioned in substrategy 5.2. Because of this, no NTAs were identified for 5.2. Suggest language for substrategy 5.2 to be changed to: Align policies, programs, regulations, planning, and agency coordination to increase support and funding for multi-benefit floodplain protection and restoration management, incorporating climate change forecasts.
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
PSP will work with other local, state and federal entities to advance floodplain protection and restoration by facilitating coordinated agency actions and policy and program changes necessary to reduce critical barriers to habitat protection and restoration. Activities will include creating focusing funding on the places that have the greatest potential to recover multiple floodplain functions and creating a construct to incentivize levee setbacks as viable management tool to achieve multiple benefits including flood risk reduction, habitat recovery, and improved water quality.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

NTA 5.1.1 as originally written was too long and convoluted. It did not articulate well what the main thrust of this Action is. The language proposed here is more consistent with work that is anticipated/funded. It is also consistent with the language that was approved by the ECB habitat strategic initiative subcommittee on June 12. It also captures an additional NTA (5.3) that was added by the subcommittee on June 12 but later eliminated by PSP staff because of redundancies with 5.1 – A change I was concerned lost some of the subcommittee's intent.

Because I've merged these two NTA's, the language provided here is a little different than the draft strategic initiative language – but I think the intent is still there and we avoid having two similar NTAs. The additional changes are also intended to further clarify the action, align it with funded work and more clearly state the intended outcomes. I will make the same recommendation to the subcommittee.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

No. Much of this work is being initiated by the Floodplains by Design project that TNC is working with PSP on. A variety of critical partners (NOAA, FEMA, USGS, Corps, Ecology/EPA) are part of the Floodplains by Design partnership and supportive of this work. The work has been funded by a NEP grant through Ecology.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

There will be lack of clarity as to what the work is and what it will produce. There will be inconsistency between the Strategic Initiative (book 1) and the Action Agenda (book 2).

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana Knaster
2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 464-1217 Email: Alana.Knaster@psp.wa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing x
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
A6.3.2
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
None
7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes x No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Monitoring and adaptive management plans for three watersheds by March 2013;
implementation performance measures for these three watersheds by June 2013

Monitoring and adaptive management plans for remaining eleven watershed by July 2014;
Implementation performance measures for these eleven watersheds by September 2014

All fourteen watersheds will be complete with steps 1 and 2 of the RITT Framework(Step 1: Modify the generic portfolio of elements(common framework) based on individual watershed chapter; Step 2: Develop conceptual model for watershed chapter by Dec 2012.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
PSP just received funding for this NTA. The timeline and approach has been revised
9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly. This is supported by the watersheds and Salmon Recovery Council
- 10.
11. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
Performance measure will be inaccurate and non-attainable

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

21. Name:

22. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Habitat Strategic Initiative

23. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

24. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

25. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

B2.1 NTA1: Protect 10% of Bluff-Backed Beaches. PSP will promote acquisitions and regulatory protections to permanently protect at least 10% of bluff-backed beaches with high sediment supply facing potential shoreline development pressure by June 2014.

26. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 1: Protect 10% of Bluff-Backed Beaches. PSP will promote acquisitions, easements, or other protective covenants to permanently protect at least 10% of bluff-backed beaches with high sediment supply or other priority nearshore habitats facing potential shoreline development pressure by June 2014.

27. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

28. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The change broadens this NTA to include protection of other nearshore priority habitats, and to consider other tools in addition to acquisition.

29. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This NTA change had broad support within the ECB Habitat SI Subcommittee Group.

30. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

While protecting bluff-backed beaches is a very important action, the NTA as written leaves other priority habitats unprotected. Without this edit, those other habitats may be lost to development when they could be protected through the same tools that protect bluff-backed beaches.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana Knaster

2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 464-1217

Email: Alana.Knaster@psp.wa.gov

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing x

5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

B2.1.1 Protect 10% of Bluff-Backed Beaches.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

New language already provided by ECB subcommittee. Should read: Protect 10% of Bluff-Backed Beaches. PSP will promote acquisitions, easements, or other protective covenants and regulatory protections to permanently protect at least 10% of bluff-backed beaches with high sediment supply or other priority nearshore habitats facing potential shoreline development pressure by June 2014

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes x No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

By Sept. 2012, identify location of bluff-backed beaches with high sediment supply and development pressure or other priority nearshore habitats facing development pressures; By Dec 2012, convey the location information to salmon recovery watershed groups and LIOS for consideration; by

