

Puget Sound Leadership Council
Meeting Summary
Lewis Creek Park Visitor's Center
Address
Bellevue, Washington
June 12 & 13, 2008

DAY 1

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Dan O'Neal
- Diana Gale
- Steve Sakuma
- Bill Wilkerson

Staff and Other Presenters:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Chris Townsend, Special Assistant to Executive Director
- Paul Bergman, Communications Director
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
- Diane Hodgson, Management Assistant to Bill Ruckelshaus
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Billy Frank, Jr.
- Jim Cahill, Director of Accountability & Budget
- Joe Ryan, Salmon Recovery Manager

*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:

- Approve Meeting Summary, March 3 & 4, 2008

Meeting Summary:

- Action Agenda Status and Update
- Action Agenda: Initial Priorities
- Funding Strategy
- Performance Management
- Strategic Science Program Report
- Invasive Species Council's Strategic Plan Briefing

Day 1

9:15 a.m. CALL TO ORDER – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda for the day. He then requested that everyone introduce themselves.

The Council was welcomed to Bellevue by City Councilman, Don Davidson. Mr. Davidson provided the Council with an overview of Puget Sound Partnership activities happening in Bellevue and the background of the Lewis Creek Park.

Bill thanked the councilman for his good work and thanked him again for hosting us at this location.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about the work being done by staff to make process toward the Action Agenda. He discussed the summary report on the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) discussion on priorities, which is one of the decisions that the Council needs to reach today. He then reviewed the agenda.

COUNCIL MEMBER UPDATES/COMMENTS - Councilmembers

- Steve Sakuma (Whidbey & Whatcom Action Areas) Has been busy working with Partnership Regional Liaison, Linda Lyshall. Several meetings have been held working on the characterization of the Action Area. He went to the Whidbey Institute and learned about rivers, which was very interesting and enlightening. There are a lot of people involved but may not be engaged with the Partnership yet. Need to reflect on who hasn't been to the table yet so we can contact them.
- Martha Kongsgaard (South Central Action Area) In her action area they have been working closely with the city of Seattle and the county. The 501C(3) has been created to support the work of the Partnership. This group will be focused on the funding piece of the strategy.
- Bill Wilkerson (Strait of Juan de Fuca Action Area) Has been working on the Monitoring effort. He has also been working with the Strait of Juan de Fuca Action Area: the removal of the Elwah is scheduled for 2012, Dungeness is another big project in the area. Monitoring Forum had its first meeting under the new statute. He will be presenting information on the first Monitoring Forum meeting later in the agenda of this meeting. There is a real potential for duplication of efforts and need to figure out how to avoid this. The budget and economy doesn't look good for next year so it will be a difficult year for the budget.
- Dan O'Neal (Hood Canal Action Area) Dissolved oxygen work is underway and a report will be done at the end of this month. Has been on vacation in Tuscany and found that there is a lot of open space in that area – people all have bicycles;

gas is \$7.50 and now getting closer to \$10, so people don't drive as much. The funding group has met and will have more to report on later in this meeting.

- Diana Gale (San Juan Action Area) had a slow start in her Action Area as there was a change in staff and, because of the way this Action Area is set up, are having two meetings to cover this area. Tom Cowan and Colleen Thumlert along with Amy Windrope are the Partnership staff assisting her with the Action Area work. She also went on an international vacation, a water meeting in Amsterdam (gas is \$8 there) smaller cars, wind turbines, bikes and walking. We have a lot to learn.
- Billy Frank, Jr. (South Puget Sound Action Area) was not in attendance at this meeting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE – David Dicks

David Dicks provided an update on what has happened with Puget Sound Partnership since the last meeting:

