

# Puget Sound Partnership Ecosystem Coordination Board Meeting Summary

April 23, 2009  
GA Auditorium, Olympia, WA

---

Strait of Juan de Fuca	Steve	Tharinger
Whidbey Basin - Alternate	Bill	Blake
Hood Canal	Teri	King
South Central Puget Sound – Alternate	Susan	Saffery
North Central Puget Sound	Steve	Bauer
South Puget Sound	Dan	Wrye
Business Interest	Sam	Anderson
Small Business	Bill	Dewey
Environmental Interest – a.m. Alternate – p.m.	Kathy	Fletcher
Environmental Interest – a.m. Alternate – p.m.	Naki	Stevens
Cities	Jacques	White
Counties	Mark	Hersh
Ports	Jeanne	Burbidge
Tribal Government	Dave	Somers
Tribal Government	John	Calhoun
Tribal Government	David	Troutt
Tribal Government	Randy	Kinley
Tribal Government	Dave	Herrera
Federal Government	Barry	Thom
Federal Government	Ken	Berg
Federal Government	Tom	Eaton
Washington State Agencies – part of day Designee part of day	Jay	Manning
Washington State Agencies – Designee	Josh	Baldi
Washington State Agencies	Bridget	Moran
	Peter	Goldmark

#### Leadership Council Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Diana Gale

#### Staff:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Lynda Ransley, Deputy Director
- Chris Townsend, Special Assistant to the Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Jim Cahill, Director of Accountability and Budget
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Ecosystem Coordination Board
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant to the Tribes

---

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting. A full recording of this meeting is retained by Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record.*

---

#### Action Items:

- Approval of January 29, 2009, Meeting Summary

**Meeting Summary:**

- ECB Input on Action Agenda Implementation
- ECB Input on Governance for a Coordinated Ecosystem Monitoring Program
- Budget and Legislative Updates
- ECB Member Focus – Ports
- National Estuary Program Update
- General Council Business

**CALL TO ORDER – David Dicks**

David Dicks opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. and updated the Board on Ron Sims' resignation. The members were provided copies of the resignation letter.

David provided Ron's thoughts on his replacement as chair and Action Area representative. Board members provided a round of applause for Ron's work on the ECB and then opened the discussion on chair replacement. David noted the election of a new chair is an ECB decision.

Members discussed the process they wanted to use to elect a new chair. There was agreement that the ECB members:

- Have worked well together and they don't want to lose that,
- Need a chair who can lead the group and bring people together,
- Need a chair who is also a good neutral facilitator,
- Don't care what sector the chair comes from, and
- Don't want to wait for three months to decide on the chair.

After discussion, Sam Anderson made **MOTION** to make nominations at this time and elect after lunch break. Dan Wrye **SECONDED**. Board **AGREED** to take nominations and vote at lunch break.

**Open Nomination:**

- Dave Somers
- Steve Tharinger
- Sam Anderson and Dave Herrera as co-chairs
- Dave Herrera

Nominations closed.

**Candidate Acceptance:**

Dave Somers thanked the group for the nomination but is happy to support the consensus of group. He appreciated the leadership Ron Sims provided. There is a lot of work to do and we haven't made progress as quickly as he would like. He is personally motivated to make progress. He has some concern with the relationship between the Partnership and salmon efforts. The "Poisoned Waters" Frontline documentary shows we have a lot of issues to work on. It is important for this Board to move things forward. He would be happy to support whoever is elected as chair.

Steve Tharinger noted that he and Dave have worked together on many different things and he agrees with Dave – nature doesn't provide bailouts so we need to get working on the issues. The strength of this group is the diversity around the table. We may need to move forward into making decisions and, as this group matures, we should be able to do that. He wants a diverse board that could be a “planning” commission for Puget Sound – the key is to move forward. He believes the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) can help move issues forward as we need local government buy-in. He would be comfortable being chair but also supports whoever is elected.

Dave Herrera didn't come here today looking for a new job, however he is passionate about getting the job done. He was the chair of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council last year when it redeveloped its charter with a new mission statement and charter. He can work with local government. He was also on the Forest Practices Board and works with the timber industry. He is a member of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and works on the policy committee. He would be interested in being the chair of the ECB.

Sam Anderson noted his advocacy for one chairperson and removed his name from the ballot. He believes the group needs someone who can transcend a lot of interest groups. Chair Sims' strength was his ability to talk to the different groups in their language – all three candidates have these attributes. Whoever gets this position needs to work with all the interest groups and keep the dialogue that Ron maintained to move the efforts forward.

