

Action: [Protect – 1(C)D2.1 pg 277, D7 pg 291 Local Action box pg 293] Work with local governments to develop and implement policies and regulations that advance Action Agenda implementation

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager:

Objective:

- Influence and support local governments to improve and better align local development and land use policies and regulations with salmon recovery plans and Action Agenda

Deliverables:

- Inventory of policy/regulatory documents, schedule of updates, and Action Agenda priorities
- Technical assistance, including incentives and “best practices”/“model” policies and regulations

Approach:

- Identify Action Agenda elements to incorporate into local government policies and regulations (i.e., What elements should be part of policies/regulations?)
- Identify regulatory gaps, overlaps, and conflicts
- Support and participate in collaborative process to develop incentives and “model” regulations
- Use Caucus Group as forum for sharing approaches to implementing policies/regulations
- Lobby for funding and technical assistance for local governments to update, adopt, and implement policies/regulations

Stakeholders:

- State agency regulatory staff; WRIAs 8, 9, and 10; local government planners

Challenges:

- Developing appropriate/desirable incentives and get agreement on “model” regulations
- Obtaining political and public will to support regulations
- Administrative needs (capacity to coordinate and manage process)
- Mapping Action Agenda priorities to local planning efforts
- Lack of funding/resources to coordinate process and support local adoption and implementation

Risks:

- Local regulations do not address Action Agenda priorities
- Reliance on other groups/agencies to take action
- Inadequate incentives
- Lack of agreement for “model” development regulations
- Lose focus on objective and engage in endless regulatory evaluation exercise

Inventory policy/regulations, updates & Action Agenda priorities

Process to develop incentives and “model” regulations

Share policies and regulations

Lobby for funding and technical assistance

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 

Action: [Protect – 2(R)A1.1, A2.1, A1.4, A2.1, B2.1, B2.2, B2.4, B2.6, B3.2] Protect high-value habitat and land at immediate risk of conversion

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager: ??

Objective:

- Create a process and develop a quick-action funding mechanism for protecting these lands

Deliverables:

- Consolidate list of *types* of high-priority, high-threat conservation lands
- Task force charter

Approach:

- Consult salmon recovery plans and other ecosystem restoration/protection plans for high-value habitat and lands at immediate risk of conversion
- Recruit task force members, including scientific, political, financial and community organizations and local, state and federal governments;
- Outline task force purpose, scope, charter and work plan
- Launch task force (produce funding mechanism recommendations, create a regular meeting schedule for reviewing lands, and implement recommendations)

Stakeholders:

- Task force - scientific, political, financial and community organizations and local, state and federal governments

Challenges:

- Developing recommendations on funding mechanisms in current economic and budget environment
- Recruiting effective task force
- Sustaining task force on an on-going basis over time
- Prioritizing acquisitions of equivalent importance

Risks:

- Political sensitivity of identifying specific target conservation properties

Consolidate list of *types* of lands

Create task force

Task force recommendations

Implement recommendations and begin reviews

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 ➡

Action: [Protect – 3(R) & Restore – 1(R)A6.1, A6.2, B2.4, A1.1, C2.1, C2.2, C2.5] Implement salmon recovery habitat protection and restoration recommendations

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager:

Objective:

- Increase the pace and amount of habitat restoration and protection, including advancing programmatic priorities (see link with objective and approach for [Protect – 1(C)])

Deliverables:

- More habitat restoration and protection projects
- See deliverables associated with [Protect – 1(C)]

Challenges:

- Reduced, inadequate, and siloed funding
- Obtaining political and public will to support plan implementation
- Demonstrating value and results of habitat restoration and protection

Risks:

- Loss of implementation momentum/interest/credibility
- Reliance on other groups/agencies to act
- Fall out of compliance with Recovery Plan and implementation of ESA = possible increased legal risk

DRAFT

Approach:

- Coordinate and promote local support for state and federal funding (PSAR, SRFB, ESRP, PCSRF, etc.)
- Lobby for funding for local governments to update and implement land use regulations, and integrate with salmon recovery plans and Action Agenda
- Develop and secure alternative funding mechanisms

Stakeholders:

- WRIA 8, 9, and 10, Local governments, Tribes, State and federal agencies, Non-profits, private sector

Support funding during legislative session



Inventory local policies and regulations and align with salmon recovery plans

Develop and secure alternative funding mechanisms



J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 →

Action: [Protect – 4(L) A1.3, A2.1, A3.2, A4.1, B1.1, B1.2, B1.3, B2.1, B2.3)] Change SMA statutes and regulations to limit residential shoreline armoring and overwater coverage, and promote “green” shoreline replacements

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager: ??

Objective:

- Influence and guide local governments to reduce new shoreline armoring and increase “soft” /”green” shoreline replacements.