- Finding that the team of a Leadership Council member, ECB representative, and Partnership staff member in each of the Action Areas has been a good process
- We are at a key moment in the Action Agenda. We have done a lot of work and beginning to see where we are heading with emerging priorities and themes
- Attended a meeting on the Chesapeake and he feels we are on the right track and have a better opportunity to be successful in Puget Sound
- Topic Forum meetings have been completed – will go through statistics later in meeting. We have received hundreds of comments, over 300 inventories, and given hundreds of speaking engagements in the last couple months
- Focus on whole ecosystem is very different than what has been done before and will talk more about this later in the meeting
- We need to have the budget request in before the Action Agenda is complete so this is something we will need to work on with the state agencies. There will be a presentation about the budget later in the meeting
- There is a meeting scheduled for June 26 for making a decision on an Authorization Bill to make Puget Sound one of the Great Waters. This is significant as it would give Congress authority to put Puget Sound in the federal budget as a line item
- ECB had a positive meeting on May 29 talking about realigning meeting dates so that they can vet the issue first before bringing to the Leadership Council
- Science Panel is doing well – Joel Baker is the chair, Jan Newton the vice-chair, and Scott Redman Partnership staff to the Science Panel

Bill noted that he discussed the use of the ECB to vet the issues ahead of bringing issues to the Council. Although this is not a consensus group, bringing information to them to get representative feedback makes a lot of sense.

SALMON RECOVERY COUNCIL – Joe Ryan (See meeting materials for details.)

Joe Ryan along with a panel of Bainbridge Island Mayor Kordonowy, Jeanette Dorner, and Randy Kinley.

The Mayor thanked the Council for having Joe and his staff to do the work they are doing. She reviewed the members of the Salmon Recovery Council (SRC), which has a 30-member council.

Joe explained the Steelhead recovery process and plan. Steelhead and Chinook Recovery are both being covered by this group.

Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe, updated the Council on the Nisqually Delta work, which is a great example of the work the Council is looking at in its priorities. Finding that watersheds are organized and that Nisqually isn't unique in their efforts. The best way to restore salmon in Puget Sound is to restore the ecosystem. The salmon work will assist in the ecosystem restoration. Jeanette explained the Nisqually plan and what the goal of this project is.

Randy Kinley, Lummi Tribe, talked about the spiritual aspect of salmon to the Tribes. He explained that it is hard to express in western civilization words unless you come and live and breathe the tribal way with salmon. The reason we will be successful where others haven't been is because we have the right people, which includes the Tribes. It will take three or four generations to see the difference. He encouraged the Council to attend tribal events to learn more about their efforts. He commended the Council on its work.

Mayor Kordonowy explained that the SRC is still meeting and is now a subset of the Puget Sound Partnership. She stressed the need to keep salmon as a symbol of what we are doing in Puget Sound. The salmon work will continue and they need to know that the Partnership is in support of this effort to meet the salmon recovery goals.

The Council discussed aspects of salmon recovery and ways that the Council and Partnership can continue to support recovery efforts including regulations, enforcement, restoration, and acquisition. Monitoring is also important to the success, work is still needed to get the correct level of monitoring in place.

The Council asked for a briefing or policy paper on harvest. Joe reported that there will be a briefing at an upcoming meeting with Department of Fish and Wildlife Director, Jeff Koenings and a tribal representative.

ACTION AGENDA STATUS AND UPDATE – Martha Neuman (See meeting materials for details.)

Martha provided an update on the Action Agenda schedule and process to be used for this meeting. She reported that the September meeting will be major point of input for the Council.

The Council would like to get the Action Agenda to read and comment on. Martha reported that she will provide the document to the Council in pieces as developed.

Martha Kongsgaard asked if the priorities have been fully vetted. Martha N reported that they will continue to be available for review and comment and the Science Panel will be reviewing at its upcoming meeting before the priorities are ready to be considered fully vetted.

Martha also reported that by the end of this month, the Action Area narratives, map, and graphics will be available for review and comment.

Martha, Jim Cahill, and Scott Redman are working together to make sure the Action Agenda, Funding Strategy, Science Strategy, Adaptive Management, and accountability work is coordinated.