Dec 2012, convene at least one meeting with each watershed group and LIO; by May 2013, identify candidate locations and local projects and incorporate into salmon recovery three year workplans if appropriate for each area. Capital projects awarded grants by March 2014. Any new regulatory protections in place by June 2014. 10% of the bluff-backed beaches with high sediment supply or priority near shore habitats facing development pressure are protected by August 2014.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

New performance measures are consistent with revised text language re types of habitat to be protected. PSP management team wishes to add the 10% performance goal- consistent with the title of the measure.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

No- supported as high priority by ECB subcommittee

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Performance measures need to include more than calendar dates and not including this is contrary to legislative intent and the direction of the Leadership Council

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

31. Name:

32. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Shellfish Strategic Initiative

33. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

34. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

35. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

C1.1 NTA3: Fish Consumption Rates and Management Standards. Ecology worked with an external advisory group on developing preliminary concepts for rule updates; tribes, stakeholders, and the public reviewed a draft technical support document on fish consumption rates; this input is being considered for rule updates. In 2012 Ecology will propose draft rule language that will address human health and background; protect ecological receptors from bioaccumulation; and include freshwater sediment standards. Rulemaking also continues to develop Implementation Tools for meeting Water Quality Standards in anticipation of future updates to water quality standards based on revised human health criteria.

36. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 3: Fish Consumption Rates and Sediment Management Standards. In 2012 Ecology will propose draft rule language that will address human health; protect ecological receptors from bioaccumulation; and include freshwater sediment standards and develop Implementation Tools for meeting Water Quality Standards based on revised human health criteria.

37. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

38. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This amendment removes information on work already concluded and tightens language.

39. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This change was supported by Ecology; no opposition expected.

40. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Lincoln Loehr
2. Agency or Affiliation: Stoel Rives, LLP
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 206 386-7686 Email: lcloehr@stoel.com
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C 1.5 NTA1
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
No discharge Zone Evaluation and Petition. By December 2013 Ecology and DOH, in coordination with the Department of natural Resources, will conduct an evaluation and draft a petition to EPA to establish a NDZs for commercial and recreational vessels to eliminate ~~discharges of sewage bacteria, nutrients, and pathogens from being discharged~~ to all or parts of Puget Sound. It is not the intent of this NTA to prohibit discharges of treated sewage from moving vessels that have advanced wastewater treatment systems that meet secondary treatment standards specified in 40 CFR Section 133.102 and provide disinfection. The evaluation will include researching petition requirements; gathering background information and pump-out station data for the petition; identifying, reaching out to, and getting input of stakeholders; identifying and prioritizing which areas of the Puget Sound are feasible for petition; and evaluating how to implement the designation.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No X
8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Many large cruise ships that transit through Puget Sound have advanced wastewater treatment systems that perform much better than the federal and state secondary treatment requirements. The effluent quality from these discharges has been well characterized by EPA (2008)¹ as well as in annual reports by Alaska's Department of Environmental Conservation². Furthermore, discharges from large cruise ships when underway achieve very rapid dilution, and have dilution factors that are typically three orders of magnitude greater than dilution factors achieved for municipal outfalls. The dilution effects have been well documented by EPA³ and by the Alaska Cruise Ship Wastewater Discharge Science Advisory Panel (2002)⁴. The Science Advisory Panel's work was also described in a 2006 article in *Marine Pollution Bulletin*⁵.

Pump-out facilities do not exist for large cruise ships, but if they were, then the wastewater would go to the large municipal treatment plant operated by King County DNR at West Point where it would receive less treatment than that provided by the onboard advanced wastewater treatment systems, and would then be discharged through an outfall achieving a dilution factor of about 100, compared to dilution factors greater than 100,000 achieved by a cruise ship discharging underway at a speed greater than 6 knots. So the effect of using a pump out facility would be that the sewage would receive less treatment and less initial dilution than is provided by the cruise ship. Such a requirement accomplishes nothing and provides no environmental benefit.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

Would probably be opposed by some of the groups that brought forward the NDZ for the Action Agenda.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

¹ See, http://www.epa.gov/owow/oceans/cruise_ships/pdf/0812cruiseshipdischargeassess.pdf

² For example, see, http://dec.alaska.gov/water/cruise_ships/pdfs/2008_LargeShip_WW_Sampling.pdf

³ See, http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/vwd/upload/2002_09_25_oceans_cruise_ships_plumerpt2002_plumereport.pdf

⁴ See, http://dec.alaska.gov/water/cruise_ships/SciencePanel/documents/impactofcruiseship.pdf

⁵ Loehr, L.C., CJ Beegle-Krause, K. George, C.D. McGee, A.J. Mearns and M.J. Atkinson. 2006. The Significance of Dilution in Evaluating Possible Impacts of Wastewater Discharges from Large Cruise Ships. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 52(2006) 681-688.