Deliverables:

- Inventory of completed SMP updates and SMP update schedule
- Incentives and “best practices”/”model” SMPs

Approach:

- Review completed SMPs and obtain SMP update schedule
- Use Caucus Group as forum for sharing best practices and model SMPs
- Lobby for funding and technical assistance for local governments to update and implement SMPs
- Assist local governments by providing “best practices” and “model” example information
- Compile incentives and provide to local governments
- Communicate to local governments, elected officials, and land owners about the importance of shoreline protection

Stakeholders:

- WRIAs 8, 9, and 10; State agency shoreline habitat and regulatory staff; Local government planning staff

Challenges:

- Availability of appropriate/desirable incentives
- Lack of political and public will to support protective SMPs

Risks:

- Local governments do not use information provided
- Reliance on other groups/agencies to take action
- Lack of funding and technical assistance to support local SMP adoption and implementation

DRAFT

Review SMP updates and update schedule

Share SMP best practices and model regulations

Lobby for funding and technical assistance

Provide “best practices” and incentives information to local governments

Communicate about importance of shoreline protection

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 ➡

Action: [Restore – 2(R)A5.1, A5.3, A5.4, A5.5, A7.1, B2.1] Restore floodplains**Lead/Owner:** South Central Action Area Caucus Group**Project Manager:** King County**Objective:**

- Develop long-term strategy for floodplain management of the area's major rivers.

Deliverables:

- Floodplain management concept and preliminary strategy
- Final strategy

Approach:

- Develop concept and preliminary strategy
- Conduct economic analysis, including ecosystem goods and services
- Engage partners and interested parties (especially local governments and business community)
- Partner with the ports and other local jurisdictions to expand intermodal investment outside of flood planes
- Inventory priority floodplain protection and restoration projects.

SI: PRH**Stakeholders:**

- WRIAs 8, 9, and 10, Local governments, Ports, Tribes, Conservation Districts, Puget Sound Partnership, Ecology, FEMA, National Marine Fisheries Service, Army Corps of Engineers, private sector

Challenges:

- Coordinating multiple jurisdictions in common strategy
- Inadequate guidance and technical assistance from state and federal agencies for complying with NFIP
- Achieving appropriate regional variance to Corps levee vegetation maintenance policy
- Obtaining political and public will to support new or updated floodplain regulations
- Lack of funding to implement strategy and priorities
- Conflicting regulatory mandates (e.g., levee maintenance and ESA)

Risks:

- Uncoordinated floodplain management
- Reliance on other groups/agencies to act
- Fall out of compliance with NFIP and levee certification

Develop concept and draft strategy

Economic analysis

Engage partners

Inventory floodplain priorities

Inventory priority floodplain protection and

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 →

Action: [Restore – 3(R),C2.3,E1.1] Develop a strategic funding proposal for restoration priorities

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager: WRIA 9?

Objective:

- Develop a draft bill authorizing the formation of Watershed Investment Districts, creating dedicated funding for timely restoration of Puget Sound and its indicator species, salmon.

Deliverables:

- Comments on draft bill
- Final bill

Approach:

- Coordinate and promote local support for authorizing the formation of Watershed Investment Districts
- Review, discuss, and provide comment on draft bills
- Vigorously support the bill at the legislature
- Provide funding to build a coalition of support across Puget Sound and the State

Stakeholders:

- WRIA 8, 9, and 10 lead entities, local governments, Tribes, lead entities, flood districts, state agencies, non-profits, conservation districts

SI: PRH

Challenges:

- Insufficient resources and funding to implement salmon habitat recovery plans
- More efficiently and effectively implementing projects and programs to achieve healthy watersheds
- Demonstrate value of natural capital gained through habitat restoration and protection
- Obtaining support for bill
- Coordinating and prioritizing watershed restoration priorities for investment

Risks:

- Extinction of species
- Priority actions not achieved; Puget Sound not restored
- Lawsuits

Develop draft bill
and build
statewide
coalition of
support

Build statewide
coalition of
support for the
bill; Introduce
bill in 2012
legislature

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 →

Action: [Reduce Pollution – 1(R) C2.1, C2.2, C2.3] Fund stormwater retrofits to improve operations/maintenance of existing stormwater infrastructure

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager: Puget Sound Regional Council

Objective:

- Influence and guide local governments to reduce stormwater impacts on Puget Sound and watersheds

Deliverables:

- Better aligned land use planning with conditions for, and implementation of, municipal NPDES permits to reduce stormwater impacts

Approach:

- Inventory land use plans and NPDES permit conditions
- Participate in ECB Stormwater Subcommittee
- Comment on retrofit prioritization and allocation criteria
- Identify and analyze funding mechanisms
- Lobby for funding for retrofit priorities

Stakeholders:

- Local governments (Phase 1 and 2/cities and counties), PSRC, Ecology, Puget Sound Partnership, EPA, private sector
- **SI: Prevention of Pollution from Urban Stormwater Runoff**

Challenges:

- Ability to coordinate with “competing” funding initiatives (e.g., salmon funds)
- Lack of political and public recognition of role of stormwater management in Puget Sound recovery
- Demonstrate clear benefits of new funding, priorities, and equity in distribution (criterion based)

Risks:

- Loss of implementation momentum/interest/credibility
- Inability to achieve state water quality standards
- Alienate potential allies (e.g., industry recovery forums, Tribes, etc.)