Martha reviewed the list of principals used to get to priorities:

- a. Address threats and choose opportunities with the highest potential magnitude of impact.
- b. Address threats with the highest level of urgency. (How imminent is the threat; will it result in an irreversible loss, how resilient are the resources that are affected?)
- c. Use strategies with a reasonable certainty of effectiveness.
- d. Use strategies that are cost effective.
- e. Address the processes that form and sustain ecosystems rather than focusing narrowly on protecting or fixing individual sites.
- f. Attempt to address threats at their origin instead of reacting after the damage has been done.
- g. Anticipate and prevent problems before they occur. (With more people coming to the region and a changing climate, a proactive strategy is increasingly important.)
- h. Address multiple threats and their interactions with strategies that work together. We cannot afford to look at problems or develop solutions in isolation.
- i. Watch out for unintended consequences. Evaluate strategies so that actions to address one problem do not cause harm to other ecosystem functions and resources.
- j. Account for the variations in ecosystem conditions and processes in different geographic areas of Puget Sound. Parts of Puget Sound are fairly intact while

others are severely degraded, and rebuilding strategies need flexibility to encompass regional differences.

- k. Ensure that no region or economic sector bears the entire responsibility for implementing solutions.

Martha reported that to create the list of four emerging themes, staff used the list of principles, information from the Topic Forum meetings, and comments received. This list was then vetted with the ECB. At today's meeting, staff is looking for Leadership Council agreement on the themes.

Board Comments:

- Like them all but believe there should be fewer
- Would like to use these for the base on project selection as a checklist but would need to tighten the descriptions a little
- need to define what cost effective is
- need to understand what we are talking about and be sure we are integrating our ecosystem recovery program with the salmon recovery projects
- need a monitoring and adaptive management component built into the projects

David reviewed a logic chain that walks through the Action Agenda Implementation Framework decision-tree going from funding to actions taken.

Martha K noted the need for monitoring to be included on this chain.

Diana asked when are we going to get to the selection of on-the-ground projects?

The Council discussed the project selection process and how the projects need to align with the priorities.

Martha N talked about staff work going on to help this process and how they are reviewing recovery plans to see how well these projects align with the priorities.

There was some concern voiced by Diana in what is the benefit to do all the work and come back with the same efforts that are already in the salmon plans or action plans?

David discussed how the projects identified through this process will be decided through one plan focused on ecosystem priorities. Through an ecosystem wide view, we can bring more resources to the solution and include salmon recovery efforts.

Bill Wilkerson, through monitoring work, has found that we have almost set up a debate on what is most important. He is not worried about getting project ideas, since there are hundreds of projects, it is the vetting and ranking of the projects that will take the work.

Bill Ruckelshaus noted the need for a process in the Action Agenda that prioritizes the projects.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound, and Fred Fellerman Friends of the Earth, talked about project funding selection and how to figure out what to do. Discussed the need for a gap analysis before prioritizing and reinventing the system.

Naki noted how the legislation provides for the Council to recommend legislative changes and Fred pointed out some items that are happening with the Departments of Natural Resources and Fish and Wildlife. He is concerned will lock us in to processes before the Action Agenda is in place.

ACTION AGENDA: INITIAL PRIORITIES DISCUSSION AND AFFIRMATION – David Dicks and Martha Neuman (See meeting materials for details.)

David reviewed four questions: 1) What is the current status of Puget Sound and what are the biggest threats to it?; 2) What is a healthy Puget Sound?; 3) What actions must be taken that will move us to a healthy Puget Sound?; and 4) Where should we start?

He then discussed process to get to the process used to get to the four priorities by synthesizing an immense amount of input and ideas received. The priorities came about through an analytical process we have engaged in and are the most significant issues facing the Sound. These strategies are inter-related, must be implemented together, and cannot stand alone as a way to restore ecosystem health. They do not cover every major problem in Puget Sound but are the priorities. Last week these priorities were vetted with the Ecosystem Coordination Board were staff received both positive reactions and helpful insights.

Martha Neuman then covered each of the proposed priorities individually starting with *Priority B: Protect the intact ecosystem processes that sustain Puget Sound.*

This priority is for the protection of existing functional upland and marine ecosystem processes is critical for maintaining wildlife habitat, flows of fresh water, groundwater infiltration, controlling the volume and composition of stormwater runoff, and many other ecosystem functions. Every topic forum discussed the need to protect ecosystem processes. Protection of high quality ecological areas is less expensive and more effective than trying to repair or recreate damaged areas.

The Council members were in agreement with this priority.

Priority C: Implement restoration projects that will reestablish ecological processes.

