

Puget Sound Partnership 2015—2017 Operating Budget Request

September 2014



PugetSoundPartnership

LEADING PUGET SOUND RECOVERY

September 19, 2014

David Schumacher
Director
Office of Financial Management
PO Box 43113
Olympia, WA 98504-3113

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

Attached is the Puget Sound Partnership 2015-17 Operating Budget request. Per the Governor's direction and with guidance from the Office of Financial Management, the eight decision packages represent three submittal categories:

- Three decision packages combine to achieve the agency's 15 percent budget reduction target. This reduction touches all aspects of our programs and operations and includes elimination of positions.
- Two decision packages request consideration to "buy back" important functions that due to the nature of the Partnership's funding portfolio had to be included in the reduction proposal.
- Three decision packages request support to advance efforts on issues key to the recovery of Puget Sound: Assessing Recovery for Effective Investment, Salmon Recovery, and Shoreline Armoring. Each of these decision packages support Goal 3 of Results Washington as well as implement elements of the Partnership's Action Agenda, the regional roadmap to achieve 2020 targets for Puget Sound recovery.

We recognize that in the current budget climate reductions are likely to be more frequent than additions, but chose to submit this combination of packages to reflect the baseline funding needed to keep the 2020 target horizon for Puget Sound recovery in sight. If you have any questions, please contact Ginger Stewart, Chief Financial Officer, at 360-464-1218.

Sincerely,



Sheida R. Sahandy
Executive Director

PugetSoundPartnership

LEADING PUGET SOUND RECOVERY

2015-2017 Biennial Budget Request Table of Contents

TAB A

- Agency Organizational Chart
- Agency Activity Inventory Report
- Performance Measure Incremental Estimates Report
- Indirect Cost Allocation to Activities Description
- Agency Strategic Plan

TAB B

- Recommendation Summary at Agency Level
- Recommendation Summary at Program Level (Not Applicable)

TAB C

- Decision Package Summary
- Individual Decision Packages

TAB D

- Summarized Revenues
- Proposed Fee Changes (Not Applicable)
- Working Capital Reserve (Not Applicable)
- Revenue Transfer Reconciliation Statement (Not Applicable)
- Federal Fund Estimate/State Match OFM Template
- Additional Federal Receipts Reporting Requirements OFM Template (Not Applicable)
- Non-Budgeted Local Fund Summary (B10), (Not Applicable)
- Puget Sound Action Agenda: List of Decision Packages and Capital Projects Requests
- JLARC Audit Responses (Not Applicable)

TAB E

- Specific Documents as Required for Information Technology-related Decision Packages & Self-Insurance Premium Decision Packages (Not Applicable)
- Electronic Decision Package Confirmation
- Central Service Fund Split Spreadsheet

478 - Puget Sound Partnership

A005 Administration

Partnership administration manages the day-to-day operations and leadership functions of the agency. Staff in this area include the executive director, deputy director, director of public affairs and agency communications, the executive assistant, and financial services staff. It also includes the support of the three statutorily created Partnership Boards: the Leadership Council, the Ecosystem Coordinating Board and the Science Panel.

Program 010 - Administration

Account	FY 2016	FY 2017	Biennial Total
FTE			
996-Z Other	9.5	8.7	9.1
001-1 State	8.9	8.1	8.5
FTE Total	18.4	16.8	17.6
02R Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account			
02R-1 State	\$56,000	\$56,000	\$112,000
001 General Fund			
001-1 State	\$1,183,000	\$1,200,000	\$2,383,000
001-2 Federal	\$696,000	\$777,000	\$1,473,000
001 Account Total	\$1,879,000	\$1,977,000	\$3,856,000
173 State Toxics Control Account			
173-1 State	\$59,000	\$64,000	\$123,000

Statewide Result Area: Sustainable Energy and a Clean Environment

Statewide Strategy: Preserve, maintain and restore natural systems and landscapes

Expected Results

Leadership and oversight of Puget Sound conservation and recovery efforts necessary to restore Puget Sound for current and future generations. Efficient agency operations consistent with state and federal guidelines regarding budget/finance, human resources, reporting, public information, and board coordination.

002164 Percentage of Financial & Ecosystem Account Tracking System (FEATS) reports submitted on time to the federal Environmental Protection Agency.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	Q8		
	Q7		100%
	Q6		
	Q5		100%
	Q4		
	Q3	0%	100%
	Q2		
	Q1	100%	100%
2011-13	Q8		
	Q7	100%	100%
	Q6		
	Q5	100%	100%
	Q4		
	Q3	100%	100%
	Q2		
	Q1	20%	100%
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

002163 % of performance evaluations completed for employees with a plan.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		100%
	A2		100%
2011-13	A3	48%	100%
	A2	33%	100%
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

A002 Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

Developing and implementing the Action Agenda - a science-based plan that identifies the most important actions to recover Puget Sound by 2020 - represents the heart of the Puget Sound recovery effort. The Partnership is responsible for revising the Action Agenda, overseeing implementation, and evaluating progress toward recovery.

- Revising the Action Agenda involves applying information about ecosystem conditions and the effects of actions to update implementation strategies.
- Implementation oversight involves coordinating activities of state, federal, and local agencies, tribal governments; and non-profit organizations. The Partnership develops a strategic science program and biennial science work plans that describe the research, monitoring, and modeling needed to guide recovery efforts.
- Performance management includes tracking, analyzing, and reporting on progress in meeting performance goals in the Action Agenda and 2020 recovery targets set by the Leadership Council. Progress is reported in the Performance Accountability Application and in the State of the Sound report.

Strategic science and performance management information combine to inform revisions to the Action Agenda.

Program 010 - Administration

Account	FY 2016	FY 2017	Biennial Total
FTE			
996-Z Other	5.7	5.3	5.5
001-1 State	6.0	6.2	6.1
FTE Total	11.7	11.5	11.6
02R Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account			
02R-1 State	\$102,000	\$103,000	\$205,000
001 General Fund			
001-1 State	\$2,160,600	\$1,557,600	\$3,718,200
001-2 Federal	\$2,636,000	\$1,729,000	\$4,365,000
001 Account Total	\$4,796,600	\$3,286,600	\$8,083,200
173 State Toxics Control Account			
173-1 State	\$111,000	\$110,000	\$221,000

Statewide Result Area: Sustainable Energy and a Clean Environment

Statewide Strategy: Preserve, maintain and restore natural systems and landscapes

Expected Results

A scientifically guided Action Agenda focused on the most important threats and using the most effective techniques to guide the investment of resources to protect and restore Puget Sound by 2020. Coordinated implementation by stakeholders involved in recovery. A comprehensive performance management system that evaluates and reports on achievement of 2020 goals. A robust regional monitoring and science program to ensure that actions and strategies are grounded in science and demonstrate effectiveness.

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002131 Number of acres per year of marine, estuarine and nearshore river habitat restored, enhanced or protected as part of the effort to restore populations of salmon and other species with declining populations.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		4,000
	A2		4,000
2011-13	A3	6,318	2,500
	A2	9,239	2,500
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

002132 Percentage of the five Puget Sound bio-geographic regions, that experience an improvement in wild Chinook abundance in 2-4 populations.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		100%
	A2		100%
2011-13	A3	0%	100%
	A2	0%	100%
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002136 Percent of highest priority near-term actions reporting 'On Plan' (and 'Completed').			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	Q8		100%
	Q7		100%
	Q6		100%
	Q5		100%
	Q4	76%	100%
	Q3	73%	100%
	Q2	78%	100%
	Q1	68%	100%
2011-13	Q8	71%	100%
	Q7	63%	100%
	Q6	66%	100%
	Q5	77%	100%
	Q4	77%	100%
	Q3	77%	100%
	Q2	77%	100%
	Q1	73%	100%
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

002129 Percent of Partnership Led Near-Term Actions Reporting 'On Plan' (and 'Completed').			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	Q8		90%
	Q7		90%
	Q6		90%
	Q5		90%
	Q4	57%	90%
	Q3	48%	90%
	Q2	46%	90%
	Q1	55%	90%
2011-13	Q8	53%	90%
	Q7	44%	90%
	Q6	40%	90%
	Q5	34%	90%
	Q4	68%	90%
	Q3	74%	90%
	Q2	74%	90%
	Q1	66%	90%
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002130 Percentage of sampling sites reporting improved condition, based on marine water condition index.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		100%
	A2	67%	100%
2011-13	A3	42%	100%
	A2	83%	100%
Performance Measure Status: Approved			

A003 Public Stewardship of Puget Sound

The Partnership is the EPA-designated Lead Organization for the regional stewardship network and its Action Agenda activities. This program implements a science-based strategy to advance best management practices for Puget Sound recovery among over four million residents in the Puget Sound region. The work in this activity builds, manages, and leverages a regional network of over five hundred community organizations to deliver targeted outcomes - best management practices implemented by citizens - that address priority pressures to the Puget Sound ecosystem related to storm water, nutrients and habitat. Staff administer the regional program; provide guidance, grants, information and technical resources to partners for local program delivery; provide web-based technology for partner collaboration; and produce publications.

Program 010 - Administration

Account	FY 2016	FY 2017	Biennial Total
FTE			
996-Z Other	3.0	3.0	3.0
001-1 State	1.5	1.8	1.7
FTE Total	4.5	4.8	4.7
001 General Fund			
001-1 State	\$576,000	\$528,000	\$1,104,000
001-2 Federal	\$466,000	\$461,000	\$927,000
001 Account Total	\$1,042,000	\$989,000	\$2,031,000
173 State Toxics Control Account			
173-1 State	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000

Statewide Result Area: Sustainable Energy and a Clean Environment

Statewide Strategy: Preserve, maintain and restore natural systems and landscapes

Expected Results

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

Reduced pressure on Puget Sound from citizen-based activities; enhanced environmental outcomes from partner programs through improved strategies, collaboration, capacity, and effectiveness; citizens’ information access and transparency; increased partner resources, and effective agency publications.