A ballot was prepared and provided to the ECB members prior to the lunch break with three nominees:

- Dave Herrera
- Dave Somers
- Steve Tharinger

**APPROVAL OF JANUARY 29, 2009, MEETING SUMMARY** (See meeting materials for details.)

Teri King **MOVED** to approve the January 29, 2009, meeting summary. Kathy Fletcher **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** the January 2009 meeting summary as presented.

#### **PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT**

David Dicks provided an overview of staff work since the last meeting.

He reviewed legislative actions and current status of session actions, and discussed his recent trip to Washington, D.C. He noted that the stimulus funding has the possibility of providing a lot of money for the restoration of Puget Sound. The Partnership has submitted a request for stimulus funds to NOAA. It helped that a lot of projects that are ready to go and are also approved through the Recovery Plan and/or the Action Agenda.

The Partnership's regional liaisons and salmon recovery watershed coordinators have been integrated into a single team with Joe Ryan as the lead.

The much-anticipated PBS Frontline documentary "Poisoned Waters" aired. The Partnership is organizing additional showings with volunteer and education groups across the Sound.

These and other issues will be further discussed later in the agenda.

**ECB INPUT ON ACTION AGENDA IMPLEMENTATION – David Dicks, Lynda Ransley, and Martha Neuman (See meeting materials and presentation for details.)**

David Dicks began the presentation by reviewing the charge of the Partnership and what has been put in place so far. Implementation of and laying the foundation for a durable process is the plan for 2009.

He noted that we get the urgency and need to move forward but we need to lay a good foundation for the work – as Bill Ruckelshaus said at the "Poisoned Waters" preview, we need "urgent patience."

Kathy Fletcher asked about the non-government partners and the need for them to be included in the actions – they are implementing the actions also. We need to tackle what it means to be a "partner" and what the roles are. David committed to sit down with her to map out a strategy.

David reminded ECB members that many of the structures, roles, and processes are being developed as we go. Puget Sound Partnership roles are also being defined – what we lead, what we fund, what we influence, what we support and/or highlight, and how we use our convening authority.

Tom Eaton stressed need for getting clarity on work plans. Everyone needs to know what to get done in the next couple years.

David introduced the new Partnership Deputy Director Lynda Ransley. She is looking at the reorganization of the staff and work being done. He discussed the reorganization of the salmon team and regional liaisons; there is now one team with Joe Ryan as the lead.

David explained the inversion theory and how this is different from how the Puget Sound Action Team put the status report information together. He explained the accountability/performance agreement process being developed by staff.

Peter Goldmark noted David didn't say that once we get that agreement, then we go forward together to get the actions funded. David agreed and said we need to focus on the most important actions.

The Board then discussed the need to make the Action Agenda stronger by enumerating goals, adding dates, and adding specificity to the proposed actions.

David agreed with the need to make the Action Agenda stronger. He hopes some proviso language will be included in the 2009-11 state capital budget that will strengthen the Agenda. If not we may need to refine the language next legislative session.

Kathy Fletcher wondered about the function of this group. She doesn't feel the role has been defined yet. She feels like the Board is listening but not yet playing a role.

The group discussed possible roles for the ECB, which included:

- Assist with the funding alignment process,
- Provide input and comment on the "implementation plan" and what it will include,
- Use strength of the Board with the various caucuses around the table to move issues forward,
- Identify ways to get additional funding,
- Bring stop/go/slide issues forward for Leadership Council decisions, and
- Use this Board as the 'How' board - how to do and how to get everyone on the same page.

Jay Manning discussed how the Frontline program got him thinking. When the Partnership's enabling legislation was passed in 2007 he knew 2020 would come fast, but it is coming faster than he thought. There are big fundamental changes that need to be made – Toxics changes such as:

- Eliminate mixing zones for PBTs with a deadline,
- Eliminate PVC pipes due to phthalates,
- Put in a stormwater program that targets stormwater controls in the Puget Sound basin, in 2012, and
- Denitrification of all sewage treatment plants.

This group needs to help find that middle road where we are making hard decisions but not so hard that it kills the efforts. The ECB needs to have this conversation.

The group discussed how they can engage the public on a lot of little things, but they really need to focus on the big issues. The ECB has a role. The problem is that we don't meet often enough so it takes a lot of time to get briefed on what has happened between meetings. We don't have time to vet the issues and provide recommendations to the Leadership Council, who ultimately makes the decisions.

Bold ideas are great – bold follow through critical – and the Board can't depend on agency staff to convey the advice to the Leadership Council.