Protecting the habitats and functions that we have left, while essential, will not be enough to sustain the health of the ecosystem, this priority is to focus on the need to restore key areas to health. Restoration strategies have often focused on “low hanging fruit”. These projects were ready to go, relatively easy to fund, construct, and report on. While these projects often have benefited the Sound they have not necessarily been the most important projects for Puget Sound. In addition, they have clearly not led to a restored ecosystem. This priority goes to the next level of restoration.

The Council would like to see this priority rewritten to be parallel with Priority B.

Priority D: Reduce water pollution at its source.

Water pollution threatens our health (most directly from eating contaminated seafood), impacts many of the species that make up the web of life in Puget Sound, and diminishes our quality of life. Increasing numbers of people, cars, and pavement mean more pollutants entering the waterways in higher concentrations at a faster rate. Pollution continues to pour into Puget Sound even as we clean up pollutants of the past. PCBs, DDT, and other persistent toxic substances known as “legacy” toxics, are slowly being cleaned up through Superfund and other efforts. But as even as we spend millions cleaning this up, we allow more pollutants to enter the Sound. This priority is intended to think in a more holistic way. The original priority wording called out stormwater but ECB stressed the need to not call out one aspect of water quality.

David noted that this priority is more focused on preventing new contamination. In the past, we have focused on in-water clean up activities and although those activities are good, we need to look at ways to prevent additional contamination getting into systems especially once you’ve cleaned them up.

The Council had several comments on this priority:

- not comfortable with the wording of this one – staff will refine the wording so it doesn’t sound like we are looking at point source versus non-point pollution
- the problem is much bigger than the source
- when we are moving forward with “healthy” we need to be clear on what we mean - healthy is a social construct not scientific
- need to make sure we define what we mean

Priority A: We must develop a process within the Action Agenda to ensure that activities and funding are focused on the most urgent and important problems facing the Sound.

Our current tools were not designed to sustain the Puget Sound ecosystem as a whole. Our existing fragmented and uncoordinated approach cannot keep up with the problems and conditions we face now, let alone the changes that are coming with significantly more people and climate shifts. This priority is to work toward a single unified game

plan for the region that can define what must happen to restore and protect Puget Sound and then direct efforts and money to the most critical issues.

The Council were in agreement with this priority but still need to think through the process to set priorities and how to get the agencies to work together on setting goals and budgets.

Jim Cahill explained that he has written a letter to the state agencies to have them line up their budget requests and the requests will be brought back to the Council to decide what is best for going to the OFM for this budget cycle. In two years we will be in a better position to get the budget request coordinated since we will have an Action Agenda to work from. Jim will be working with the agencies to get agreement on what to bring forward to the Leadership Council. This will not be a perfect process but is a start.

The Council then discussed other changes to the wording of this priority:

- Bill Wilkerson is concerned with the wording “we must develop a process.” He thought that the legislative intent was for the Leadership Council to create the Action Agenda and then implement it. If he is correct then need to rewrite this priority to say implement the legislative process. David agreed with that change.
- The Partnership’s role is to work with other agencies to help to align budgets to help Puget Sound. The emerging role will be to help create dollars or incentives to get these priorities done. Since the Action Agenda is not just about projects it is also about changing regulations, processes, and other ways to get to a healthy Puget Sound it was suggested to change the wording to “Ensure that activities and funding are focused on the most urgent and important problems facing the Sound”.
- The Council discussed the need to look out to 2020 and concerned with how to do this with a two-year plan.

Martha Neuman noted that there will be eight Action Area meetings in July. Staff would like to get Leadership Council approval on the proposed list of priorities before those meetings so the locals can be engaged in to the process. We can get the buy-in and support so we can be successful. We don’t want to present them with something after we are done with the process. The more they can feel part of the development of the process ,the more likely they are to be supportive of the process.

Bill Wilkerson **MOVED** to approve the proposed list of priorities as amended during the discussion. Dan O’Neal **SECONDED** the motion. Council **APPROVED** the list as amended.

FUNDING STRATEGY – Jim Cahill (See meeting materials for details.)

Jim Cahill introduced this agenda item reporting on the finance strategy.