002144 By survey, on best management practices knowledge, percentage of Puget Sound residents answering correctly that leaving dog waste in residential yards is harmful to water quality.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	63%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002138 By survey, on best management practices knowledge, percentage of Puget Sound residents answering correctly that using chemical products to control weeds or other plants in residential yards is harmful to water quality.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	89%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002140 By survey, on best management practices knowledge, percentage of Puget Sound residents answering correctly that using weed and feed on residential lawns is harmful to water quality.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	77%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
A1			
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002142 By survey, on best management practices knowledge, percentage of Puget Sound residents answering correctly that washing personal vehicles in the driveway, street or parking lot is harmful to water quality.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	77%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
A1			
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002133 By survey, percentage of Puget Sound residents rating the need to clean-up and protect waters in and around Puget Sound as Urgent/Extremely Urgent.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		66%
	A2	60%	66%
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002145 By survey, on best management practices, percentage of Puget Sound households answering that they 'Always' / 'Usually' pick up their dog's waste from their yard.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	77%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
A1			
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002139 By survey, on best management practices, percentage of Puget Sound households answering that they 'Never' / 'Seldom' use chemical products to control or kill moss, weeds or other plants in their yard.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	65%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
A1			
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002141 By survey, on best management practices, percentage of Puget Sound households answering that they 'Never' / 'Seldom' use weed and feed on their lawn.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	66%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
A1			
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002143 By survey, on best management practices, percentage of Puget Sound households answering that they 'Never' / 'Seldom' wash their vehicles in the driveway, street or parking lot.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	60%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
	A1		
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

002134 By survey, percentage of Puget Sound residents agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'one person's actions can make a difference in improving the health of waters and fish and wildlife habitat in the Puget Sound region'.			
Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		90%
	A2		90%
2011-13	A3		
	A3		
	A2		
	A2	83%	100%
	A2		
	A2		
	A1		
	A1		
Performance Measure Status: Draft			

A004 Support Ecosystem Recovery

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

The Partnership implements several key programs related to Puget Sound recovery. It helps coordinate local actions and provides financial and technical assistance to advance priority actions and local projects including salmon recovery, storm water (including low-impact development), oil spills, nutrients and toxics, and invasive species. The Partnership is the state-designated regional organization that coordinates implementation of Puget Sound salmon recovery actions. This includes supporting local decision makers to develop, update, and implement Chinook and steelhead recovery plans, as well as coordinating region-wide salmon recovery implementation reporting, monitoring, and adaptive management.

Program 010 - Administration

Account	FY 2016	FY 2017	Biennial Total
FTE			
996-Z Other	4.5	4.5	4.5
001-1 State	5.0	5.0	5.0
FTE Total	9.5	9.5	9.5
02R Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account			
02R-1 State	\$92,000	\$91,000	\$183,000
001 General Fund			
001-1 State	\$406,500	\$457,500	\$864,000
001-2 Federal	\$1,540,000	\$1,371,000	\$2,911,000
001 Account Total	\$1,946,500	\$1,828,500	\$3,775,000
06A Salmon Recovery Account			
06A-1 State	\$780,000	\$920,000	\$1,700,000
173 State Toxics Control Account			
173-1 State	\$170,000	\$169,000	\$339,000

Statewide Result Area: Sustainable Energy and a Clean Environment

Statewide Strategy: Preserve, maintain and restore natural systems and landscapes

Expected Results

Completed habitat recovery projects to protect and restore the highest priority fish passage, near-shore, floodplain, and estuary locations. Fulfillment of state responsibilities for salmon recovery. Reduced negative impacts from storm water and invasive species in Puget Sound. Coordinated and prioritized implementation of Action Agenda responsibilities by local entities.

Appropriation Period: 2015-17 Activity Version: AA - 2015-17 Budget

002131 Number of acres per year of marine, estuarine and nearshore river habitat restored, enhanced or protected as part of the effort to restore populations of salmon and other species with declining populations.

Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		4,000
	A2		4,000
2011-13	A3	6,318	2,500
	A2	9,239	2,500

Performance Measure Status: Approved

002132 Percentage of the five Puget Sound bio-geographic regions, that experience an improvement in wild Chinook abundance in 2-4 populations.

Biennium	Period	Actual	Target
2013-15	A3		100%
	A2		100%
2011-13	A3	0%	100%
	A2	0%	100%

Performance Measure Status: Approved

Grand Total

	FY 2016	FY 2017	Biennial Total
FTE's	44.1	42.6	43.4
GFS	\$4,326,100	\$3,743,100	\$8,069,200
Other	\$6,708,000	\$5,852,000	\$12,560,000
Total	\$11,034,100	\$9,595,100	\$20,629,200

**Agency Performance Measure
Incremental Estimates for the Biennial Budget**

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership

Budget Period: 2015-17

Activity: A005 Administration

CB	AA	Current Biennium CFL	No measures linked to decision package
PL	A0	Realign Organizational Staffing	No measures linked to decision package
PL	A2	Eliminate WSAC Support Contract	No measures linked to decision package
PL	N3	WSAC Reduced Scope Contract	No measures linked to decision package

Activity: A002 Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science

CB	AA	Current Biennium CFL	No measures linked to decision package
M2	AE	Federal Authority Tech Adjustment	No measures linked to decision package
PL	A0	Realign Organizational Staffing	No measures linked to decision package
PL	N0	Assessing Recovery	No measures linked to decision package

Activity: A003 Public Stewardship of Puget Sound

CB	AA	Current Biennium CFL	No measures linked to decision package
PL	A1	Scale PSSH Program	No measures linked to decision package
PL	N4	PSSH Program Restoration	No measures linked to decision package

Activity: A004 Support Ecosystem Recovery

CB	AA	Current Biennium CFL	No measures linked to decision package
----	----	----------------------	--

Outcome Measures 002131 Number of acres per year of marine, estuarine and nearshore river habitat restored, enhanced or protected as part of the effort to restore populations of salmon and other species with declining populations.

			<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>
PL	N1	Puget Sound Salmon Recovery	0.00	0.00
PL	N2	Shoreline Property Owner Assistance	0.00	0.00

Outcome Measures 002132 Percentage of the five Puget Sound bio-geographic regions, that experience an improvement in wild Chinook abundance in 2-4 populations.

			<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>
PL	N1	Puget Sound Salmon Recovery	0.00%	0.00%

Activity Inventory Indirect Cost Allocation

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership

Date: September 19, 2014

Allocation Method Description: Indirect costs were allocated to activities based on total cumulative expenditures for each activity. Indirect cost estimate includes 12.5 FTEs and central agency costs.

ACTIVITY	% Allocation Received	Dollars Allocated FY2016	Dollars Allocated FY2017	Total Allocated
A002 - Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science	31.1%	\$399,000	\$399,000	\$798,000
A003 - Public Stewardship of Puget Sound	15.8%	\$203,000	\$203,000	\$406,000
A004 - Support Ecosystem Recovery	40.3%	\$517,000	\$517,000	\$1,034,000
A005 - Administration	12.8%	\$164,000	\$164,000	\$328,000
Total	100%	\$1,283,000	\$1,283,000	\$2,566,000

Puget Sound Partnership Strategic Plan Framework 2014 - 2020

VISION

Vibrant, enduring natural systems and communities

MISSION

Leading and inspiring the collective effort to recover Puget Sound

CULTURE

- We are dedicated to providing backbone support for effective, collaborative work.
- We support science-informed, evidence-based decisions by the many partners engaged in recovery efforts.
- We are strategic in our thinking, decisions, communications, and actions.
- We are a mission-aware, supportive, and credible organization accountable for its results.
- We question, we learn, we catalyze, and we celebrate.

BACKBONE FUNCTIONS

Puget Sound recovery can only be achieved through the commitments and efforts of partners across many sectors of society. The Puget Sound Partnership was established and is organized to provide support to ensure the collective success of Puget Sound recovery efforts. To be effective in that role, the Partnership will focus on six key functions, known as “backbone” support. The Partnership is committed to serving these roles and will use them to guide decision-making and our work programs.

Backbone Function	Puget Sound Partnership Efforts
Guide Vision and Strategy	Coordinate with our partners to develop a shared vision for Puget Sound, including a common understanding of the problems we are addressing and a joint approach to solving them through agreed upon actions.
Support Aligned Activities	Encourage differentiated but coordinated activities by diverse partners through a mutually reinforcing plan as expressed in the Action Agenda for Puget Sound.

Backbone Function	Puget Sound Partnership Efforts
Establish Shared Measurement Practices	Facilitate the collection of data and measurement of results across all partner efforts to ensure investments remain aligned, partners hold each other accountable, and partners are continually learning about the Puget Sound system and its response to recovery efforts.
Build Public Will	Guide development of a vision and a coordinated implementation strategy so partners and community members feel empowered to take action in support of Puget Sound recovery and then tell the story of those actions and the associated outcomes.
Advance Policy	Collaborate with partners to identify and pursue opportunities to better align policies at all levels of government with Puget Sound recovery needs.
Mobilize Funding	Collaborate with partners to develop integrated and innovative funding strategies to leverage investments to support Puget Sound recovery efforts.

Collective I.M.P.A.C.T. Center

I. INNOVATION

- Identify and address system barriers
 - ◆ Identify effective interventions, develop tools for partner use, and disseminate
 - ◆ Remove barriers and help partners address challenges in implementing recovery work
 - ◆ Develop and harness the support of opinion and policy leaders

- Serve as a hub of innovation and excellence
 - ◆ Position Action Agenda as a rally point to generate engagement and investment on highest priority issues
 - ◆ Catalyze and support new approaches

M. MONITORING and PRIORITIZATION BASED ON SCIENCE

- Support science-based shared priorities for action
 - ◆ Build partner capacity to collect, contribute, and use data
 - ◆ Generate funding to assess effectiveness

- Scale recovery effort to meet magnitude of the problem
 - ◆ Develop shared theories of change and provide regional guidance on how to express evidence-based work
 - ◆ Prioritize science investments to support decision-making

P. PARTNERSHIP

- Be relationship managers
 - ♦ Be proactive
 - ♦ Facilitate communication among partners
 - ♦ Develop programs to train and support staff and partners in working collaboratively

A. AGENCY EXCELLENCE

- Become a destination workplace
 - ♦ Provide work experience with opportunities to learn and develop
 - ♦ Implement structure to manage integrated work programs and prioritize internal and external opportunities
 - ♦ Empower employees to be shared stewards of our culture
- Integrate strategic and collaborative decision-making across all efforts
 - ♦ Engage employees in developing the shared vision, Action Agenda and targets
 - ♦ Express consistent connection between mission/vision and policy direction
 - ♦ Create deliberate opportunities for feedback

C. COMMUNICATION

- Promote effective, consistent and accessible communications
 - ♦ Identify strategic messages by audience
 - ♦ Ensure communication channels are accessible and up to date
 - ♦ Implement a robust intra-agency communication strategy and culture
- Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery
 - ♦ Promote successes of the agency and our partners
 - ♦ Tell the story of the work yet to do and the cost of that work

T. TRANSPARENCY and ACCOUNTABILITY

- Measure success of the work done within the agency, of recovery efforts, and of the state of overall recovery
 - ♦ Report on the outcomes and share the results with partners
 - ♦ Learn from the outcomes and work with partners to develop the next phase of the effort

TEAM COMMITMENTS

Team commitments for the biennium ahead and annual performance plans for individual team members will be developed to ensure linkage with the agency mission, culture, backbone functions, and goals outlined in this strategic plan framework.