The Leadership Council members provided their thoughts on the role of the ECB, which included:

- The need for ECB to take control of their agendas, possibly need to have an executive committee,
- This is not a consensus board but a representational group,
- Heard the ECB recommendation to strengthen the Action Agenda with clear goals and dates,
- Need clear relationships with the various partners – currently we don't connect closely enough,
- Discussion on “bold” priorities – one challenge is how is the ECB is going to decide the issues to come forward to the Leadership Council so the Leadership Council can take action on them.

Dan Wrye suggested a small work group of ECB members to develop a work plan for next year – with a proposed schedule to bring back to ECB for full discussion.

Randy Kinley would add tribal reserved water rights to Jay Manning's list of bold actions.

Dave Somers believes defining the ECB role is job one. After that look at the big picture and what should be done – identity “Bold” moves. He will get a group to help develop products between meetings.

David Dicks encouraged the group, reminding them that we are inventing this together – the Partnership staff is small, 27 people. He agrees with a lot of what has been said during this discussion. He talked about what he feels was the best ECB meeting on October 1, 2008, in Sequim, where the ECB prioritized actions in ranked order to put in the Action Agenda. That list went from 4,000 things to do down to a ranked, prioritized order of around 100. The role the ECB has played in the development of the Action Agenda was significant for the staff and Leadership Council.

Sam Anderson wants to take on bold initiatives but not suicidal ones. Need to go through a vetting process to move issues forward, but need to proceed thoughtfully.

#### **OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound*, thanked Jay Manning for putting benchmarks on the table – that is what is needed. She suggested two bold moves: meeting water quality standards by 2012 and enforcement. More work is needed on enforcement and looking to make sure the laws are adequate.

#### **SCIENCE POLICY WORK GROUPS**

Martha Neuman reviewed the five proposed work groups:

1. Performance Management
2. Threats to the Ecosystem
3. Implementation
4. Communications and Outreach
5. Finance/Funding/and Budget Issues

Joel Baker discussed the Science Panel's thinking behind its suggestion for Science Policy Work Groups, noting some issues need to have both science and policy input to answer the questions. These groups will be used to vet those questions before taking to the Leadership Council for decisions.

Martha will be pulling the various work groups together and asked for ECB volunteers to be on the different groups. She is looking for three or four ECB members on each group and noted that even if you don't serve on the committees, the work will come back to the ECB for further vetting. ECB members will prioritize which groups they would be willing to serve on and send the list to Tammy Owings by Monday, April 27, 2009.

### **ELECTION RESULTS**

Sam Anderson reported that, after tallying the ballots, Dave Somers is the new ECB chair.

Dave thanked everyone and stressed his dedication to the ECB. At the July meeting he would like to better define the role of ECB.

### **ECB INPUT ON GOVERNANCE FOR A COORDINATED ECOSYSTEM MONITORING PROGRAM – Scott Redman and Panel (See meeting materials and presentation for details.)**

Scott started this presentation by explaining the materials in the meeting packet.

Allison Butcher and Karen Dinicola provided the presentation, explaining their group is looking for a way to make this more effective and develop a coordinated monitoring and assessment program. The group studied other efforts around the nation and developed two options: 1) housing this program within the Puget Sound Partnership, and 2) creating an independent entity.

Karen explained the request will be presented to Leadership Council for decision in May. The request at this meeting is for ECB input on the two options.

She explained how both options would be organized and the differences between them. The Leadership Council asked the Consortium to provide a report on efficiencies recognized and cost differences between the two options. Karen will provide this report to the ECB members.

The Consortium realizes that if the Leadership Council approves the independent entity option, it will still take governor and legislative approval and statutory change to get it in place. They recognize the program will be housed within the Partnership for the 2009-11 biennium. Everyone agrees this needs to be sustainable, although neither option would be immune to long-term problems. The Consortium's recommendation is to start small and build off successes, but also need to get an institution in place that can get the data collected and analyzed - to get better value out of the work being done now.

Leadership Council members in attendance welcomed comments from ECB members if they would like to share thoughts before the Council meeting in May.

**ECB INPUT ON IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS – Chris Townsend** (See meeting materials for details.)

*Proposal for “Partners” Program*

In the interest of time, Chris will send a memorandum updating the Board on the in-lieu fee program and watershed characteristics program, and just discuss the proposed “partners” program at this meeting.

Chris outlined the legislation pertaining to “partners” and noted how the legislation stresses the need to connect to state-funded programs, but that it is not necessarily exclusive.