Questions for the Council:

- Are we moving forward on the financing strategy in the right direction?
- Is there additional guidance you'd like to offer to this effort?

Jim Cahill reported that three firms (ECONorthwest, Evergreen Funding Consultants, and Parametrix) have been retained by the Partnership to assist with the financing analysis and strategy for the Action Agenda. The work consists of five tasks:

1. Analysis of the costs of Action Agenda items (led by ECONorthwest);
2. Development of a tool for evaluating cost-effectiveness and initial application of the tool to Action Agenda items (led by ECONorthwest);
3. Evaluation of current spending, with an in-depth look at substantial redirectable sources (led by Evergreen);
4. Analysis of conventional and market-driven opportunities for additional funding (conventional funding led by Evergreen, market-driven funding led by Parametrix);
5. Integration of these products into a unified financing analysis and strategy (led by Evergreen).

Jim then reviewed the legislation around the funding strategy that states “Sect 13 (1)(e): “Identify the agency, entity, or person responsible for completing the necessary strategies and actions, and potential sources of funding”

The guidelines used for development of the strategy include:

- Build upon existing sources as much as possible
- Reasonably ambitious
- Equitable in distribution of costs and benefits
- Focused on long-term improvements as well as immediate gains

Dennis Canty reviewed the products and timeline for the strategy. The Leadership Council will be reviewing the interim document at its July meeting with a goal for approval of the strategy at the September meeting.

The products include:

- A detailed 2009-11 funding plan,
- Recommendations for future budget sessions, and
- An overview of 2020 targets and process on how to get there

Mark Buckley talked about cost and benefit analysis work he is doing. His work will include a cost-effectiveness analysis. This work will combine information on costs and

benefits, present it in a manner to facilitate comparison and prioritization of Action Agenda items, and then identify areas of uncertainty and further research needs.

Dennis reported on the third part of the project, which is how to raise the money. This project is looking a current funding sources, investigating a wide variety of sources, and additional funding needs.

Next steps include:

- Converting cost information into cost packages using priorities
- Upgrading spending information
- Translating the benefit information into a cost/benefit model
- Beginning to develop the finance strategy and schedule

Council members aren't sure they understand how the financing piece fits in to the Action Agenda. David reported that we will not be able to say what we need to do from now until 2020 but we will have certain components, organized around the four questions, and will be able to get to a basic outline on what to do. Each of the Action Agenda revisions will get us closer to the final list of what is needed for 2020. This Action Agenda will start identifying the key priorities. He would like to start identifying projects to start working on now, if at all possible, using the federal funding.

Dan asked if the final product will show where we are going and how much it will cost although we won't know how we will get the funding needed?

Mark responded that this is a struggle since they don't know what the Action Agenda is going to look like making it hard to get the costs together.

The Council discussed possible fund sources and need to make the funding strategy as realistic and honest as possible. They also talked about ways to show how ecosystems can be preserved and the cost to do this. Need to show how we can do it here and be successful.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound, appreciates the discussion on funding. The Legislature, in creating the Partnership, allowed for finding new fund sources. Need to connect what people will get for the money.

Fred Fellerman, Friends of the Earth, suggested getting presentations from different groups and how they are doing with funding such as DNR's habitat reserve program. Goal of protecting habitat is apple pie. Protecting water quality and to encourage Ports to continue with their positive development programs. Oil Spill funds are not distributed by a public process. There are good projects being done but no overarching goals and it

would help to get them engaged in the Partnership activities. His group is trying to get Partnership education on the ferries starting in the San Juans.

Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, presented information on a study that was released last week concerning mixing zones. This is one of the pathways for toxics to get into the Sound. She reported that a volatile vinyl report will be on the news tonight highlighting the amazing amount of toxics in shower curtains and how cotton or woven shower curtains would be better for the environment.

4:00 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING

Puget Sound Leadership Council
Meeting Summary

June 12 & 13, 2008
Bellevue, Washington

DAY 2

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Dan O'Neal
- Diana Gale
- Steve Sakuma
- Bill Wilkerson

Staff and Other Presenters:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Joe Ryan, Salmon Recovery Manager
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
- Diane Hodgson, Management Assistant to Bill Ruckelshaus
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Billy Frank, Jr.
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Mary Beth Brown, Accountability Specialist

8:30 a.m. MEETING RECONVENED – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus welcomed everyone. He then requested that everyone introduce themselves.