Recommendation Summary

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership

11:37:42AM

9/19/2014

Dollars in Thousands

	Annual Average FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
2013-15 Current Biennium Total	46.0	4,849	12,277	17,126
Total Carry Forward Level Percent Change from Current Biennium	46.0	4,849	12,277	17,126
Carry Forward plus Workload Changes Percent Change from Current Biennium	46.0	4,849	12,277	17,126
M2 AE Federal Authority Tech Adjustment	(2.3)		(1,417)	(1,417)
Total Maintenance Level Percent Change from Current Biennium	43.8 (4.9)%	4,849	10,860 (11.5)%	15,709 (8.3)%
PL A0 Realign Organizational Staffing	(1.4)	(272)		(272)
PL A1 Scale PSSH Program		(296)		(296)
PL A2 Eliminate WSAC Support Contract		(160)		(160)
PL N0 Assessing Recovery	1.0	2,722		2,722
PL N1 Puget Sound Salmon Recovery			1,700	1,700
PL N2 Shoreline Property Owner Assistance		850		850
PL N3 WSAC Reduced Scope Contract		80		80
PL N4 PSSH Program Restoration		296		296
Subtotal - Performance Level Changes	(0.4)	3,220	1,700	4,920
2015-17 Total Proposed Budget Percent Change from Current Biennium	43.4 (5.8)%	8,069 66.4%	12,560 2.3%	20,629 20.5%

Recommendation Summary

Agency: 478

11:37:42AM

9/19/2014

Dollars in Thousands

Annual Average FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
------------------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------

M2 AE Federal Authority Tech Adjustment

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is requesting a reduction of (2.3) FTEs and (\$1,417,000) in GF-Federal appropriation authority in the 2015-17 Biennium. PSP's federal appropriation authority exceeds projected federal revenue.

PL A0 Realign Organizational Staffing

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership is proposing a (1.4) FTE and (\$272,000) GF-State reduction derived from staffing changes across several business units. Cost savings will be achieved by better alignment of job functions within the Administrative Support team and reduced reliance on part-time positions within the Information Technology, Finance, and Science groups. All affected positions provide support for the implementation of the Puget Sound Action Agenda.

PL A1 Scale PSSH Program

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership is proposing a (\$296,000) GF-State reduction to its Puget Sound Starts Here Program, a 12-county public awareness campaign dedicated to improving water quality and aquatic habitat. Cost savings will be achieved by reducing PSP's investment in the campaign, which is implemented by a coalition of public and private organizations. The reduction will likely result in decreased awareness of the campaign and fewer residents in the Puget Sound Basin who connect that they have a role as its steward.

This package is related to Puget Sound Action Agenda Implementation (Strategy D5 - Changing Practices and Behaviors, Strategy D6 - Building Issue Awareness and Understanding, Strategy D7 - Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure).

PL A2 Eliminate WSAC Support Contract

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is proposing a (\$160,000) GF-State reduction based on not renewing a contract with the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). WSAC facilitates collaboration and communication between the PSP and city and county governments to address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. The reduction will make it more difficult to coordinate with cities and counties in their role as local implementers of the Action Agenda.

PL N0 Assessing Recovery

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) created and supports the Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program (PSEMP) for the purpose of coordinating Puget Sound assessment. PSEMP inventoried current monitoring programs and identified and prioritized gaps in those programs. PSP and PSEMP also identified gaps in assessing the effectiveness of programs and activities to restore and protect Puget Sound. A fundamental role for PSP is to prioritize investments in Puget Sound recovery and without the identified information, that function is compromised. Therefore, the Partnership is requesting \$2,722,200 to fund high priority gaps for these programs to be carried out primarily through agreements with other agencies and organizations. This funding is complementary to WDFW's proposal for toxics in fish monitoring. These two funding packages together would ensure that there is adequate data collection and analysis to report on the status of the ecosystem and determine if investments intended to restore Puget Sound are delivering the promised benefits. This work directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation and will also help to advance the habitat restoration goals set forth by Tribal Nations in the Treaty Rights at Risk whitepaper.

Recommendation Summary

Agency: 478

11:37:42AM

9/19/2014

Dollars in Thousands

Annual Average FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
------------------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------

PL N1 Puget Sound Salmon Recovery

The vitality of the Salmon population directly correlates with the overall health of Puget Sound; they are an economic generator for the region, and they are a symbol of the heritage of the Pacific Northwest. The Puget Sound Partnership is requesting \$1,700,000 to continue the most essential Puget Sound salmon recovery projects: 1) update the 2005 Chinook recovery plans to fill key information gaps, complete prioritized monitoring plans, and implement adaptive management processes; and 2) coordinate watershed-scale actions as part of a comprehensive, science-based roadmap to recover steelhead. These projects will lead to investment in the highest priority and most effective recovery actions, enhanced assessment processes, and ultimately salmon recovery across Puget Sound. This request directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation.

PL N2 Shoreline Property Owner Assistance

Puget Sound's 2,500 miles of shoreline are a valuable natural resource critical for the survival of key marine species including salmon, forage fish, and marine birds. Our shorelines have been impacted by the construction of hard armoring or bulkheads built based on the perceived need to protect public and private property from potential damage caused by tides and waves. The Puget Sound Partnership is requesting \$850,000 GF-State for a pilot project to provide technical assistance to landowners in Kitsap and Jefferson Counties who wish to remove bulkheads and utilize alternative shoreline protection approaches on their property. The program would contribute directly to the regional targets for reducing hard armoring by 2020. This request directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation.

PL N3 WSAC Reduced Scope Contract

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) submitted a (\$160,000) GF-State reduction to eliminate its contract with the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). PSP is requesting \$80,000 GF-State to partially restore contracted services. WSAC facilitates collaboration and communication between the PSP and city and county governments to address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. The buy-back focuses on contract scope elements most critical to ensuring PSP coordination with cities and counties in their role as local implementers of the Action Agenda.

PL N4 PSSH Program Restoration

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership submitted a (\$296,000) GF-State reduction to its Puget Sound Starts Here Program (PSSH) that the agency is requesting to buy-back. PSSH is a well-known and highly effective 12-county public awareness campaign dedicated to improving water quality and aquatic habitat. This request supports PSP's investment in the campaign, which is implemented by a coalition of public and private organizations. This proposal will result in increased awareness of the individual behaviors residents in the Puget Sound Basin should practice in their role as stewards of this resource.

This package is related to Puget Sound Action Agenda Implementation (Strategy D5 - Changing Practices and Behaviors, Strategy D6 - Building Issue Awareness and Understanding, Strategy D7 - Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure).

Agency Budget Request Decision Package Summary**(Lists only the agency Performance Level budget decision packages, in priority order)****Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership**9/17/2014
2:09:29PM**Budget Period: 2015-17**

Decision Package	
Code	Decision Package Title
PL-A0	Realign Organizational Staffing
PL-A1	Scale PSSH Program
PL-A2	Eliminate WSAC Support Contract
PL-N0	Assessing Recovery
PL-N1	Puget Sound Salmon Recovery
PL-N2	Shoreline Property Owner Assistance
PL-N3	WSAC Reduced Scope Contract
PL-N4	PSSH Program Restoration

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: AE Federal Authority Tech Adjustment
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is requesting a reduction of (2.3) FTEs and (\$1,417,000) in GF-Federal appropriation authority in the 2015-17 Biennium. PSP's federal appropriation authority exceeds projected federal revenue.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-2 General Fund - Basic Account-Federal	(947,000)	(470,000)	(1,417,000)
Total Cost	(947,000)	(470,000)	(1,417,000)
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	-2.0	-2.5	-2.3

Revenue		<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Fund</u>	<u>Source</u>			
001 General Fund	0366 Environ Protection A	(947,000)	(470,000)	(1,417,000)
Total Revenue		(947,000)	(470,000)	(1,417,000)

Package Description:

The 2020 Action Agenda, developed by the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), has been designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Estuary Program as the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan for the recovery of Puget Sound. As a result PSP receives federal funds from three EPA grant programs. It is estimated PSP will need \$9,676,000 of GF-Federal authority in the 2015-17 Biennium. Therefore, PSP is requesting a reduction of (2.3) FTEs and (\$1,417,000) GF-F to bring our carry forward funding to this level.

For the 2013-15 Biennium, PSP negotiated an aggressive federal workplan based on direction from EPA to spend down federal carry forward funding. The workplan includes substantial funding for contracts related to the Chinook Monitoring and Adaptive Management project and several facilitation contracts to advance Near Term Actions. As the federal carry forward amount diminishes, PSP will no longer have the ability to fund implementation activities and contractual costs will decrease.

In addition, PSP anticipates several staff vacancies during State Fiscal Year 2015. PSP will identify 2.0 FTEs in SFY16 to eliminate and an additional 0.5 FTE in SFY17.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The primary goal of this decision package is to decrease the agency's federal appropriation authority in the 2015-17 Biennium.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A002Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Reduction of staff has the potential to affect the pace at which Strategic Plan goals are achieved.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

While these staff positions do not directly implement Goal 3 related actions, the PSP mission is to lead and inspire the collective effort to recover Puget Sound and therefore indirectly support both the Healthy Fish and Wildlife and Clean and Restored Environment emphasis areas.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

None

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

None

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

PSP will have more federal appropriation authority in the 2015-17 Biennium than projected federal revenue.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is requesting a reduction of (\$1,417,000) GF-Federal appropriation authority. The reductions will be taken as follows:

Staffing: Cost savings are achieved by reducing (2.0) FTEs in SFY16 and an additional (0.5) FTE in SFY17. Estimated salary savings

are based on an annual salary of \$73,000, plus benefits, and the standard agency FTE cost. Total costs are estimated to be (\$188,000) in SFY16 and (\$235,000) in SFY17.

Contracts: Cost savings are achieved by reducing contractual costs of (\$759,000) in SFY16 and an additional (\$235,000) in SFY17.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These reductions are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	(146,000)	(182,500)	(328,500)
B Employee Benefits	(42,000)	(52,500)	(94,500)
C Professional Svc Contracts	(380,000)		(380,000)
E Goods\Other Services	(379,000)	(235,000)	(614,000)
Total Objects	(947,000)	(470,000)	(1,417,000)

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: A0 Realign Organizational Staffing
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership is proposing a (1.4) FTE and (\$272,000) GF-State reduction derived from staffing changes across several business units. Cost savings will be achieved by better alignment of job functions within the Administrative Support team and reduced reliance on part-time positions within the Information Technology, Finance, and Science groups. All affected positions provide support for the implementation of the Puget Sound Action Agenda.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(136,000)	(136,000)	(272,000)
Total Cost	(136,000)	(136,000)	(272,000)
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	-1.4	-1.4	-1.4

Package Description:

To meet the Office of Financial Management GF-State 15 percent reduction target, the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) evaluated three major aspects of its operating budget: staffing, programs, and contracts. This proposal reflects cost savings associated with the realignment of job functions and reduced utilization of part-time staff positions. The following savings are proposed:

Administrative Support (\$12,000)

PSP evaluated the job functions of the Administrative Support team and will be realigning positions to provide more direct support to agency managers and teams. The Office Manager position will be replaced with an Administrative Assistant 3 so each team within the agency will have direct administrative support. The difference in job class and salary range results in a savings to the agency.