If Ecology petitions for and gains EPA approval for a Puget Sound wide NDZ affecting all vessels – including large cruise ships with advanced wastewater treatment systems, then Ecology will have effectively rendered the treatment technology investments made by the industry meaningless. Water quality criteria are attained far more rapidly by these discharges when underway than for municipal secondary treatment discharges. Loadings are trivial. While some would portray a NDZ prohibiting discharges from these advanced wastewater treatment systems as a significant accomplishment for Puget Sound, the reality is it would be a false trophy of no consequence toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The Action Agenda would be better served by addressing real problems. The requested change for NTA C 1.5 will allow NDZs to be appropriately focused in their application, rather than be applied as a broad brush.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

41. Name:

42. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Shellfish Strategic Initiative

43. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

44. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

45. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

C2.1 NTA1: Watershed-Based Stormwater Management. PSP, with guidance from the Ecosystem Coordination Board, will evaluate the effectiveness of transitioning the existing, municipal stormwater jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction permit approach, using "general permits," to watershed-based municipal stormwater management by February 2013.

This action is based on the ECB policy paper on stormwater.

46. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 1: Watershed-Based Stormwater Management. PSP in consultation with Ecology and with guidance from the Ecosystem Coordination Board, will evaluate the feasibility, costs, and effectiveness of expanding the existing, municipal stormwater jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction permit approach, using "general permits," to include additional watershed-based municipal stormwater management practices. PSP will complete the evaluation and provide to Ecology for consideration by February 2013.

47. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Performance measure: PSP to commission and complete an evaluation of the effectiveness of transitioning to watershed-based municipal stormwater management and provide to Ecology by February 2013, and give a presentation and discuss next steps with the ECB by March 2013.

48. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This amendment increases coordination with the managing agency charged with stormwater management, and will help ensure a product that is useful and applicable. It also changes language slightly to show the intention is to expand the permit, incorporating watershed approach into existing framework, rather than transition to something new.

49. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This change is supported by ECY, PSP, EPA.

50. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Christie True

2. Agency or Affiliation: King County

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 206-296-6500

Email: Christie.true@kingcounty.gov

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing

5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C2.1 NTA 3: Stormwater System Mapping. King County in cooperation with Ecology, local governments, WSDOT, and Department of Natural Resources, will help improve understanding and management of the region's stormwater infrastructure by developing protocols, methodology and definitions for stormwater system mapping, and developing geo-referenced databases that can be compiled into a regional geo-referenced database of the Sound's regulated, municipal stormwater system.

Performance measure: Protocols, methodology and definitions to guide mapping and documentation efforts by March 2013; completed geo-referenced database by December 2013.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Stormwater System Mapping. King County in cooperation with Ecology, local governments, WSDOT, and Department of Natural Resources, will help improve understanding and management of the region's stormwater infrastructure by developing protocols, methodology and definitions for stormwater system mapping.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes x No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

The deadline for the protocols/definitions is moved to May 2013, and the deadline for the database requirement is deleted.

Performance measure: Protocols, methodology and definitions to guide mapping and documentation efforts by May 2013.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

King County does not have the capacity/resources to complete the database by December 31, as indicated in the NTA. Apparently, this has been previously expressed to the PSP, and our understanding the NTA would be adjusted as we request. This could be an oversight.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

Unknown.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Not making the change undermines the credibility of the Action Agenda by placing unreasonable or unacceptable expectations on the entity tasked as "owner".

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

51. Name:

52. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Shellfish Strategic Initiative

53. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

54. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing

55. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C2.3 NTA1: Stormwater Retrofit Projects. Ecology will lead a process to identify the top priority retrofit projects associated with the transportation infrastructure in the urbanized portions of King, Pierce, Kitsap and Snohomish counties and complete conceptual design to a stage sufficient to seek project implementation funding. The work will build on retrofit prioritization work by WSDOT, King County and others, and will be replicable in other urban and suburban areas around the Sound.

56. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 1: Stormwater Retrofit Projects. Ecology will lead a process to identify high priority retrofit projects that will contribute to the recovery of Puget Sound and complete conceptual design to a stage sufficient to seek project implementation funding. The work will build on retrofit prioritization work by WSDOT, King County and others, and will be replicable in other urban and suburban areas around the Sound.

57. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

58. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This amendment broadens the NTA, so that the prioritization process is not limited solely to the four-county area.

59. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This change was strongly supported by Ecology and the ECB Stormwater SI Subcommittee.

60. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Without this change, the project addressed by this NTA will have limited impact.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

11. Name: Krista Mendelman, Stormwater Strategic Initiative Work Group representative and Linda Anderson-Carnahan, Associate Director Ecosystem Tribal and Public Affairs and Manager of EPA's Puget Sound Team

12. Agency or Affiliation: US EPA Region 10

13. Contact Information:

Phone: 206 553-1571

Email: Mendelman.Krista@epa.gov

14. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

15. Identify the existing NTA.

C.2.3 NTA 1: Stormwater Retrofit Projects

16. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Ecology will lead a process to identify the top high priority retrofit projects ~~associated with the transportation infrastructure in the urbanized portions of King, Pierce, Kitsap, and Snohomish counties~~ that will contribute to the recovery of Puget Sound and complete a conceptual design to a stage sufficient to seek project implementation funding. The work will build on retrofit prioritization work by WSDOT, King County and others, and will be replicable in other urban and suburban areas around the Sound.

17. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Performance Measure: *RFP issued by September 2012; new regional stormwater retrofit prioritization process and list of projects by December 2013.*

18. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
The text describing this NTA has not been updated to reflect the current approach developed in the multi-agency (Ecology, PSP staff, EPA) project team developing the stormwater retrofit work plan -which is not limited to transportation infrastructure and is not limited to the 4 urban counties. The proposed revised language is also consistent with the revised retrofit NTA that was endorsed by Stormwater Strategic Initiative work group and included in their recommended content of the strategic initiative.

19. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
Although PSP staff prefer a transportation-centric approach only focused on the 4 most urban counties, the rest of the stormwater retrofit technical work group and also the Stormwater Initiative Working Group have both agreed to the broader watershed-based strategy to more effectively use the effort to protect and restore areas where valuable resources are threatened.

20. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
If unchanged, the NTA will be inconsistent with the actual project about to be launched and will be less relevant to making progress toward Puget Sound recovery targets. The current NTA text is also inconsistent with the recommended Stormwater Strategic Initiative content. The proposed revisions would bring consistency across the Action Agenda, the recommended Strategic Initiative and the funded implementing work plan.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Matt Baerwalde
2. Agency or Affiliation: Snoqualmie Tribe
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 425-292-0249 ext. 2101 Email: mattb@snoqualmiation.com
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)
New Existing

5. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

C2.3 NTA 2 Map, Prioritize, and Restore Degraded Streams. King County, in cooperation with agencies populating the Puget Sound Stream Benthos database, will identify and map stream drainages with “fair” B-IBI scores, and develops a prioritized list, strategies and actions to improve scores of 30 of these streams.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

C2.3 NTA 2 Map, Prioritize, and Restore Degraded Streams. King County, in cooperation with agencies populating the Puget Sound Stream Benthos database, will identify and map stream drainages with B-IBI scores considered “fair” or worse, and develops a prioritized list, strategies and actions to improve scores of 30 of these streams.

7. Should the NTA’s owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

N/A

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

If we focus only on streams with “fair” scores, we may miss out on opportunities that could have greater benefit than projects that might be selected simply based on their “fair” score. Why not use a benefit/priority analysis on the front end to determine if some degraded streams (e.g. waterbodies characterized as “poor” condition) might provide relatively greater benefits from near-term actions, for example, certain streams with known disproportionately high Chinook or other salmonid use. Working on these type streams, even if they are currently characterized as worse than “fair” through B-IBI, could provide more “bang for the buck” than some “fair” waterbodies.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

None in particular. There could be a rationale for only selecting “fair” streams that is not apparent. However, for the reasons outlined above and below, some consideration should be given to other impaired waterbodies.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Narrowing the focus to only “fair” waterbodies could cause some opportunities for dramatic benefits to Puget Sound ecosystem health to be passed over.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

21. Name: Julie Horowitz

22. Agency or Affiliation: Hood Canal Coordinating Council

23. Contact Information:

Phone: 360-620-0852

Email: jhorowitz@hccc.wa.gov

24. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing

25. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

C2.3 NTA HC4 Fix problems caused by existing development

26. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Amend to say: HCCC will pursue a stormwater retrofit program to identify, ~~and~~ prioritize, **and implement** stormwater retrofit opportunities throughout the Hood Canal watershed. (Changes in red)

27. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

28. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The first stages of identification and prioritization of stormwater retrofits are underway in Hood Canal, the next stage of our efforts will focus on implementation - construction of stormwater retrofits, including this in the NTA supports the Hood Canal Action Area in continuing to advance this process as quickly as possible.

29. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

30. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

We will advance our work implementing stormwater retrofits based on availability of resources and local support; however, it would be beneficial to have the revised NTA in the Action Agenda to support the advancement of these efforts.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

61. Name:

62. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Shellfish Strategic Initiative

63. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

64. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing

65. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C2.4 NTA1: Inspection, Technical Assistance, and Enforcement. Ecology and local governments will increase inspection, technical assistance, and enforcement programs for high-priority businesses and at construction sites.

66. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 1: Compliance Assurance Program. Ecology and local governments will increase inspection, technical assistance, and enforcement programs for high-priority businesses and at construction sites.

67. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

68. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This amendment changes the title of the NTA, so that it is not duplicative with description.

69. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This change was supported by Ecology; no opposition expected.

70. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana Knaster

2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 464-1217

Email: Alana.Knaster

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing x

5. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

C5.3.2 Regional OSS Program Funding

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Regional OSS Program Funding Source. DOH will evaluate optional approaches to establish a regional funding source approaches and mechanisms (e.g., a regional flush tax or sewer surcharge) to generate and distribute funds to Puget Sound counties to implement their establish a regional funding source for local OSS management plans and programs by June 2014.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No x

Might change later on, but not now

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Proposed by ECB subcommittee on Shellfish SI

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

Nope

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Important component of the Shellfish Initiative

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Chris Townsend
2. Agency or Affiliation: Puget Sound Partnership
3. Contact Information:
Phone: Email: chris.townsend@psp.wa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? *(check box)*
New Existing **X**
5. Identify the existing NTA. *(example: A1.1 NTA1)* If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: *(example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)*

C7.1 NTA 3: Pollution Control Action Team. Ecology, working with DOH, WSDA, EPA, and the tribes will form a Pollution Control Action Team (PCAT) to respond quickly when water quality problems threaten shellfish areas are identified. They will initiate community outreach and education, pollution identification, inspection, technical assistance to local agencies and landowners and finally, enforcement. The team will focus its work in priority areas and support PIC programs where they are established. The first effort will be in Drayton Harbor and Portage Bay.

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Amend to say: Pollution Control Action Team. Ecology, working with DOH, WSDA, EPA and the Tribes will form a Pollution Control Action Team (PCAT) to respond quickly when areas are identified where water quality ~~problems threaten~~ problems threaten shellfish areas ~~are identified~~. They will initiate community outreach and education, pollution identification, inspection, technical assistance to local agencies and landowners and finally, enforcement. The team will focus its work in priority areas and support PIC programs where they are established. The first effort will be in Drayton Harbor and Portage Bay.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No **X**

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment.

Clarify the language in the NTA

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

Supported by ECB Shellfish SI Sub-Committee

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alex Mitchell
2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 360.464.1220 Email: alex.mitchell@psp.wa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C7.3.3 - Shellfish Model Permitting Program.
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

The Department of Ecology will work with the Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance (ORA) to lead and facilitate a state team to develop and implement a Model Permitting Program that ensures early and continued coordination among state and federal agencies, tribes and local governments for permitting and licensing of shellfish aquaculture.
7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Department of Ecology (in place of ORA)

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

More appropriate owner in terms of role and reporting requirements.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

31. Name: Greg Hanon

32. Agency or Affiliation: Western State Petroleum Association

33. Contact Information:

Phone: 253.279.8282

Email: hanon@ix.netcom.com

34. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing X

35. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development) C8.1 (page 243)

36. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA: C8.1 currently reads (underline is to focus on proposed amendment)

While the rarity of major spills has not lead to complacency, two decades of success in averting a low frequency/high impact incident in Washington waters has led to diminished attention to systematic analyses of regional and industry sector-specific patterns in oil spill risk by regulated industries and subsequent targeting of prevention efforts. Ongoing changes in marine transportation patterns, including the substantial increase in crude oil exportation from Vancouver, BC, and the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point in northern Puget Sound, increase the risk of major spills to Washington's marine waters.

Proposed amendment: Underlined portion of paragraph should be deleted.

37. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No X

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

38. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The cited language is conjecture, opinion, and has no supporting documents or substantiation.

39. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly. No-the action agenda is based upon documented analysis and science and not based upon opinion.
40. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

If the public and policymakers believe the report departs from science and analysis and includes opinions not supported by facts, it will undermine the public and policymakers opinion of the final action agenda.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Greg Hanon
2. Agency or Affiliation: Western State Petroleum Association
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 253.279.8282 Email: hanon@ix.netcom.com
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)
New Existing X
5. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development) C8.3 (page 245)
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA: C8.1 currently reads (underline is to focus on proposed amendment)

The Cross Partnership Work Group's overarching recommendation was to improve the state's response capacity by requiring the regulated community to have timely access to the best achievable technology and training necessary to safely, promptly and properly respond to a worst-case oil spill. This response capability must be independent of where or when the response is necessary. The following NTAs support implementation of legislative direction under HB 1186, Ecology's rulemaking efforts, and strengthen coordination with Canada during transboundary spills.