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the presentations and actions taken on day 1 of the meeting and the agenda for the day.

MARCH 3 & 4, 2008 MEETING SUMMARY

Martha Kongsgaard **MOVED** approval of the March 3 & 4, 2008 meeting summary, Steve Sakuma **SECONDED – APPROVED** as presented.

Bill Thanked Kit Paulsen, city of Bellevue and member of the Monitoring Forum, for her help in arranging for the meeting room.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Accountability and Adaptive Management – Status and Next steps - Mary Beth Brown and Scott Redman

Mary Beth reviewed the proposed framework to use for adaptive management in the Action Agenda.

She explained that a performance management strategy has four steps:

Plan

- A goal that can be measured
- Logic links among goals, strategies, and activities
- A set of activities that can be tracked
- Buy in from implementers
- Information management strategy

Do

- Implementers who can track and report progress
- Monitoring of ecosystem conditions and effects of actions
- A system to hold the data

Assess

- Capacity for analysis
- Forum and format for reporting out findings

Adapt

- Capacity to change strategies and actions based on analysis

At this meeting the focus will be on the plan step.

Steve Sakuma asked where the management of data comes in? Mary Beth believes this is a Leadership Council responsibility to figure out how and where the data will be kept and managed.

Scott reported that on the ecosystem side there are already some systems in place and that the Science Panel is looking to recommend existing entities to store and manage the data.

Steve sees this as a short-time answer since at some point need to have a way to pull all the different systems together.

David reported that we just got a grant from EPA for \$500,000 to develop a data management system.

Adaptive management will need to include strategic alignment in the Action Agenda:
Four levels to manage and measure:

- Goals
- Strategies
- Action Classes
- Activities

Dan asked what action classes are; Martha Neuman explained that this is higher level big groupings of actions such as culvert removal, protect forested floodplains that may cross several levels and boundaries.

Scott further explained what an action class is by going through the logic model using examples.

Mary Beth noted that some of this information is hypothetical and this is where the Science Panel may come in to determine what to monitor and may have a stronger monitoring program for some of these items.

Martha Kongsgaard asked where the indicators fit in. Scott said the Science Panel isn't to that point yet but now that the goals have been adopted the Panel will be able to recommend indicators that link to the goals. The Strategic Science Plan will address the "What is a Healthy Puget Sound?". But won't be able to get to this answer in the 2008 Action Agenda but will work toward this in the next version.

The Council noted the need to deal with this work transparently making sure people know we don't have all the answers but that we are working to get the answers.

Bill reminded Mary Beth the importance of tying the salmon plan to performance management. She reported that staff is starting to work on integrating that information and figuring out the data system.

Scott reported that Joe Ryan has a good group working on this effort and salmon efforts will be included.

Ecosystem Monitoring – Status and next steps - Bill Wilkerson and Scott Redman

Bill Wilkerson provided an overview of the Monitoring Forum efforts and how the Partnership and Forum have a double statute and stressed the need to not duplicate efforts. He believes the Partnership is the "policy train" and the Monitoring Forum will follow the direction set by the Partnership. The Monitoring Forum has done great work but doesn't have the policy train for the Puget Sound region.

Bill outlined his vision for the Monitoring Forum and noted that in July, he will be talking to the Monitoring Forum about this vision of linking with the regional policy trains and to include the Forum's action plan. He believes they will then be able to connect the policies and priorities from the Action Agenda. If the Forum and Council are in agreement on how to make this link, then they need to go to the Legislature and let them know what changes are needed for the Monitoring group to be connected with the Partnership and other regional policy trains.

Bill asked about the Monitoring Consortium, the work they are doing, and how it is all linked. The Council will need to have the connections and links lined out so they can

understand all angles before making any decisions about the Monitoring Forum or Consortium. The Council sees this as a good role for the Partnership but wants to know how this will be different from what it is now.

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES – Dave Williams, Deborah Knight, Sultan City Administrator, and Doug Jacobsen, City of Bothell (See meeting materials for details.)