Science Program (\$60,000)

The PSP Science Program is comprised of scientists who facilitate, translate, communicate, share, synthesize, review, and coordinate to ensure scientific information and processes are available to guide recovery, protection, monitoring, and understanding of the Puget Sound ecosystem. PSP is proposing a reduction of (0.4) FTE to this program.

Information Technology (\$90,000)

PSP evaluated the job functions of the Information Technology team and have begun to realign job duties to more efficiently serve the agency. It is anticipated that the emerging staff configuration will reduce reliance on part-time positions and produce savings for the agency. PSP is proposing a reduction of (0.5) FTE to Information Technology.

Finance Staff (\$110,000)

The previously described realignment of the Administrative Support team will result in more support for the Finance staff. Job functions performed by fiscal staff are being evaluated for reassignment to the Administrative Assistant serving the team. It is anticipated that the resulting efficiencies will reduce reliance on part-time positions and produce savings for the agency. PSP is proposing a reduction of (0.5) FTE to Finance.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The primary goal of this decision package is to help meet the agency's 15 percent reduction target set by OFM for the 2015-17 biennium Operating Budget.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A002Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science** **Incremental Changes**

No measures submitted for package

Activity: **A005Administration** **Incremental Changes**

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Reduction of part-time staffing supporting the Science Program has the potential to affect the pace at which the program advances the following Strategic Plan goals related to Monitoring and Prioritization Based on Science: a) Support science-based shared priorities for action, and b) Scale recovery effort to meet magnitude of the problem.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

While these staff positions do not directly implement Goal 3 related actions, the PSP mission is to lead and inspire the collective effort to recover Puget Sound and therefore indirectly supports both the Healthy Fish and Wildlife and Clean and Restored Environment emphasis areas.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The only connection is with the OFM's budget reduction target.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The agency reviewed all programs funded by GF-State to identify reduction options and prioritized those options for submittal. The agency attempted to minimize impacts caused by the reductions and therefore evaluated both the number of reduction actions as well as the magnitude of those actions (i.e. having one area accommodate the full reduction target versus spreading the burden across a number of work groups). This alternative was selected as part of a three-part balanced submittal to minimize impacts across the agency.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting this package would reduce PSP staffing to support implementation of the Puget Sound Action Agenda while helping to meet the budget reduction target. Not adopting the package means OFM would need to identify other savings to achieve the reduction target.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is proposing a GF-State reduction of (\$136,000) in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and (\$136,000) in SFY17. Assumptions are as follows:

Administration

It is assumed the Office Manager position is reclassified to an Administrative Assistant 3 position resulting in a cost savings of (\$6,000) GF-State in SFY16 and (\$6,000) in SFY17.

Science Program

Cost savings are assumed by reducing (0.4) FTE in the Science Program for a savings of (\$30,000) in SFY16 and (\$30,000) in SFY17. Saving estimates are based on the salary and benefits of current staff within the position.

Information Technology

Cost savings are assumed by reducing (0.5) FTE for a savings of (\$45,000) in SFY16 and (\$45,000) in SFY17. Saving estimates are based on the salary and benefits of current staff within the position.

Finance

Cost savings are assumed by reducing (0.5) FTE for a savings of (\$55,000) in SFY16 and (\$55,000) in SFY17. Saving estimates are based on the salary and benefits of current staff within the position.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These reductions are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	(105,000)	(105,000)	(210,000)
B Employee Benefits	(31,000)	(31,000)	(62,000)
Total Objects	(136,000)	(136,000)	(272,000)

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: A1 Scale PSSH Program
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership is proposing a (\$296,000) GF-State reduction to its Puget Sound Starts Here Program, a 12-county public awareness campaign dedicated to improving water quality and aquatic habitat. Cost savings will be achieved by reducing PSP's investment in the campaign, which is implemented by a coalition of public and private organizations. The reduction will likely result in decreased awareness of the campaign and fewer residents in the Puget Sound Basin who connect that they have a role as its steward.

This package is related to Puget Sound Action Agenda Implementation (Strategy D5 - Changing Practices and Behaviors, Strategy D6 - Building Issue Awareness and Understanding, Strategy D7 - Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure).

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(148,000)	(148,000)	(296,000)
Total Cost	(148,000)	(148,000)	(296,000)

Package Description:

To meet the Office of Financial Management GF-State 15 percent reduction target, the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) evaluated three major aspects of its operating budget: staffing, programs, and contracts. This proposal reflects cost savings associated with a major stewardship program: Puget Sound Starts Here (PSSH).

Stewardship of Puget Sound resources by the region's 4.5 million residents is critical to the long-term recovery and protection of Puget Sound. Public engagement and stewardship strategies foster broad scale actions to address polluted water, degraded land and habitat, and imperiled species. The regional approach to public stewardship of Puget Sound is an integrated three-pronged strategy: Changing Practices and Behaviors (Action Agenda strategy D5); Building Issue Awareness and Understanding (Action Agenda strategy D6); and Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure (Action Agenda D7).

PSSH is a major program element for building issue awareness and understanding among specific audiences or sectors of people who have the capacity to institute and sustain changes in practices and behaviors. It also fosters the development of the social and institutional infrastructure needed to implement specific actions and behaviors.

This reduction would eliminate funding to purchase promotional media content (radio, television and internet promotional content) to bring awareness to the campaign.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The primary goal of this decision package is to help meet the agency's 15 percent reduction target set by OFM for the 2015-17 biennium Operating Budget.

The PSSH campaign has six performance outcomes from increasing awareness and understanding of issues and individual actions to reducing pressures on the Puget Sound ecosystem. Implementing the proposed funding reduction in the absence of alternative funding or promotional material acquisition, will inhibit full achievement of these programmatic measures. Additionally, reductions in PSP's investment may require unanticipated effort from other state agencies and local partners within the coalition that place value on the effectiveness of the campaign.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A003Public Stewardship of Puget Sound**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Reduction in funding to support the PSSH program has the potential to affect PSP's ability to effectively communicate issues and impacts to the residents of the region - a key audience for this program. As a result, PSSH would not likely contribute to advancing the following Strategic Plan goals related to Communications: a) Promote effective, consistent and accessible communications, and b) Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery.

In addition, PSSH is explicitly named in the 2014-2016 Action Agenda as the implementation mechanism for several sub-strategies supporting Strategy D6 - Build Issue Awareness and Understanding to Increase Public Support and Engagement in Recovery Actions.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

While PSSH is not directly tied to one of the Goal 3 Leading Indicators, its mission is to improve water quality and the associated aquatic habitat, which is consistent with both the Healthy Fish and Wildlife and Clean and Restored Environment emphasis areas.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

PSSH is implemented through a partnership consisting primarily of the PSP, Department of Ecology, and STORM (Stormwater Outreach for Regional Municipalities) - a collaboration of stormwater permit holders working together to meet permit requirements and improve our region's water quality. Many other participating organizations are members of ECO Net, a network of education and outreach professionals representing approximately 470 local organizations.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The agency reviewed all programs funded by GF-State to identify reduction options and prioritized those options for submittal. The agency attempted to minimize impacts caused by the reductions and therefore evaluated both the number of reduction actions as well as the magnitude of those actions (i.e. having one area accommodate the full reduction target versus spreading the burden across a

number of work groups).

This alternative was selected as part of a three-part balanced submittal to minimize impacts across the agency. The program was included in the package, in part, because the broad coalition of partner implementers and participants could potentially mitigate impacts from the PSP funding reductions by identifying alternative approaches or funding sources.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting the package would reduce PSP participation in the PSSH campaign while helping to meet the budget reduction target. However, the potential consequences of this action include shifting the program burden to other state agencies or local partners and making it more difficult for PSP to achieve the goals of the Action Agenda. Not adopting the package means the PSSH program will continue to produce significant results and OFM would need to identify other savings to achieve the reduction target.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is proposing a GF-State reduction to contractual costs of (\$148,000) in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and (\$148,000) in SFY17.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These reductions are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	(148,000)	(148,000)	(296,000)

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: A2 Eliminate WSAC Support Contract
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is proposing a (\$160,000) GF-State reduction based on not renewing a contract with the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). WSAC facilitates collaboration and communication between the PSP and city and county governments to address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. The reduction will make it more difficult to coordinate with cities and counties in their role as local implementers of the Action Agenda.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(80,000)	(80,000)	(160,000)
Total Cost	(80,000)	(80,000)	(160,000)

Package Description:

To meet the Office of Financial Management GF-State 15 percent reduction target, the PSP evaluated three major aspects of its operating budget: staffing, programs, and contracts. This proposal reflects cost savings associated with the elimination of a key contract with the WSAC.

Cities and counties are responsible for implementing many of the Near Term Actions included in the Action Agenda. They also are the gatekeepers of permitting processes, shoreline master programs, and other policy and regulatory practices that can have a major influence on PSP's ability to lead the region toward Puget Sound recovery by 2020.

The WSAC contract services engage and inform cities and counties in PSP's boards, task forces, caucuses and other venues to collaboratively address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. Contract tasks include coordinating with WSAC and Association of Washington Cities (AWC) membership on agenda issues before PSP's Ecosystem Coordination Board, Leadership Council and subcommittees; identifying local government priorities; engaging WSAC and AWC members in the development and implementation of the Action Agenda; and assisting in coordinating local government meetings (elected officials and staff) around Puget Sound recovery-related topics.

This package proposes a reduction equal to the total contract amount needed to provide these services.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The primary goal of this decision package is to help meet the agency's 15 percent reduction target set by OFM for the 2015-17 biennium Operating Budget.

PSP's performance management program and contract stipulations associated with federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grants require tracking of the implementation status of Near Term Actions in the Puget Sound Action Agenda. Many of these actions are sponsored by cities and counties throughout the region. Elimination of this contract will make it more difficult to coordinate with cities and counties to collect the information needed to complete these performance reports.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A005Administration**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Elimination of the WSAC contract has the potential to affect the PSP's ability to effectively communicate issues and collaborate on solutions related to Puget Sound recovery with partners vital to the effort - cities and counties. As a result, the following Strategic Plan goals will be more difficult to achieve: related to Innovation (Identify and address system barriers and Serve as a hub of innovation and excellence) and related to Communication (Promote effective, consistent and accessible communications and Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery).

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The work of cities and counties related to Puget Sound recovery is closely related to a number of Goal 3 supportive activities including improving stream habitat and correcting fish passage barriers under the Healthy Fish and Wildlife topic as well as converting contaminated brownfield sites and incorporating stormwater treatment into capital projects under the Clean and Restored Environment topic. This work is most effective for Puget Sound recovery when it is coordinated from policy through to implementation and the WSAC contract facilitates that coordination.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

By its nature, this reduction package impacts WSAC, AWC, and each of the local jurisdictions within their memberships, including twelve counties and more than 110 cities.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The agency reviewed all programs funded by GF-State to identify reduction options and prioritized those options for submittal. The agency attempted to minimize impacts caused by the reductions and therefore evaluated both the number of reduction actions as well as the magnitude of those actions (i.e. having one area accommodate the full reduction target versus spreading the burden across a number of work groups).