Proposed amendment: Underlined portion of paragraph should be deleted.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No X

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The underlined section of the sentence does not make sense and is out of context with the remaining proposed near term action. What does it mean to have the response capability independent of where the response is necessary or when the response is necessary? The proposed sentence will cause confusion during implementation of the NTA. Removing the sentence clarifies the proposed NTA.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly. No-this amendment provides greater clarity.
10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Not implementing the amendment result in confusion when implementing the NTA

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

11. Name: Greg Hanon

12. Agency or Affiliation: Western State Petroleum Association

13. Contact Information:

Phone: 253.279.8282

Email: hanon@ix.netcom.com

14. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing X

15. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

Page 241 Effectively Prevent, Plan for, and Respond to Oil Spills

16. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Each of the NTA items in this section are supported by the opening statements and analysis of this section. The proposed oil spill actions are to focus on "major" oil spills, but there is no definition of major oil spills. There needs to be a definition of major oil spills to give context to the NTA elements.

Proposed amendment: Page 241 Relationship to Recovery Targets

"Prevention of major oil spills.....

Include language that says "A major oil spill is a spill of 20 gallons or more".

17. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No X

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

18. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Page 154 of this draft action agenda details the Puget Sound Toxic Assessment conducted by The DOE (Publication No 11-03-055 and 11-03-024). The action agenda summarizes the assessment conclusions (in part) to include source control actions on copper, PAHs, bis(ethyl)phthalate, and petroleum.

The final report on Control of Toxic Chemicals in Puget Sound (Phase 3, publication 11-03-024) Page 162, defines major oil spills as greater than 20 gallons.

The recently released Supplemental Material for the Action Agenda Ranking Survey provides a description of moderate and large spills, and attempts to differentiate between spills of various hazardous materials, but this description has not been vetted or deliberated such as the definitions contained in the DOE report regarding toxic chemicals released to Puget Sound

19. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
No opposition-this clarification just brings clarity to the concept of "Major" oil spills.

20. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The proposed action agenda builds upon the work done by DOE and other agency's regarding the Puget Sound, and in particular relies upon the DOE Puget Sound Toxic Assessment. The proposed amendment simply clarifies for the reader the size of spills that are addressed in the NTA. If the proposed amendment is not adopted, the consequence is that the opportunity for synergy between the multi-year peer reviewed DOE toxic assessment and the continually changing proposed action agenda is lost.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Julie Horowitz
2. Agency or Affiliation: Hood Canal Coordinating Council
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 360-620-0852 Email: jhorowitz@hccc.wa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C9.4 HC3 Develop and implement local and tribal pollution identification and correction programs
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

Amend to say: Hood Canal PIC Program. By April 2014, HCCC will complete Phase I of a regional Hood Canal Pollution Identification and Correction program to determine the needs for a comprehensive regional program **and advance funding proposal(s) for implementation.**

(Changes in red)
7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The Hood Canal PIC Program Phase I is underway. The next stage of our efforts will focus on implementation. While the grant is a for two years, we think there may be opportunities to initiate some aspects of implementation of the HCPIC Phase II Program during this time. This modification of the NTA would support this effort.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

The Hood Canal Action Area is working to advance the Hood Canal Regional PIC program and this NTA effectively supports Phase I. However, it would be beneficial have the revised NTA in the Action Agenda to support the initiation of Phase II – implementation of HCPIC.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana Knaster

2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 360-464-1217

Email: Alana.Knaster@psp.wa.gov

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing x

5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

E1.2.1 Farm Bill and Water Quality

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

PSP will work with NRCS and Partners to identify and increase funding to Puget Sound through the Farm Bill to improve water pollution prevention efforts and habitat protection and restoration efforts in rural areas in this biennium. Partners will also develop a system to identify and track both the need and completed requests for these programs in the RCP PRISM database.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Farm Bill and water quality. Meet with federal and state partners on a quarterly basis to direct ~~NRCS~~-Partner funds to strategic areas and collaborations; Follow up and facilitate if needed the efficient allocation of funds to the on-the-ground efforts of the agricultural community with a target to allocation funds in each calendar year. Specific funding levels will be identified by September, 2012 and added to the performance measure.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Partners have decided that this measure can be more robust than originally proposed and would like to track how it is spent.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Limits our goals in achieving recovery.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana Knaster