Dave Williams reported that the cities are in support of the priorities the Council adopted earlier in the meeting and wants to talk about ways to be able to work together toward these priorities.

Dave talked about the integrated plan that the cities have that is based on the Growth Management Act. He would welcome and support the Partnership taking the lead to let people know how to coordinate all this.

Next year the Action Agenda will be developed and the cities and counties will be in queue for requesting infrastructure funding. They will be looking for funds to get brick and mortar projects done. He is not sure how agencies will figure out how the cities are consistent with the Action Agenda when making funding decisions and the Council will need to make sure this is clear.

Chair Ruckelshaus informed Dave that the deadline for the Action Agenda has moved from the first of September to the first of December, which doesn't mesh well with legislative deadlines for making budget requests. He asked for patience with each other when planning for things.

Deborah Knight provided perspective from the cities and communities needing to implement any policy decisions made in the Partnership.

She talked about Sultan, which is 30 miles east of Everett. She is proud of the fact that Ecology says they have pristine waters and they want to keep it that way. They are struggling with the Growth Management Act due to growth in the area. When asked to do additional monitoring or other items, it gives them angst since they have very little money to have for park and transportation systems. The citizens are already struggling to meet existing regulations and she asked the Council to remember this when making decisions and to think about how they may affect communities. She encouraged the Council to not to create new systems but to use the tools that are currently in the toolbox.

Diana Gale noted that she would think the City would want to jump on the bandwagon and ask the Leadership Council to help them to protect the headwaters.

Deborah agrees that they are a community that the Leadership Council would want to support. The difficulty is with the current tax structures with the only way to get funds is with retail. The way the city is set up, and with new regulations, limits the ability to develop retail.

Diana noted the need to find a different way to do land use management and this might be a good pilot city to see how to work differently with the small communities.

The Council talked about how cities grow, the need for retail sales, and need to find ways to grow to make it viable to exist.

Steve Sakuma is hearing two different conversations in that the different cities are different and we need to think out of the box a bit. We are talking about making Puget Sound better so we need to stay consistent and think out of the box. We may want to pilot an area.

Doug Jacobsen brought the discussion down to street level by talking about NPDES permitting and stormwater issues. He has had to double his staff for doing this work. It is frustrating since they don't control rain or pollutants that get into the system and he believes it is impossible to control the pollutants getting into the stormwater. He discussed the need to change products and find other ways to educate people on the water quality issues along with changing of laws.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about the risk/benefit balance and how it is hard to figure out what the correct balance is. He also talked about how difficult it is to get federal regulations changed once they are in place. He understands the frustration.

The Council discussed the concerns including:

- How to figure out how to get the best "bang for the buck" and where the priorities make sense or not.
- What the role of the Partnership should be once the Action Agenda is in place, one role discussed was for the Partnership to act as a broker to help cities to work with state agencies and find the right tools to help. This would be hard to do with a small staff.

Dave Williams believes the cities would welcome that role for the Partnership. He actually had that in his closing notes on how the Partnership needs to be a catalyst to make this work.

Chair Ruckelshaus reminded the Council that once the Action Agenda is in place, they need to develop partnerships and design the process for designating partners.

STRATEGIC SCIENCE PROGRAM REPORT – Joel Baker

Joel Baker provided a briefing on what the Science Panel has been working on over the last couple months.

Three things:

1. *Strategic Science Plan* – this is a broad statement of the role of science for the Partnership and will be one of the supporting documents for the Action Agenda. The Panel is also working on the Biennial Science Work Plan. They would have preferred to have the Strategic Science Plan in place before working on the Biennial Plan but the timing was off in this first cycle. The hope is to write one Strategic Science Plan with a 10-year shelf life.
2. *Monitoring Plan* – Joel appreciates what Bill Wilkerson said about monitoring efforts. The monitoring plan will be a balance between status and trends, effectiveness/performance, and sources and loading monitoring. Writing the status and trends monitoring piece now at the basin-wide level and hope is to have other groups to lay their monitoring programs on top of this work. To start this work, the Consortium is writing the initial stormwater plan.
3. *Indicators* – the Partnership will rely heavily on the development of the indicators built around the six goals. Last week the workgroup for the indicators narrowed the list of indicators from around 500 down to about 80. The number of indicators still needs to get down to a smaller number and the Science Panel will be working to get to a smaller number depending on how many the Leadership Council would like to have.