This alternative was selected as part of a balanced three-part submittal to minimize impacts across the agency. The contract was selected because PSP has other avenues for communicating and working with cities and counties. For example, local jurisdictions and/or their staff members could be members of other PSP frameworks including the Local Integrating Organization for a watershed or an ECONet.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting the package would eliminate contract services that allow PSP to efficiently work with all cities and counties in the 12-county Puget Sound basin while helping to meet the budget reduction target. A likely consequence of this reduction is that cities and counties will be less engaged in the development and implementation of the Action Agenda and thereby slow the pace of Puget Sound recovery. Not adopting the package means PSP will continue to build strong partnerships with local jurisdictions, but OFM would need to identify other savings to achieve reduction target.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is proposing a GF-State reduction in contractual costs of (\$80,000) in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and (\$80,000) in SFY17.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These reductions are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	(80,000)	(80,000)	(160,000)

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: N0 Assessing Recovery
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) created and supports the Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program (PSEMP) for the purpose of coordinating Puget Sound assessment. PSEMP inventoried current monitoring programs and identified and prioritized gaps in those programs. PSP and PSEMP also identified gaps in assessing the effectiveness of programs and activities to restore and protect Puget Sound. A fundamental role for PSP is to prioritize investments in Puget Sound recovery and without the identified information, that function is compromised. Therefore, the Partnership is requesting \$2,722,200 to fund high priority gaps for these programs to be carried out primarily through agreements with other agencies and organizations. This funding is complementary to WDFW's proposal for toxics in fish monitoring. These two funding packages together would ensure that there is adequate data collection and analysis to report on the status of the ecosystem and determine if investments intended to restore Puget Sound are delivering the promised benefits. This work directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation and will also help to advance the habitat restoration goals set forth by Tribal Nations in the Treaty Rights at Risk whitepaper.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	1,653,600	1,068,600	2,722,200
Total Cost	1,653,600	1,068,600	2,722,200
Staffing	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	1.0	1.0	1.0

Package Description:

Local, state, federal, and tribal governments as well as private entities are making significant investments to protect and restore Puget Sound. Unfortunately, there are large gaps in our understanding of the current conditions of the Puget Sound ecosystem and there is little funding for monitoring the effectiveness of the restoration and protection programs. Without such information, it is difficult to know if ecosystem conditions are changing due to our actions or if the activities and programs we are funding are producing intended outcomes. Without that analysis, PSP cannot effectively inform the next round of investments using prioritization criteria that are fully evidence-based. The result of decision-making without full information is that the available funding may not be directed to the most effective interventions or solutions, thereby delaying aspects of Puget Sound recovery.

From 2012-2014 PSEMP technical workgroups inventoried all current, funded, on-going monitoring programs and evaluated significant monitoring and information gaps related to understanding and tracking the health of Puget Sound. More than 200 gaps were identified and were prioritized into a "short" list of 56. Gaps were identified for nine of the 21 Vital Signs: toxics in fish, swimming beaches, Puget Sound quality of life, birds, shoreline armoring, Chinook salmon, estuaries, pacific herring, and land use/land cover. Currently these Vital Signs cannot be effectively reported on as pre-existing monitoring and reporting programs did not exist for some

of them and for many others the monitoring programs are insufficient to provide the needed information.

WDFW has a separate, complementary budget request for the toxics in fish monitoring gap. This proposal would fund the other high priority gaps in monitoring, data management, and data analysis identified by PSEMP through interagency agreements or contracts with the most appropriate entities to carry out the specific type of monitoring. The proposal would provide the funding needed to fully report on nine Vital Signs where current monitoring either does not exist or is too little to provide the needed information. In addition, monitoring needed to evaluate the effectiveness of actions and investments supporting PSP's Strategic Initiatives in the Action Agenda would be provided.

This proposal would add to our understanding of the changes occurring in the Puget Sound Ecosystem and increase our ability to apply adaptive management to the restoration and protection programs in the Puget Sound Action Agenda. Most importantly, having this information, and systems to receive updated information over time, will enable PSP to more efficiently advance focused investments known to produce the highest return for Puget Sound recovery.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

As a result of this funding along with the WDFW toxics in fish proposal, PSP will be able to fully report on all 21 Vital Signs that have been adopted as key indicators of the status and pressures affecting Puget Sound. In addition, monitoring the effectiveness of actions and investments directed toward the Strategic Initiatives will allow PSP to report on the outcomes and the effectiveness of the Near Term Actions in the Action Agenda addressing stormwater, habitat, and shellfish.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A002Setting Priorities and Evaluating Progress with Science**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

To assess the direction and effectiveness of the many activities and actions in the Action Agenda, reliable data and an adequate monitoring and assessment program is essential. As such, this proposal advances the following Strategic Plan goals: Monitoring and Prioritization Based on Science (Support science-based shared priorities for action and Scale recovery to meet magnitude of the problem).

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The outcome of this project will support PSP's ability to report effectiveness outcomes for several Results Washington Goal 3 leading indicators under the Healthy Fish and Wildlife, Clean and Restored Environment, and Working and Natural Lands Goal Topics.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

PSEMP was created to fulfill the statutory requirement for an ecosystem assessment and monitoring program (RCW 90.71.060). The PSEMP Steering Committee and associated work groups consists of a cross section of government agency, tribal, university, nonprofit, government agency, university and other scientists numbering more than 200 people who voluntarily provide their expertise. The work of this proposal implements the next steps out of the PSEMP report previously referenced.

Other agencies and/or independent contractors may be successful bidders in requests to implement monitoring and assessment

programs with these funds. Effectiveness monitoring might best be accomplished through an independent contractor. The most likely implementing agencies have been identified for some gaps (e.g. Ecology for the Beach monitoring program). However for some programs, PSP will identify the most efficient and cost-effective implementing organizations.

This work will also help to advance the habitat restoration goals set forth by Tribal Nations in the Treaty Rights at Risk whitepaper.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

PSP and PSEMP considered several approaches. The baseline alternative is continuing the status quo where data gaps and insufficient monitoring programs continue to exist. Another alternative was to ask each monitoring agency to individually request funding to fill gaps relating to their programs, as WDFW has done with toxics in fish. The proposed comprehensive approach will fund the highest priority gaps and, as PSEMP identifies monitoring need changes in the future, PSP can redirect the funds.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting this package would fill key data gaps needed to assess whether current and future investments in Puget Sound recovery are producing the intended outcomes and therefore allowing agencies to focus funding on the highest yield projects and programs. If the package is not adopted, the current inadequate and insufficient monitoring and assessment programs will be perpetuated creating an even greater barrier to achieving Puget Sound recovery by 2020.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is requesting 1.0 FTE and \$1,653,600 in SFY16 and \$1,068,600 in SFY17. This request supports effectiveness monitoring for nine Vital Signs and adds additional staff support for data analyses and regional coordination. The cost estimates for each of the nine Vital Signs were derived from the Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Gaps report prepared by PSEMP and released in July 2014. The nine Vital Sign cost estimates are:

Toxics in Fish: WDFW is separately requesting funding that will provide for field data collection, analysis, and reporting of data needed for the Puget Sound Toxics in Fish Vital Sign. WDFW's request is consistent with and supports the Vital Sign monitoring addressed in this budget request. PSP is not requesting funding for the Toxics in Fish Vital Sign.

Swimming Beaches: The funding currently available for this program is scheduled to end. This request would allow for continuation of a minimal program, jointly operated by the Department of Health and Department of Ecology. Cost estimate assumes 1.0 FTE is needed to staff the program. Additional costs include contracts with local jurisdictions and for laboratory analysis of samples. PSP is requesting \$224,000 in SFY16 and \$224,000 in SFY17. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Puget Sound Quality of Life: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes a partial FTE is needed every other fiscal year for data collection, compilation, and scaling of data for vital sign reporting and monitoring. PSP assumes this would be an interagency agreement and is requesting \$35,000 in SFY16. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Birds: The cost estimate for this vital signs assumes an interagency agreement for staff time (biometrician, database manager, and lead scientist) to develop an automated data extraction system. PSP is requesting \$28,400 in SFY16 and \$28,400 in SFY17. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Shoreline Armoring: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes one-time contracted costs to develop improved protocols, extract relevant data from the regulatory HPA database, and field (ground-truth) testing. PSP is requesting one-time funding of \$125,000 in SFY16.

Chinook Salmon: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes one-time start-up costs of \$300,000 in SFY16 for equipment. PSP is also requesting ongoing contractual costs of \$485,000 in SFY16 and \$485,000 in SFY17 to provide credible adult Chinook abundance estimates in several regions of Puget Sound.

Estuaries: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes funding is needed to determine priority Chinook near-shore estuary habitat status and trends. PSP assumes this would be an interagency agreement and is requesting \$125,000 in SFY16 and \$125,000 in SFY17. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Pacific Herring: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes an interagency agreement for staff time and related costs. PSP is requesting \$96,200 in SFY16 and \$96,200 in SFY17. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Land Use / Land Cover: The cost estimate for this vital sign assumes funding is needed every other year to apply NAIP analysis to Land Use / Land Cover analysis. PSP assumes this would be an interagency agreement and is requesting \$125,000 in SFY16. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

This decision package also includes a request for 1.0 FTE and \$110,000 in SFY16 and \$110,000 in SFY17. Staff capacity is needed to carry out effectiveness monitoring analyses and coordination of regional effectiveness-monitoring activities. This is an ongoing cost into future biennia.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

This request includes one-time funding of \$425,000 in SFY16. Ongoing costs to future biennia are \$2,297,200.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	80,000	80,000	160,000
B Employee Benefits	21,000	21,000	42,000
C Professional Svc Contracts	1,543,600	958,600	2,502,200
E Goods\Other Services	7,500	7,500	15,000
G Travel	700	700	1,400
T Intra-Agency Reimbursements	800	800	1,600
Total Objects	1,653,600	1,068,600	2,722,200

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: N1 Puget Sound Salmon Recovery
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The vitality of the Salmon population directly correlates with the overall health of Puget Sound; they are an economic generator for the region, and they are a symbol of the heritage of the Pacific Northwest. The Puget Sound Partnership is requesting \$1,700,000 to continue the most essential Puget Sound salmon recovery projects: 1) update the 2005 Chinook recovery plans to fill key information gaps, complete prioritized monitoring plans, and implement adaptive management processes; and 2) coordinate watershed-scale actions as part of a comprehensive, science-based roadmap to recover steelhead. These projects will lead to investment in the highest priority and most effective recovery actions, enhanced assessment processes, and ultimately salmon recovery across Puget Sound. This request directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
06A-1 Salmon Recovery Account-State	780,000	920,000	1,700,000
Total Cost	780,000	920,000	1,700,000

Package Description:

Puget Sound Chinook salmon were listed under the Endangered Species Act in 1999 and recovery plans were developed for each of the salmon recovery watersheds in 2005. Puget Sound steelhead were listed as threatened in 2007 and no comprehensive recovery plans exist.