2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP

3. Contact Information:

Phone: 464-1217

Email: Alana.Knaster@psp.wa.gov

4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (check box)

New

Existing x

5. Identify the existing NTA. (example: A1.1 NTA1) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development)

E1.6.1 Compensatory Mitigation Program

6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

PSP to provide assistance, where necessary, on the development of in-lieu fee(ILF) compensatory mitigation programs in Hood Canal, Pierce County and Thurston County. HCCC is working with partners I this process and will be in position to implement high priority actions from the ILF for 2013 and beyond. PSP will work with HCCC to track implementation progress and achievement of outcomes.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes x No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

For Hood Canal program, consult at least semimonthly with Navy and key federal and state agencies to provide assistance and guidance to advance the goal of directing funding toward Hood Canal's habitat priorities while maintaining project timelines. US Navy, other partners and HCCC will

complete the ILF Program by June 30, 2012. The goal will be to provide a minimum of \$7 million dollars in fees with a minimum ratio for replacement of habitat with equivalent habitat functioning of 3 to 1 for fresh and marine water habitat. Pierce County and Thurston County programs adopted by December 30, 2012.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals. The ILF documents have been signed. The parties are committed to a specific program with specific numeric goals that need to be tracked. The performance measure represents a minimum level that the parties expect to achieve.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
Should be supported by all parties

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals. Just tracking date outcomes is not appropriate given the importance of the NTA.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name:
2. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Habitat Strategic Initiative
3. Contact Information:
Phone: Email:
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
A1.3/B1.3: Improve, strengthen, and streamline implementation and enforcement of laws, plans, regulations, and permits consistent with protection and recovery targets.
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NEW NTA 1: The ECB Regulatory Subcommittee will address regulatory exemptions to provide effective oversight and mitigation sequencing for activities that impact the ecosystem (e.g., HPA and SMA).

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Owner: Work for this NTA will be conducted primarily by the ECB Regulatory Subcommittee, with input from WDFW, ECY, DNR, and local governments.

Performance measure: By December 2013, deliver recommended changes to current regulation to the ECB.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

There currently are no NTAs under substrategy A1.3, although the Habitat SI Subcommittee determined this to be a critical strategy for habitat protection and restoration. While several other NTAs address improvements to the HPA permitting process (B1.3, NTA1 & NTA2), it is important to close this loophole in order to ensure that the success of efforts to remove armoring around Puget Sound are not offset by construction of new bulkheads on single-family properties.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This NTA had the support of WDFW, EPA, WRIA 7, WRIA 9, and tribes (Lummi Natural Resources). This NTA may be opposed by Master Builders Association, among others.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Without this NTA, it will be more difficult to reach the 2020 target on shoreline armoring.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. **Name: WRIA 16 Watershed Team**—Working Together on Watershed Issues from Brinnon to Belfair
2. **Agency or Affiliation:** Mason & Jefferson counties, Mason PUD1 and Jefferson PUD1, Skokomish Tribe, Washington State Ecology and numerous local interest groups and citizens. Mason County is the lead agency.
3. **Contact Information:** Susan Gulick, project manager and facilitator
Phone: 360.427-9670, x544 Email: amyg@co.mason.wa.gov
4. Is this a **new NTA** or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a **new NTA**, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

A 1.3 Improve local governments' ability to implement, monitor and enforce plans, regulations, and permits that are consistent with protection and recovery targets for Puget Sound

A8.1 Update Puget Sound instream flow rules and to encourage conservation

D5.2 Enable and encourage residents to take informed stewardship actions addressing infiltration, pollution reduction, habitat improvement, forest cover, soil development, critical areas, reductions in shoreline armoring and specific actions identified in sub-strategy D5.1
6. Proposed **new** or amended language for the NTA:

Ongoing funding for implementation of the WRIA 16/14b Watershed Plan and Detailed Implementation plan.

7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? **Yes** **No**

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

WRIA 16/14b will continue to implement prioritized actions from the Detailed Implementation Plan.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

If this NTA is not funded and implemented, we lose local capacity and the ability to reach the PSP 2020 targets. Without this new NTA, WRIAs -particularly those in rural counties—will have no ability to continue to function. A key venue for collaborative input on key projects (from both governments and citizens) will be lost.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

SUPPORT: Tribes, Mason and Jefferson counties, Mason PUD1 and Jefferson PUD1, Hood Canal Environmental Council, Lower Hood Canal Watershed Coalition, Port of Hoodport, Ecology, Chimacum Grange, citizens....

