

## South Central Action Area Caucus Group Meeting Summary Notes

June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013

### Renton City Hall Council Chambers

#### Attendance:

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz (WRIA 8), Kathy Minsch (Seattle), Susan Saffery (Seattle), Sarah Hemphill (King CD), Andy Rheume (SCA), Craig Goodwin (SCA), Doreen Booth (SCA staff), Alisa O'Hanlon (City of Tacoma), David Boe (City of Tacoma) Erika Harris (PSRC), Tom Kantz (Pierce County), Steve Carstens (City of Puyallup), Paul Meyer (Port of Seattle), Megan Smith (KC Exec office), Leda Chahim (Forterra), Heather Ballash (State Department of Commerce), Anne Fritzel (State Department of Commerce), Jim Bolger (PSP), Brandy Reed (KCD), Teresa Lewis (Pierce County), Bruce Wulkan (PSP)

#### 1. Welcome and introductions

The meeting began with the introduction of Jim Simmonds Supervisor Water Quality Unit King County and WRIA 9.

#### 2. WRIA 9 Stormwater retrofit project

The presentation was given by Jim Simmonds, King County Water and Land Resources Division. The presentation focused on WRIA9 assessment of stormwater retrofits in the WRIA 9 watershed (PowerPoint attached). The project was funded by the 2010 EPA grant for Watershed scale strategies to Protect and Restore Puget Sound. The project will be conducted by King County and will develop a cost estimate and prioritization plan for implementing stormwater best management practices and low impact development techniques. The total amount of the project grant is \$999,981 with matching funds of \$333,786.00.

Following the presentation Caucus members discussed the information presented and provided a series of considerations and questions.

Fred Jarrett asked what the estimated cost would be for the WRIA 9 area? Jim Responded by saying it will be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Susan Saffery asked what was the estimated cost for stormwater retrofits in the whole area? Jim responded that it will exceed hundreds of millions of dollars.

Heather Trim inquired if Jim has considered quantifying the value of redevelopment cost in the assessment as a way to demonstrate we are all in this together.

Jason asked Jim if he could expand on his statement that the Department of Ecology will continue to require more retrofits in permitting. Jim responded that he has heard that Department of Ecology is planning each Phase of permits to include more retrofits

### 3. Regional Alliance Proposal

Fred Jarrett introduced Anne Fritzel and Heather Ballash from the state Department of Commerce.

Anne Fritzel introduced herself as a Senior Planner for the Growth Management Services at the Washington State Department of Commerce. She introduced a special project that is a technical assistance opportunity for Puget Sound LIOs. Commerce staff will provide staff time and state agency expertise to develop strategies to address key land-use issues that are barriers to implementing the Action Agenda.

The key objectives:

- To develop and prioritize land-use strategies that can be incorporated into upcoming Growth Management Act.
- To create a framework for ongoing regional work in Action Areas around the Sound.

Timing:

- Commerce is funded to work with three LIOs on regional alliance process in 2013.
- Commerce intends to convene participants over the summer and fall, with a report by December of 2013 or January of 2014.

Anne mentioned that she has been working with De'Sean Quinn and other caucus group members to brainstorm ideas for a project for the South Central Caucus Group.

De'Sean presented the brainstormed proposal developed by a subset of Caucus members that included the South Central Caucus Group's Erika Harris, Alisa O'Hanlon, and Susan Saffery.

The intent by the group was to identify an issue that aligned directly with the South Central Caucus Group's local actions/priorities.

The issue identified is finding solutions to the challenge of addressing stormwater requirements in highly urbanized environments and encouraging infill development. The goal is to have the Department of Commerce continue the work of the Growth Management Policy Boards that have been raising awareness of this urban infill development challenge through a series of presentations outlining different perspectives on the topic. A well-framed and facilitated conversation on the issue to reveal and generate the specific types of solutions needed to address the challenge. This conversation would engage the broadest spectrum of stakeholders who are touched by the issue (developers, planners, policy makers, ecology staff, and consultants) and may include the following elements:

- 1.) Organizing the information already gathered (deliverable: memo summarizing information presented to the Growth Management Policy Board on the issue)
- 2.) Augmenting the information with further research to:
  - a. Present a full picture of the challenges experienced in implementing growth management and water quality policy and all of the conditions contributing to that challenge and

- b. Identify innovative strategies and approaches that other places have used to address the challenge.  
(Deliverable: report summarizing meetings, interviews, and literature review)
- 3.) Identifying key questions, assumptions, and conditions that potential solutions would need to address (deliverable: summary memo)
  - 4.) Recommending strategies and approaches that jurisdictions, agencies, developers, consultants, and other stakeholders can take to help align growth management and water quality goals, and that can inform or be implemented in comprehensive plan and development regulation updates in 2015.  
(Deliverable: report with recommendations and summary information listed above).

**Time Frame**

July 2013 – Aug 2013	Develop Scope of Work, and get underway
Sept – Dec 2013	Research, Meetings, Interviews
February 2014	Draft Report with Recommendations

CM Boe provided background information on the issue from his work on the policy boards and his experience with as an architect who has worked on projects in urban areas.

Other items mentioned during presentation:

- Challenges of conveyance
- Requirement for storage tanks in Tacoma
- Cheaper for developers to buy property by urban growth boundary rather than redeveloping a site in urban Tacoma.
- Rates per square foot in the city not as high a value as the city of Seattle, so development in urban area is challenging.
- Other mechanism that exist that can increase opportunities for infill.

Questions and comments that arose following presentation:

Heather Trim mentioned that this will be a good issue to work on and she was interested in identifying where the actual problems may exist, like toxic materials on sides of building that contaminate surface water.

Leda asked if the main output of the proposal is to report and gather info from what has been going on in the region.