Over the past decade, investments representing a small portion of the estimated need have been successful in preventing the extinction of some salmonid species, but there has not been sufficient investment in the strategy and implementation of salmon recovery to help the populations thrive. Despite well publicized habitat restoration projects, such as the Elwha Dam removal, Puget Sound steelhead continue a ten-year decline. Over the same timeframe the 22 remaining Chinook populations in Puget Sound show decreasing or stable trends at best. Because Chinook recovery plans need updating and steelhead recovery plans need development, the Puget Sound region is unable to clearly document or describe where we are making progress, where we are falling short, and which strategies and actions are most effective in helping to reach salmon recovery targets.

The regional salmon recovery organizations have made progress in coming to agreement on identifying and prioritizing the actions needed to shift the salmon narrative from "survive" to "thrive," but resources are needed to develop the plans to apply a regional framework to local watersheds. Building on lessons learned and recent work during the 2013-2015 biennium that initiated steelhead marine survival research and identified gaps in Chinook recovery, the Puget Sound is ready to move forward with regionally

coordinated watershed-scale recovery and management actions that guide, prioritize, and direct limited funding toward the highest priority actions supporting steelhead and Chinook recovery.

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), as the designated Puget Sound regional salmon recovery organization (RCW 77.85.090), proposes a two-part project to produce project implementation plans, ensure strategies incorporate the latest research, and describe the crucial, watershed-scale actions necessary to advance steelhead and salmon recovery in Puget Sound.

Chinook

This part of the project will complete the following in all sixteen Chinook recovery areas in Puget Sound: 1) advance and begin to operationalize an adaptive management system for the Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan to fulfill a federal NOAA requirement and create a more structured way for the Puget Sound region to review progress, learn, and strengthen implementation over time; 2) identify monitoring priorities and operationalize monitoring plans for Chinook recovery; 3) highlight strengths and gaps in Chinook recovery plans and watershed organizations; and 4) allow PSP to more easily integrate information from the Chinook recovery plan into the Puget Sound Action Agenda, the roadmap for Puget Sound recovery.

Steelhead

This part of the project will: 1) establish the technical basis for steelhead recovery action planning in all sixteen watershed areas using emerging information from investigations such as the juvenile marine survival study currently underway; and 2) support the development of detailed strategies in three of those watersheds with steelhead populations critical to recovery of the Puget Sound steelhead Distinct Population Segment as a whole.

By moving forward the Chinook and steelhead efforts in parallel, this project will create efficiencies in the use of local watershed staff and state agency staff as well as leverage local and regional technical resources. Having up-to-date evidence-based plans that identify the most important actions to take within a watershed is an important step in the salmon recovery process because it allows organizations implementing the work to provide strong justification to funders about the efficacy and regional support for projects proposed, which in turn should increase funding for Puget Sound salmon recovery work.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

This request will improve the Puget Sound region's ability to advance one of the three Strategic Initiatives from the 2014 Action Agenda: "Protection and Restoration of Habitat." It will provide the resources to implement Near Term Action A6.4 #2 (Steelhead Recovery Plan) and enhance our ability to make progress on 2014 Action Agenda sub-strategy A6.4 (Protect and recover steelhead and other imperiled salmonid species). The plans that result from this project will also help support multiple Near Term Actions for Chinook and steelhead recovery and habitat protection and restoration.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A004Support Ecosystem Recovery**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Integrating monitoring and adaptive management into the Chinook recovery plan updates and utilizing lessons learned from the Chinook efforts to inform the development of steelhead recovery plans in select watersheds supports the following strategic plan goals: related to Innovation (Identify and address system barriers); related to Monitoring and Prioritization Based on Science (Support science-based shared priorities for action); Communication (Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery); and related to Transparency and Accountability (Measure success of the work done within the agency, of recovery efforts, and of the state of overall

recovery).

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The outcome of this project will support several Results Washington Goal 3 leading indicators under the Healthy Fish and Wildlife sub-topic of Pacific Salmon (2.2a, 2.2b, and 2.2c) as well as indicators under the Working and Natural Lands sub-topic of Habitat Protection (4.4c, 4.4e, and 4.4f).

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

PSP works with the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council (PSSRC), a policy body with representatives from each of the salmon recovery watersheds, tribes, state and federal agencies, environmental groups, and the business and agricultural communities. In 2014, PSSRC identified its top priorities as 1) securing funding to update and adaptively manage the sixteen Chinook recovery plans in Puget Sound; and 2) advancing steelhead recovery planning.

The Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has submitted a related decision package to continue funding for the steelhead marine survival research project begun with funding secured by PSP during the 2013-2015 budget process. Consistent with PSSRC's priorities, PSP agrees that the WDFW proposal is a higher priority than the steelhead recovery plan portion of this proposal.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is the federal agency responsible for developing recovery plans for species listed under the Endangered Species Act. In 2014, NMFS convened an interdisciplinary Steelhead Recovery Team (SRT) consisting of federal, state, Tribal, and other representatives to guide development of a Puget Sound-wide steelhead recovery plan by 2017. One of the first tasks of the SRT is to begin development of a watershed-scale recovery chapter template and associated guidance that will ensure technical rigor, consistency, and a common understanding of recovery plan strategies across the 16 salmon recovery watersheds in Puget Sound. The steelhead portion of this proposal follows the NMFS lead on completing the regional steelhead recovery plan through the development of detailed watershed-scale strategies that can form the basis for future chapters.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

Due to NMFS's national focus and host of competing priorities, the agency is unable to fully fund watershed engagement in Puget Sound steelhead recovery planning or advance a comprehensive update of the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plans at this time. Yet, Puget Sound steelhead and Chinook populations are not thriving, so PSP is proposing this package to keep some level of planning for higher yield implementation moving forward.

The original alternative considered was to fully fund the Chinook plan updates and steelhead chapter development in all 16 watersheds, but the total cost of \$7 million was deemed to be an unrealistic request in the current budget climate. One option considered deleting the steelhead portion until the WDFW juvenile survival rate study was complete in five years, but by that time steelhead populations in some areas may be extinct. Since coordinated local actions now could prevent that outcome, selection of a limited number of highest priority watersheds was considered. Another option was not to advance updates to the 2005 Chinook chapters. However, with the 2014 completion of the Phase 1 Monitoring and Adaptive management framework there is interest and momentum to refine the plans using evidence-based analysis of what is working and incorporating a process for on-going learning and adjustment as more research is completed.

Therefore, the steelhead project was scaled back from \$2.1 million to address only three of the sixteen watersheds and the Chinook request was reduced 60 percent to provide just \$40,000 to each of the 16 watersheds to advance but not complete development of the plan updates.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting this package will ensure strategies for fostering recovery of both steelhead and Chinook populations is current with known science and advances regional coordination for consistency of focus at the watershed level - in short the package plans for the survival of these populations. Not adopting this package has the opposite impact. Puget Sound Chinook recovery plans will remain out of date, watershed-scale actions supporting steelhead recovery will be developed inconsistently or not at all, and PSP will not be able to report accurately on progress made, prioritize needs for recovery, or guide the most effective investment of other local, state, and federal dollars.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions:

PSP is requesting \$780,000 in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and \$920,000 in SFY17 to advance Puget Sound salmon recovery projects. Costs are detailed as follows:

Chinook Watersheds

Funding is requested to provide \$40,000 grants to 16 Chinook watersheds. This level of funding will allow for all watersheds to incorporate a common set of indicators and monitoring protocols, further develop strategies and effectiveness monitoring (enabling them to prioritize projects and understand which are having the greatest impact on recovery), and begin filling gaps in from their 2005 recovery plans (e.g. defining quantitative goals and desired future conditions). It will also allow for significant advancement of the Chinook monitoring and adaptive management plans in each of the watershed. The total cost estimate is \$320,000 in SFY16 and \$320,000 in SFY17.

Steelhead Recovery Watersheds

Funding is requested to provide \$40,000 grants to three (3) watersheds to support development of steelhead recovery plans. Selections of watersheds to receive funding will likely be based on their contribution to overall steelhead recovery, capacity to complete the work with the level of funding, and current status of steelhead planning in the watershed. The federal NOAA Recovery Team and/or PSSRC will select the watersheds. The total cost estimate is \$60,000 in SFY16 and \$60,000 in SFY17.

Regional Support and Guidance

Funding is requested to procure a contractor to provide regional guidance and support to 16 Chinook watershed and three (3) steelhead watersheds. Contractor would provide one-on-one support to watersheds to ensure products are consistently developed. The total cost estimate for contractual costs is \$200,000 in SFY16 and \$290,000 in SFY17.

Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT)

Funding is requested to conduct EDT modeling for steelhead in Puget Sound. EDT is an analytical tool to assess salmon habitat and their populations.

The total costs estimate is \$175,000 in SFY16 and \$175,000 in SFY17.

Regional Technical Support

Funding is requested to provide independent technical support to watersheds through review and input on draft and final Chinook and steelhead products. The total cost estimate for contractual costs is \$10,000 in SFY16 and \$75,000 in SFY17.

Puget Sound Recovery Conference

Funding is requested for a Puget Sound salmon recovery conference. This conference will provide an opportunity for regional adaptive management. The first part of the conference will allow for watersheds to exchange information and share lessons learned from a technical perspective on salmon recovery. The second part of the conference will bring together the regional decision makers to identify what is needed for advancing regional salmon recovery and to develop a two year workplan for the PSSRC. The total cost estimate for the conference is \$15,000 in SFY16.

Revenue Calculations and Assumptions:

This work will be supported by the Salmon Recovery Account. Funding will need to be directed or appropriated to the account by the legislature as required in RCW 77.85.17.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs are one-time with no impacts to future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	390,000	465,000	855,000
E Goods\Other Services	10,000	75,000	85,000
N Grants, Benefits & Client Services	380,000	380,000	760,000
Total Objects	780,000	920,000	1,700,000

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: N2 Shoreline Property Owner Assistance
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

Puget Sound's 2,500 miles of shoreline are a valuable natural resource critical for the survival of key marine species including salmon, forage fish, and marine birds. Our shorelines have been impacted by the construction of hard armoring or bulkheads built based on the perceived need to protect public and private property from potential damage caused by tides and waves. The Puget Sound Partnership is requesting \$850,000 GF-State for a pilot project to provide technical assistance to landowners in Kitsap and Jefferson Counties who wish to remove bulkheads and utilize alternative shoreline protection approaches on their property. The program would contribute directly to the regional targets for reducing hard armoring by 2020. This request directly relates to Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	402,500	447,500	850,000
Total Cost	402,500	447,500	850,000

Package Description:

Shoreline armoring reduced the availability of beach habitat for various life stages of critical marine species in Puget Sound. Although the legislature has mandated the adoption of Shoreline Master Programs that are intended to reduce impacts to the shoreline, a recent study shows that construction of new bulkheads and replacement of old structures continues to outpace removal. Many property owners believe that bulkheads are the only approach to protect their property from erosion and flooding. They are either unfamiliar with the existing new technologies that could benefit the marine environment and protect their property or are concerned that these approaches would not work for their situation. Moreover, even those owners who might be receptive to armor removal find the expense and complications of permitting to be significant barriers.