OPPOSITION None

10. Describe the **consequences of not making** the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

WRIA 16 (and other WRIA groups) will disband—losing their coordination, communication, implementation and oversight of water quantity, water quality and habitat projects. Over ten years of working together on project development and implementation will be lost. Without WRIA 16, Ecology will not be able to move forward on water management rulemaking with the necessary and crucial community input.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This NTA has been reworded to focus on the importance of removing barriers to restoration, and focusing funding toward efforts to determine floodplains by process rather than by parcel.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This NTA had the support of EPA, WRIA 7, WRIA 8, and WRIA 9. One concern is that this NTA overlaps with the actions included in the performance measure for A5.1.1.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Linda Anderson-Carnahan
2. Agency or Affiliation: EPA
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 206.553.2601 Email: anderson-carnahan@epa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
A6.2 Implement the high priority salmon recovery actions identified in other parts of the Action Agenda and the Biennial Science Workplan.
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
Implement the Puget Sound Federal Agency Action Plan. Federal agencies with authorities in Puget Sound will work to implement and account for actions listed in the federal agency action plan and matrix to protect and restore habitat and respond to the concerns raised by treaty tribes in western Washington.
7. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Performance measure: By December 2012, EPA will work with Puget Sound Federal Caucus agencies to identify priority activities from the federal action plan and matrix which can be achieved in the near term and develop a tool for tracking and reporting on the progress of these actions. Work will also continue on all activities identified in the matrix.

8. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
Existing NTAs and ongoing programs described in the Action Agenda do not adequately capture the scope and volume of the work that federal agencies have committed to achieving in response to the Treaty Rights at Risk white paper. This NTA will capture this work and provide a mechanism for federal agencies to provide updates on their progress.

9. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
This work is already underway and has broad support from the federal agencies involved.

10. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
Not making this change would decrease cooperation and accountability surrounding this effort. It would miss an opportunity to enhance communication and collaboration between tribal, local state and federal agencies and could lead to poorly coordinated actions to improve salmon, shellfish and habitat protection and recovery at various levels within government.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

1. Name: Alana knaster
2. Agency or Affiliation: PSP
3. Contact Information:
Phone: 464-1217 Email: Alana.Knaster@psp.wa.gov
4. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)
New Existing
5. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)
C1.1.New Water Quality Enforcement
6. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:
7. C1.1 New NTA (Owner needs to be identified) Increase the capacity for enforcement, and enforce all regulations pertaining to the discharge of pathogens and contaminants to the waters of the state to ensure achievement of approved shellfish growing water certification.
8. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.
Still being negotiated

9. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.
Proposed by Shellfish subcommittee

10. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.
Not from subcommittee.

11. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

Action Agenda Amendment Request

Please provide responses to all of the following questions for each additional NTA or change to an NTA that you suggest. We encourage participants to focus changes on major flaws or content gaps. All requested changes to NTAs and additional NTAs proposed will be posted online at www.psp.wa.gov and made available for review and comment.

All suggested amendments are due no later than June 22, 2012. Please send a completed form for each proposed change to actionagenda@psp.wa.gov.

11. Name:

12. Agency or Affiliation: ECB Subcommittee: Shellfish Strategic Initiative

13. Contact Information:

Phone:

Email:

14. Is this a new NTA or an amendment to an existing NTA? (*check box*)

New

Existing

15. Identify the existing NTA. (*example: A1.1 NTA1*) If proposing a new NTA, identify the sub-strategy it falls under: (*example: A1.1 Identify and prioritize areas for protection, restoration, and best suitable for [low impact] development*)

C2.5: Provide focused stormwater-related education, training, and assistance.

16. Proposed new or amended language for the NTA:

NTA 2: [WHO???] develops a near-term plan for academic course work, including tribal history and civics, for future stormwater professionals that emphasizes continuing improvements in stormwater management in the context of the larger issues of sustainable water resource management and climate change.

17. Should the NTA's owner or performance measure change as a result of this proposed amendment? Yes No

If yes, describe new or amended owner and performance measure.

Owner: TBD

Performance measure: ?

18. Explain your rationale for this amendment. If proposing a new NTA, describe why ongoing programs and existing NTAs are not sufficient to move the region toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

This new NTA emphasizes the need to plan for the next generation of stormwater professionals, and move toward incorporating a watershed approach into education curriculum. The action would provide long-term support for watershed-based restoration by building on a curriculum already started in some community colleges.

19. Do you anticipate any particular support or opposition/concern related to the amendment? If so please describe briefly.

This NTA does not currently have an owner.

20. Describe the consequences of not making the requested change on our ability to make progress toward Puget Sound recovery goals.

.