Inventory plans and permit conditions

Participate in ECB Stormwater Subcommittee

Comment on stormwater retrofit priorities

Analyze funding mechanisms

Lobby for retrofit funding

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 

Action: [Reduce Pollution – 2(C)B4.1, C1.1, C1.2, C1.4, C2.2, C2.5,] Incorporate LID requirements into stormwater codes and develop and implement LID incentives

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager:

Objective:

- Influence local governments’ stormwater management through increased implementation of LID actions.

Deliverables:

- Inventory of upcoming development policy/regulatory updates
- Incentives and LID “best practices”/”model” policies and regulations

Approach:

- Comment on NPDES permit, LID guidebook, model ordinances, updated LID Technical Guidance Manual
- Compile and provide incentives and “best practices” information to local governments
- Use Caucus Group as forum for sharing approaches to implementing LID policies and regulations
- Encourage local governments’ participation in WSU LID technical workshops
- Lobby for and guide technical assistance for local government adoption of LID regulations
- Assess connections with objective and approach for action to develop regulations that implement Action Agenda priorities
- SI: PPUSR

Stakeholders:

- Puget Sound Partnership, Ecology, Washington State University Extension, and local governments

Challenges:

- Delay of NPDES permit from mid-2012 to 2013
- Development of appropriate/desirable incentives and useful “model” regulations
- Lack of political and public will to support development and implementation of regulations
- Ability to manage coordination of comments

Risks:

- Inadequate policies, regulations, incentives, and guidance
- Reliance on other groups/agencies to take action
- Lack of agreement for “model” development regulations
- Lack of funding and adequate technical assistance and guidance to local governments to integrate model ordinances into stormwater codes.

Inventory regulatory updates, compile incentives, and share information

Comment on draft LID requirements for NPDES permit

Comment on LID guidebook, model ordinances, and updated Technical Guidance Manual

Share example regulations

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012

Action: [Reduce Pollution – 3(L)C1.1,] Restore and protect Local Toxics Control Account under the Model Toxics Control Account (MTCA)

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area

Project Manager:

Objective:

- Preserve the Local Toxics Control Account (LTCA) for its statutory purpose – helping to fund clean-up of our state’s most toxic sites.

Deliverables:

- Help make protection of these funds/clean-ups a higher priority for the Puget Sound Partnership
- Lobby for capital funding protection and appropriation
- Assist in educating legislators and others to understand the history, purpose and ongoing need for LTCA funding

Approach:

- Coordinate/promote local support for protection of LTCA
- Work with Ecology to find a solution to the longer term funding challenges
- Participate in efforts to better explain this issue

Stakeholders:

- Local governments, Ports, State and federal agencies, private sector
- **SI: Prevention of Pollution from Urban Stormwater runoff**

Challenges:

- Ongoing state budget deficits leave the LTCA vulnerable to being “raided” for other purposes
- Obtaining adequate funding for the 2011-13 biennium
- Inadequate funding to implement cleanups begun in last decade that are close to completing study phase and going to construction in the next decade
- Obtaining political and public understanding of account purpose, and better legislative leadership

Risks:

- Loss of state match for project costs
- Slower clean-up of toxic sites
- Higher local taxes and utility rates
- Ongoing liability and higher costs for private partners

Support funding protection and adequate appropriation during legislative session

Strengthen coalition of supporters

Make higher priority in the Action Agenda update

Meet with legislators during interim to provide education and build support

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 ➡

Action: [Reduce Pollution – 4(L)C1.1, C1.2, C1.5, C2.1, c2.4, C3.1, C3.2, C5.1, C5.2, C6.1, C6.4, C6.5, C.7.1] Keep toxics and excess nutrients out of the waste stream

Lead/Owner: South Central Action Area Caucus Group

Project Manager: ??

Objective:

- Influence local governments to reduce toxic chemicals and excess nutrients from getting into Puget Sound from consumer and commercial products

Deliverables:

- Inventory of toxics reduction efforts and programs and additional chemicals of concern that need to be reduced

Approach:

- Coordinate efforts for product-focused strategies through the Northwest Product Stewardship Council
- Lobby for funding for Local Source Control and Local Hazardous Waste Management (Moderate Risk Waste) programs
- Lobby for legislative initiatives to ban problematic ingredients or require product stewardship responsibility by manufacturers, such as for pharmaceuticals, copper bottom paints, phthalates, triclosan and other chemicals of concern, as well as for nutrients in lawn fertilizers

Stakeholders:

- Local governments, Tribes, State and federal agencies, non-profits, private sector
- SI: PPUSR

Challenges:

- Lack of political support to ban problematic ingredients
- Lack of adequate research on, or availability of, safe alternatives
- Lack of adequate knowledge regarding level of contribution to the problem from various sources, as well as their controllability.
- Lack of business support for product stewardship

Risks:

- Limited ability to address significant sources
- Reliance on federal action for some products
- Replacements create separate or new problems

Lobby for legislative initiatives (e.g., medicines take back)

Coordinate with and support new product stewardship initiatives

J F M A M J J A S O N D 2012 ➔