A number of local governments have indicated that there is limited access to professionals (geotechnical specialists and construction contractors with expertise in property evaluation for soft armoring techniques) who can assist property owners considering alternatives to traditional armoring. Local government staff have also indicated that the status of monitoring tools and funding for effectiveness studies has limited their ability to measure whether their programs have resulted in "no net loss" of shoreline function as required in statute.

The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), the agency responsible for leading the collective effort to recover Puget Sound, does so by collaborating with agencies and organizations to achieve 2020 recovery targets. Under this proposal, PSP would enlist a contractor(s)

to work with local governments and organizations in Kitsap and Jefferson Counties to establish a pilot Shoreline Property Owner Assistance program. The program would provide 1) a technical feasibility assessment to candidate property owners and, if appropriate, assistance with both project development plans and permit processes; 2) training on alternative technologies for construction service providers and local government permit staff; and 3) support to implement an effectiveness monitoring component to evaluate the services provided and environmental outcomes resulting from the pilot. The monitoring component during the pilot would collect information on the "before" state and would rely on training and oversight of a cadre of community volunteers who have been actively engaged in monitoring Puget Sound recovery.

PSP anticipates contracting this work out through a competitive process or interagency agreement. Project elements include: Assessment and technical assistance, Training, and Monitoring.

In developing this proposal, PSP identified reasons why other incentive programs related to removal of shoreline armoring have not generated significant ecosystem benefits and has created a platform for a success based on the information garnered from that evaluation. One way this program takes a new approach to the issue is that property owners eligible to participate in the program are targeted based not only on characteristics of the property (i.e. armoring protecting property with no structures on it) but also on the ecosystem benefit of the habitat that would be improved. Although there are more than six miles of armoring in the region, the highest value to the ecosystem will be generated when the benefits from improvements associated with coordinated parcels are realized. Most other incentive programs offer funding to willing property owners regardless of the benefit that could be seen from random parcels. Another difference is that this program would contract for the actual services needed (geo-technical analysis, plan development, and permit assistance) and offer a comprehensive package of assistance rather than providing funding and expecting the property owners to find qualified experts on their own. A final improvement included in this proposal is the introduction of a mandatory monitoring component associated with receiving assistance. This monitoring will collect baseline data that can be used to assess the improvement to the ecosystem over time.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The Shoreline Management Act and the Hydraulic Code regulate alterations to shorelines and address the quantity of armoring with the goal of attaining a "no net loss" of habitat functions. This pilot project will position a number of property owners to take advantage of programs (current and future) supporting the removal of bulkheads so that by 2020 the total amount of armoring removed will be greater than the total amount of new armoring.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A004Support Ecosystem Recovery**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

The project directly addresses Action Agenda SubStrategy B2.3 to remove armoring, and Near Term Action B1.2WC2 which promotes incentives for armor removal in Kitsap County. It also directly supports the following goals from the strategic plan: related to Innovation (Identify and address system barriers and Serve as a hub of innovation and excellence); and related to Transparency and Accountability (Measure success of the work done within the agency, of recovery efforts, and of the state of overall recovery).

Results of the pilot project will also be informative for the sponsors of Near Term Actions in the Action Agenda related to shorelines and habitats.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The outcome of this pilot project will develop shoreline de-armoring projects for future implementation in support of several Results Washington Goal 3 leading indicators under the Working and Natural Lands topic area, including: 4.4.b (Increase hydraulic project approval compliance) and 4.4.c (Reduce rate of conversion of marine and freshwater riparian habitat).

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

This pilot project would support goals in the Shoreline Management Act and as such would support the work of Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources, and Department of Ecology each of which has distinct responsibilities related to implementation of statutes for protecting shoreline habitat, marine species, and water quality. The pilot program is being offered in Kitsap and Jefferson Counties (based on an inventory of high value habitats for recovery conducted by the Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore Grant Program) and therefore the local permitting agencies and property owners will be key stakeholders. The monitoring component could be contracted to Seagrant, a program of the University Washington that helped to develop a Monitoring Toolkit to site habitat functions.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

PSP explored implementing a sound-wide landowner assistance program, but determined a pilot that was more geographically focused and targeted a subset of candidate properties would be more effective in demonstrating if the outcomes supported continuation of the approach. The agency considered a model of building capacity in local governments, but it was cost prohibitive. PSP also considered a companion capital request to provide assistance for the removal of the bulkheads, but determined that for the program to be successful property owners would need assistance to get plans and permits in place. Therefore, a focused pilot of property owner assistance for project development was selected as the preferred alternative.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting this package will enable Puget Sound to develop and position a number of capital projects to remove hard armoring in locations within Kitsap and Jefferson counties deemed as high value for habitat recovery. This scalable pilot project provides a focused, low risk, evidence-based investment that will yield new data on the true effectiveness of coordinated de-armoring efforts. Not adopting the package means that new approaches to systemic barriers will not be tested in a timely manner as a trend toward constructing new hard armoring and even higher armoring due to property owner fears about rising waters from the effects of global warming and climate change continue.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None in this biennium.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is requesting one-time funding of \$402,500 in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and \$447,500 in SFY17 to enlist a contractor(s) to work with local governments and organizations in Kitsap and Jefferson Counties to establish a pilot Shoreline Property Owner Assistance program. Cost estimate includes:

Assessments: \$150,000 in SFY16 and \$100,000 in SFY17

Designs: \$60,000 in SFY16 and \$60,000 in SFY17

Plan/Permits: \$75,000 in SFY16 and \$150,000

Training: \$27,500 in SFY16 and \$27,500 in SFY17

Monitoring: \$40,000 in SFY16 and \$60,000 in SFY17

Administration: \$50,000 in SFY16 and \$50,000 in SFY17

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs are one-time with no impacts in future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	402,500	447,500	850,000

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: N3 WSAC Reduced Scope Contract
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) submitted a (\$160,000) GF-State reduction to eliminate its contract with the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). PSP is requesting \$80,000 GF-State to partially restore contracted services. WSAC facilitates collaboration and communication between the PSP and city and county governments to address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. The buy-back focuses on contract scope elements most critical to ensuring PSP coordination with cities and counties in their role as local implementers of the Action Agenda.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	40,000	40,000	80,000
Total Cost	40,000	40,000	80,000

Package Description:

Cities and counties are responsible for implementing many of the Near Term Actions included in the Action Agenda. They also are the gatekeepers of permitting processes, shoreline master programs, and other policy and regulatory practices that can have a major influence on PSP's ability to lead the region toward Puget Sound recovery by 2020.

The current WSAC contract services engage and inform cities and counties in PSP's boards, caucuses and other venues to collaboratively address Puget Sound restoration priorities and implement the Action Agenda. Contract tasks include coordinating with WSAC and Association of Washington Cities (AWC) membership on agenda issues before PSP's Ecosystem Coordination Board, Leadership Council and subcommittees; identifying local government priorities; engaging WSAC and AWC members in the development and implementation of the Action Agenda; and assisting in coordinating local government meetings (elected officials and staff) around Puget Sound recovery-related topics.

This package proposes a buy-back of key contract services focused on ensuring effective collaboration. Those elements include:

- Facilitate process to identify local government priorities - \$20,000
- PSP product development feedback (Action Agenda, Report Card, etc) - \$10,000
- Organize quarterly coordination meetings - \$10,000
- Action Agenda Implementation Support - \$40,000

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO, 360-464-1218

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

PSP knows that it will be the most effective when all its partners are engaged at each development stage of agency efforts. Therefore, a primary outcome of this buy-back request is ensuring the local government "voice" is present.

PSP's statutorily-directed performance management program and contract stipulations associated with federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grants require tracking of the implementation status of Near Term Actions in the Puget Sound Action Agenda. Many of these actions are sponsored by cities and counties throughout the region. By providing funding in the buy-back framework to support local agencies with Action Agenda implementation, PSP can continue to coordinate with cities and counties to collect the information needed to complete these performance reports.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

A005Administration

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Funding of a modified WSAC contract continues PSP's ability to effectively collaborate on solutions related to Puget Sound recovery with partners vital to the effort - cities and counties. As a result of this proposal, the following Strategic Plan goals will be advanced: related to Innovation (Identify and address system barriers and Serve as a hub of innovation and excellence) and related to Communication (Promote effective, consistent and accessible communications and Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery).

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

The work of cities and counties related to Puget Sound recovery is closely related to a number of Goal 3 supportive activities including improving stream habitat and correcting fish passage barriers under the Healthy Fish and Wildlife topic as well as converting contaminated brownfield sites and incorporating stormwater treatment into capital projects under the Clean and Restored Environment topic. This work is most effective for Puget Sound recovery when it is coordinated from policy through to implementation and the WSAC contract facilitates that coordination.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

By its nature, this buy-back package supports WSAC, AWC, and each of the local jurisdictions within their memberships, including twelve counties and more than 110 cities.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

In evaluating buy-back options, PSP assessed if some or all of the elements should be included in the request. The WSAC contract has two key components under consideration: communication and coordination/collaboration. While the communication elements were efficient, PSP determined there were other channels to accomplish that work and therefore decided to not request to buy-back those efforts. A higher priority was to ensure on-going coordination and collaboration that could not be accomplished under an existing framework.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

October 1, 2014

Adopting the package means that coordination and collaboration with cities and counties would continue to be facilitated through the WSAC contract and support critical Action Agenda implementation. Not adopting the package would help meet OFM budget reduction targets at the expense of slowing Puget Sound recovery because cities and counties would not have the assistance they need to maintain current levels of engagement in the recovery effort.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is requesting \$40,000 GF-State in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and \$40,000 in SFY17 to partially buy-back the proposed reduction to the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) contract.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	40,000	40,000	80,000

Agency: 478 Puget Sound Partnership
Decision Package Code/Title: N4 PSSH Program Restoration
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Office of Financial Management directed state agencies to submit 15 percent GF-State reduction proposals for the 2015-17 biennium. The Puget Sound Partnership submitted a (\$296,000) GF-State reduction to its Puget Sound Starts Here Program (PSSH) that the agency is requesting to buy-back. PSSH is a well-known and highly effective 12-county public awareness campaign dedicated to improving water quality and aquatic habitat. This request supports PSP's investment in the campaign, which is implemented by a coalition of public and private organizations. This proposal will result in increased awareness of the individual behaviors residents in the Puget Sound Basin should practice in their role as stewards of this resource.

This package is related to Puget Sound Action Agenda Implementation (Strategy D5 - Changing Practices and Behaviors, Strategy D6 - Building Issue Awareness and Understanding, Strategy D7 - Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure).