Jim Cahill elaborated regarding the state grant and loan process around natural resources and the requirement to not fund programs inconsistent with Action Agenda. He reported that the first meeting of the grant and loan group will be held May 12. Staff may also use the newly developed science policy finance committee to vet the questions before bringing the state grant and loan issue back to the ECB for direction in July.

Chris reviewed the proposed “partner” process criteria and explained he is looking at a certification type process. Because there will be different types of recipients, there will need to be different types and levels of certification. Some questions that need to be answered will include:

- Need to be recertified, and
- If the certification will increase in vigor as we get more actions in place.

He will start work with the state agencies and then bring options to the ECB in July, and to the Leadership Council for decision in the fall.

Chris noted that in the future we will have criteria for as many partners as possible, but the first priority will be to focus on the “partner” that is statutorily required, and then branch out to the other types or levels of partners including business and non-profits.

**BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE UPDATE - Jim Cahill and Michael Grayum** (See meeting materials for details.)

Jim Cahill reported that the Legislature has reached an agreement on the budget but the details haven’t been released yet. He gave a general overview of the budget status, noting the Partnership’s budget was cut by 19% in the House operating budget and 6% in the Senate operating and governor’s budget. We are hoping the final budget is in the middle ground – most cuts were around education and outreach.

He is still unsure about the Partnership’s role in the review of the state oil spill program.

Bill Dewey asked about funding for the Shoreline Management Plan revisions and if that would speed up the actions or meet existing schedule. Josh Baldi reported it is to keep the current schedule on track.

Michael Grayum provided his reflection on the legislative session. This was the first time the Partnership was active in getting on the hill, tracking bills, and looking at bills for consistency with the Action Agenda. This year the Partnership's legislative priority was to support others who were working on Action Agenda issues. He was pleased to report that five of the seven issues the Partnership supported passed this session. He discussed how important it is that we all work together and come up with a unified legislative package for next session. He looks forward to working with the ECB.

Susan Saffery asked if we will be looking at existing statutes and policy changes that are needed. Jim and Michael both agreed that the Action Agenda suggests changes to the statutes and policies, and the first step would be to review those statutes and policies. The Partnership will need the support and commitment of the ECB to move changes forward.

Jim Cahill reviewed how the federal fiscal year (FFY) 08 funds were allocated and gave an overview of projects funded with this money. He reported the next round of federal funding – approximately \$20 million – has different distribution criteria from last year and it will need to be awarded competitively. Staff will be working with EPA to see what that means. This is another issue that may be vetted with the science policy funding work group.

Tom Eaton reported that he doesn't have the timeline for distribution of this money yet but it is two-year money. Although the distribution language is different this year, the money will be directed to the Action Agenda. Tom will bring information back to the ECB in July. He is hoping to release the request for proposals (RFP) later in the summer.

Jim Cahill reminded the group it is important to think about the different sources of funds and the best way to fund different components of the Action Agenda.

**ECB MEMBER FOCUS – PORTS – John Calhoun** (See meeting materials and presentation for details.)

John Calhoun provided the ECB members with an overview of how the ports are supporting the Action Agenda. He reviewed actions that have taken place at the various ports around the Sound. Dan Wrye gave kudos to the Port of Shelton for its Clean Marina Initiative.

Ports are taking on three initiatives in the Action Agenda:

- Assist in the development of the role and definition of “partners,”
- Develop a “Green Ports” initiative – the ports will discuss this at their May meeting, and
- Help with the development of a report card system - willing to be used as a test case for the Partnerships.

Bill Ruckelshaus appreciated the presentation and noted that the Partnership should take up the ports' offer of being a pilot for the report card project.

John noted that the ports have gone through a transition from the beginning of the Partnership development. At first they thought it would be a regulatory process, but through these meetings and information they have come around and want to work together.

**NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM UPDATE – Martha Neuman**

Martha Neuman presented this agenda item. She explained that when we did the original Action Agenda we didn't meet all the criteria for the National Estuary Program (NEP) and the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP), where we get the funds. For example, the comment period should have been 30 days; it was only two weeks.

She reviewed the other changes and clarification needed and reported there will be an updated Action Agenda released in May. It will include a summary of all comments received on the document (over 1,200). The ECB will receive the draft document a week before the May Leadership Council meeting and will have an opportunity to make additional comments at the May Council meeting if they would like.

**ADJOURN**

Sam congratulated Dave on his new position.

Dave reported he will be talking to ECB members in the next couple months to get their thoughts on the direction ECB should take in its role.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Ecosystem Coordination Board Approval



Dave Somers, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

Next Meeting: July 30, 2009  
Silver Reef Casino and Conference Center  
Ferndale, Washington