In response Anne and De’Sean mentioned the goal is to identify where the challenges are and what innovative tools have been suggested by key stakeholders.

The caucus group concurred with the caucus group proposal to have Department of Commerce conduct technical work on the issue outlined above.

#### **4. Alliance for Healthy South Sound (South Sound LIO) Presentation**

Tom Kantz provided a brief summary of the PowerPoint (attached). South Sound LIO is proposing an initiative for 2014 making a request of the legislature to request state and federal funds to be distributed meet a set of criteria rather than go through the Lead Organization process. The purpose is to provide allocation directly to Local Integrating Organizations (LIO) to fund local priorities that have been vetted throughout the action Agenda process.

Tom mentioned that this item was presented as an FYI to LIOs and they were not asking for any formal response from other LIOs; they just wanted to make sure they are aware that the discussions are occurring throughout the sound.

Susan Saffery asked what has been the feedback from other LIOs?

Tom mentioned that they have heard both positive support and concern that the change is legislative.

Susan Saffery mentioned that South Sound is well organized and is ahead of the curve of most other LIOs; however, she expressed some concern that the other LIOs in different stages of establishing their local actions under this proposal may not be eligible to receive funds for work.

CM Goodwin asked if this proposal is successful and the change occurs legislatively, what will the role of the Puget Sound Partnership going forward.

Fred Jarrett asked what has been the response from the Puget Sound Partnership.

Other comments were:

- Adding another layer of bureaucracy by adding local approval
- Consider asking for a certain percentage that can go to priorities from Lead Organizations
- Opening up the PSP act is not a riskless act and could be difficult for the partnership.

Tom fielded questions and agreed to pass information on to Alliance for Healthy Sound.

#### **5. New LIO Work plan Guidelines**

De'Sean briefly summarized upcoming changes to the South Central Action Area Caucus Group Work Plan that needs to be negotiated by August 2013.

Every year the Puget Sound Partnership presents a new LIO Work plan; we have provided the new guidelines for this year's work.

The list of notable changes begins with section two, subtask 2.02; it reads “work with the Puget Sound Partnership to introduce Sound wide terminology into LIO planning. This terminology includes the Sound wide Pressure Taxonomy and Sound wide sub-strategies from the 2012 Action Agenda”.

De’Sean mentioned that this process is currently not finalized, but the hope is to get the methodology from PSP in writing as we begin the new cycle of this work plan.

- Section 2 subtask 2.04” Coordinate with watershed-scale monitoring and adaptive management work in the Salmon Recovery Plan watersheds to ensure that information developed through this process will be incorporated into LIO planning and prioritization and vice-versa; Arrange quarterly presentations to the LIO of progress made in Chinook monitoring and adaptive management framework development for watersheds within the LIO geography. “

De’Sean referenced this issue to highlight as WRIA’s have just begun this process and this is a significant undertaking.

Jason Mulvihill Kuntz mentioned that as the WRIA 8 coordinator that he is aware of this work and it can result in quite a bit of work for this LIO and the WRIA’s to meet the quarterly presentation timeline.

- Section 3 subtasks 3.01 “Coordinate funding opportunities for near-term actions or ongoing programs in the Action Agenda, including responses to RFPs.  
Example: Convene potential applicants as part of a habitat protection funding task for to develop a coordinated funding application for Watershed Lead Organizations RFP’s.”

Jason Mulvihill Kuntz inquired if this is a new task, do we know from the Lead organization if they will give preference to coordinated applications? And/or if the lead organizations will give higher points to those applications if they have been endorsed by LIOs?

Bruce mentioned that it is currently variable; some Lead Organizations do give additional points and others are not so clear. This is an issue that continues to be discussed by PSP and other Lead Organizations.

Heather Trim responded that there are groups that do not know the South Central Action Area Caucus body exists, as well as city staff in our region. There needs to be a focus on outreach to make sure organizations and cities are aware of the role South Central Action Area Caucus plays in the Action Agenda.

Andy Rheume concurred that many small cities with limited resources may not know we, the South Central Action Area, exists.

Bruce mentioned – the point is a good one – does the Caucus group want to take on that review, approval and endorsement. He mentioned it that the general trend is that other LIO will in the future.

De’Sean mentioned it may require forming another subcommittee to set up a scoring process.

Fred Jarrett mentioned that we may put ourselves at a disadvantage if we do not set up some form of endorsements.

Heather Trim mentioned Alternative approach could be set up a set of minimum criteria that needs to be met by applicants

## **6. Prep for ECB**

Fred began the discussion with the reference that it is our tradition; "I want to provide an opportunity to members to identify any messages that you would like me, as your representative, to carry to ECB."

- The next ECB meeting will be on Thursday, June 20, Edmonds City Hall.

Fred provided a brief summary of the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) funding subcommittee understood that it needed 2 things we need to put a plan together to do.

1. Subcommittee needed to know what to do to recover Puget Sound
2. Subcommittee needed to know what resources the Puget Sound Partnership have to recover the sound.

Fred mentioned that last year the ECB funding subcommittee hired a consultant to do a study covering these two items.

This material was provided to legislature and there was some push back because the information was incomplete.

Fred added that the subcommittee knew the information was complete and that it will continue the work to finalize the consultant report and, following review, provide it to legislators next year.

Fred mentioned that the South Sound proposal will probably come up and he will share comments mentioned from today's meeting and raise these concerns.

Heather Trim mentioned she had a comment on the ongoing programs; it was not addressed in the Action Agenda and she was interested in a status update by the Partnership.

## **7. Updates and Announcements**

**Next Caucus Group meeting will be September 16 at Renton City Hall Council Chambers  
12:30pm-2:30pm.**