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	148,000	148,000	296,000
Total Cost	148,000	148,000	296,000

Package Description:

Stewardship of Puget Sound resources by the region's 4.5 million residents is critical to the long-term recovery and protection of Puget Sound. Public engagement and stewardship strategies foster broad scale actions to address polluted water, degraded land and habitat, and imperiled species. The regional approach to public stewardship of Puget Sound is an integrated three-pronged strategy: Changing Practices and Behaviors (Action Agenda strategy D5); Building Issue Awareness and Understanding (Action Agenda strategy D6); and Changing Social and Institutional Infrastructure (Action Agenda D7).

PSSH is a major program element for building issue awareness and understanding among specific audiences or sectors of people who have the capacity to institute and sustain changes in practices and behaviors. It also fosters the development of the social and institutional infrastructure needed to implement specific actions and behaviors. Progress is tracked through periodic public opinion polls. Implementation of beneficial practices over the long-term is tracked through the Sound Behavior Index, one of PSP's Puget Sound Vital Signs.

This buy-back proposal provides funding to purchase promotional media content (radio, television and internet promotional content) to bring awareness to the campaign.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The PSSH campaign has six defined performance outcomes: increase awareness of the PSSH brand from 26 to 50 percent; increase the number of residents in the Puget Sound Basin who feel they are connected by Puget Sound and can have a role as its steward; greater awareness and understanding of targeted issues; targeted audience behavior changes related to targeted issues; public paradigm shift in the way people live in and relate to the Puget Sound ecosystem; and reduced pressures on Puget Sound.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: **A003Public Stewardship of Puget Sound**

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

Funding to support the PSSH program directly affects PSP's ability to effectively communicate issues and impacts to the residents of the region - a key audience for this program. As a result, PSSH contributes to advancing the following Strategic Plan goals related to Communication: a) Promote effective, consistent and accessible communications, and b) Be a hub for information about Puget Sound recovery.

In addition, PSSH is explicitly named in the 2014-2016 Action Agenda as the implementation mechanism for several sub-strategies supporting Strategy D6 - Build Issue Awareness and Understanding to Increase Public Support and Engagement in Recovery Actions, including Near Term Action D.6.1.1 for the implementation of Phase 2 of the PSSH campaign.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

While PSSH is not directly tied to one of the Goal 3 Leading Indicators, its mission is to improve water quality and the associated aquatic habitat, which is consistent with both the Healthy Fish and Wildlife and Clean and Restored Environment emphasis areas.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

PSSH is implemented through a partnership consisting primarily of the PSP, Department of Ecology, and STORM (Stormwater Outreach for Regional Municipalities) - a collaboration of stormwater permit holders working together to meet permit requirements and improve our region's water quality. Many other participating organizations are members of ECONet, a network of education and outreach professionals representing approximately 470 local organizations.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

In evaluating buy-back options, PSP assessed if some or all of the elements should be included in the request. The decision to buy-back the full amount of the reduction package was based largely on PSP's role as the convener and facilitator of regional efforts related to Puget Sound recovery. PSP's direct involvement in the PSSH program has extended the depth and breadth of the campaign and raised awareness on a larger portfolio of best practices associated with improving water quality. In past years when investments were not made in media content, program recognition among residents dropped. This amount, however, could be scaled to achieve both program and budget reduction goals.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Adopting the package means the PSSH program could continue at its current level and continue to raise awareness of issues and shift behaviors so that individual actions produce measurable improvements in the quality of water flowing into the Puget Sound. Not adopting this package would help meet OFM budget reduction targets at the expense of slowing Puget Sound recovery or shifting the expense of the campaign to other partners in the PSSH coalition.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

PSP is requesting \$148,000 GF-State in State Fiscal Year 2016 (SFY16) and \$148,000 in SFY17 to buy-back the proposed reduction to the PSSH contract for media content.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

All costs are on-going into future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
C Professional Svc Contracts	148,000	148,000	296,000

State of Washington

Summarized Revenue by Account and Source

Budget Period: 2015-17
 Dollars in thousands
 478 - Puget Sound Partnership
 Agency Level
 AA - 2015-17 Budget
 Supporting Text Excluded

	Maintenance Level		Performance Level		Biennium Totals		Total
	FY2016	FY2017	FY2016	FY2017	FY2016	FY2017	
001 - General Fund							
0366 - Environ Protection A - F	6,285	4,808					
AE - Federal Authority Tech Adjustment	(947)	(470)					
Total - 0366 - Environ Protection A - F	5,338	4,338			5,338	4,338	9,676
001 - General Fund - Federal	5,338	4,338			5,338	4,338	9,676
Total - 001 - General Fund	5,338	4,338			5,338	4,338	9,676
478 - Puget Sound Partnership - Federal	5,338	4,338			5,338	4,338	9,676
Total - 478 - Puget Sound Partnership	5,338	4,338			5,338	4,338	9,676

	Code	Title
AGENCY	478	Puget Sound Partnership

2015-17 Federal Funding Estimates Summary

CFDA NO.*	Agency	Federal Fiscal Year	State Fiscal Year	State Match Amounts	State Match Source [001-1, XXX-1, etc.]
	Agency Total				
	FY 2014	7,729,000	7,729,000	2,203,000	
	FY 2015	5,795,000	5,795,000	2,109,000	
	FY 2016	5,338,000	5,338,000	2,538,000	
	FY 2017	4,338,000	4,338,000	2,538,000	
66.123	Environmental Protection Agency Puget Sound Action Agenda Implementation Activity: A004 - Support Ecosystem Recovery				
	FY 2014	5,690,000	5,690,000	999,000	001-1, 173-1, 02R-1
	FY 2015	3,688,000	3,688,000	960,000	001-1, 173-1, 02R-1
	FY 2016	3,800,000	3,800,000	1,500,000	001-1, 173-1, 02R-1
	FY 2017	2,800,000	2,800,000	1,500,000	001-1, 173-1, 02R-1
	Notes: EPA state match requirements are 50/50. PSP contributes a portion of the state match from operating budget expenditures and then utilizes PSAR capital expenditures to fully meet the match requirements. The EPA workplan also requires PSP to identify PSAR capital expenditures for match to the EPA tribal agreements. This obligation is not reflected above.				
66.456	Environmental Protection Agency National Estuary Program Base Grant Activity: A005 - Administration				
	FY 2014	528,000	528,000	772,000	001-1
	FY 2015	1,107,000	1,107,000	599,000	001-1
	FY 2016	538,000	538,000	538,000	001-1
	FY 2017	538,000	538,000	538,000	001-1
	Notes: EPA state match requirements are 50/50. PSP contributes 100% of the match from operating budget expenditures.				
66.122	Environmental Protection Agency Puget Sound Action Agenda Outreach, Education, and Stewardship Program Activity: A003 - Public Stewardship of Puget Sound				
	FY 2014	1,511,000	1,511,000	432,000	001-1
	FY 2015	1,000,000	1,000,000	550,000	001-1
	FY 2016	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	001-1
	FY 2017	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	001-1
	Notes: EPA state match requirements are 50/50. PSP contributes approximately 50% of the match requirements from operating budget expenditures. The remainder of state match is contributed from subrecipient contractors.				

Puget Sound Action Agenda

Decision Package Code	Request Title	Fund	Agency Biennial Request (\$ 000's)	Puget Sound Portion of Biennial Request (\$ 000's)	Biennial FTEs	Near Term Action (NTA)	Action Agenda Sub-Strategy	Activity
M2-AE	Federal Authority Technical Adjustment	001-2	(\$1,417)	(\$1,417)	(2.3)		D1.1 – Provide backbone support for the recovery effort and Management Conference	A002
PL-A0	Realign Organizational Staffing	001-1	(\$272)	(\$272)	(1.4)		D1.1 – Provide backbone support for the recovery effort and Management Conference	A005
PL-A1	Scale PSSH Program	001-1	(\$296)	(\$296)		D6.1.1 – Phase 2 of Puget Sound Starts Here (STORMWATER)	D6.1 – Implement long-term, highly visible, coordinated public-awareness effort using PS Starts Here brand to increase public understanding of PS's health, status, and threats. Conduct regionally and locally scaled communications	A003
PL-A2	Eliminate WSAC Support Contract	001-1	(\$160)	(\$160)			D1.1 – Provide backbone support for the recovery effort and Management Conference	A003 & A005
PL-N0	Assessing Recovery	001-1	\$2,722	\$2,722	1.0		D4.2 – Implement a coordinated, integrated Ecosystem Monitoring Program	A002
PL-N0	Assessing Recovery	001-1					C1.1 – Implement and strengthen authorities and programs to prevent toxic chemicals from entering the Puget Sound environment	A002
PL-N1	Puget Sound Salmon Recovery	06A-1	\$1,700	\$1,700		A6.4.2 - Steelhead recovery plan	D4.2 – Implement a coordinated, integrated Ecosystem Monitoring Program	A004
PL-N2	Shoreline Property Owner Assistance	001-1	\$855	\$855		B2.1.1 – Protect 10% of bluff-backed beaches (HABITAT)	B2.1 – Permanently protect priority nearshore physical and ecological processes and habitat, including shorelines, migratory corridors, and vegetation particularly in sensitive areas such as eelgrass beds and bluff backed beaches	A004
PL-N3	WSAC Reduced Scope Contract	001-1	\$80	\$80			D1.1 – Provide backbone support for the recovery effort and Management Conference	A005
PL-N4	PSSH Program Restoration	001-1	\$296	\$296			D6.1 – Implement long-term, highly visible, coordinated public-awareness effort using PS Starts Here brand to increase public understanding of PS's health, status, and threats. Conduct regionally and locally scaled communications	A003

2015 Supplemental Budget Request

ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL CONFIRMATION FORM

Agency Number: 478

Agency Name: Puget Sound Partnership

Agencies are required to provide electronic access to each decision package in their budget request as part of the submittal process. Confirm Option 1 or 2 below:

Option 1(Prefered):

- This agency posts all decision packages for our 2015-17 budget request to our public facing website at the following URL:

URL: http://

Option 2:

- This agency does not post decision packages and has forwarded copies via e-mail to OFM.Budget@ofm.wa.gov.

These decision packages conform to our agency's ADA accessibility compliance policy.

Agency Contact: Ginger Stewart, CFO

Contact:

360-464-1218

Contact Phone:

ginger.stewart@psp.wa.gov

Contact E-mail:

Date: 9/19/2014

**Central Service Fund Split Spreadsheet
2015-17 Biennial Operating Budget**

Agency #	Agency	Account	Fund	13-15 Allocation	15-17 Allocation
478	Puget Sound Partnership	001-1	General Fund - State	50%	35%
		001-2	General Fund - Federal	45%	60%
		173-1	State Toxics Control - State	5%	5%
TOTAL				100%	100%

The 2015-17 allocation is based on the projected carryforward levels and anticipated spending.