Joel and the Council discussed the indicators and need for a larger list of indicators to be used for the science and a smaller subset to be used for the communication. The Science Panel will be looking at the whole list of indicators but will not need to figure out which are the correct indicators to use for communicating.

Joel agreed that the Science Panel will review all the indicators and provide a report to the Leadership Council shortly.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Joel for his work and the work of the Science Panel in getting information ready for the Council to make decisions.

WASHINGTON INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL (WISC) STRATEGIC PLAN – Bridget Moran, WISC Chair

Bridget provided an overview of the Invasive Species Council and what their mission is. She then provided a summary of the report findings and discussed ways for the Puget Sound Partnership and WISC to work together.

The goal of the WISC is to sustain Washington's human, plant, and animal communities and our thriving economy by preventing the introduction and spread of harmful invasive species.

Bridget listed the top five priorities in the strategic plan and noted the intersection with the Partnership:

- Compile existing information and conduct a baseline assessment of invasive species in Washington (health of Puget Sound),
- Develop web based clearing house as the interchange for all existing invasive species information statewide (build and sustain capacity for action),
- Support targeted outreach campaigns to educate both public and private sectors on the damage caused by invasive species (promote public awareness, education and engagement of citizens),
- Increase and enhance communication across all entities to ensure coordinated approaches are supported and tools are accessible to address invasive species issues (build government/non-government collaborations),
- Enhance capacity to respond to invasive species by improving agencies' access to emergency funding and building on existing efforts to develop an interagency early detection and rapid response network (strategic ecosystem science program to monitor and model),

Key areas for partnership:

- Science
- Local work
- Policies
- Funding

Questions and answers for Council:

- Will climate change have an impact and is it being looked at also? Climate change definitely will have impact. Bridget is the Department of Fish and Wildlife lead on climate change and is also on the Western Governor's Association Climate Change group. She is finding that Washington is ahead of other states on this work, some states aren't even sure climate change is a problem
- Does a state boundary makes any sense? It doesn't, WISC is working with Oregon and Idaho and discussing whether there should be a Pacific Northwest Council
- What are the principle threats to Puget Sound? Tunicates and Nutria are two but this is the information the baseline will provide
- Are there some invasive species that are not being addressed? Bridget explained that some have gotten "past the gate" at this point it becomes a risk assessment on whether it is cost effective to get rid of the invasive species or to focus on the most invasive species
- Is there a list of all the invasive species in Washington? No
- When will the baseline report be completed? Will be dependent on funding

Bill Ruckelshaus thanked Bridget for the presentation and her work on the invasive species.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Pete Beaulieu, citizen, noted that, in this process, he has provided lots of comments and he was very impressed with Martha Neuman's work on getting the comments integrated. He then provided comments, reasoning, and thoughts behind his three-theme strategy recommendation:

- Alignment
- Ranking/bundling
- Collaboration/being in charge

Maryanne Guichard, Department of Health (DOH) Office of Shellfish and Water Protection, shared the newly released shellfish map with the Council.

Martha Kongsgaard asked where the DOH stands on the aquaculture issue.

Maryanne responded that DOH's job is making sure the shellfish are safe to eat and are on the group that the Legislature put in place to work on the aquaculture issue but main focus is how safe the shellfish are for human consumption.

Bill Ruckelshaus noted how many of the environmental laws have stemmed from the human health standard.

Russell Sparkman, City of Langley, talked about how Langley would be willing to be part of a land use pilot project. Talked about Florida laws and when fertilizer can be put on lawns. He stressed the need for both public education and regulations.

Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, liked the morning discussion and thinks the discussion on the Monitoring Forum was a good idea. The Consortium has been discussing this and how to make monitoring work. Some monitoring will need to go forward even without the Action Agenda in place. She is concerned with the Science Panel having a conference call this afternoon that was not publicized.

Fred Fellerman, Friends of the Earth, provided thoughts on invasive species, ballast water, and cruise ship issues.

