Voluntary Stewardship Program
Joint Technical Panel & Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting
Friday, November 17, 2017
9:00 am – 3:00 pm

Facilitator – Bill Eller, VSP Coordinator, WSCC

Attendees in Lacey:  Brian Cochrane, WSCC (Technical Panel); Kelly McLain, WSDA (TP); Stacy Polkowske, WDFW (TP); Alicia McClendon, WSCC; John Stuhlmiller (SAC), Brandon Roozen (SAC); Wes McCart (SAC); Evan Sheffels, Erik Johansen, Cecily Van Cleave, Adam Cares, Linda Lyshall, Jennifer Thomas, Mark Clark, Jay Gordon

Webinar: Barbara Adkins; Renee Hadley; Aaron Rosenblum; Audrey Ahmann, Joanna Cowles, Bruce Gregory, Ron Wesen, Amanda Barg, Mak Kaufman, Jennifer Thomas

VSP TECHNICAL PANEL & STATEWIDE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

9:00 am: Opening Comments, Introductions, Session Objective & Agenda

9:05 am: VSP Program update (if any) – Bill Eller, Ron Shultz, WSCC
Bill Eller introduced this topic. Gave an update on the following:
- Ron Shultz back home.
- Lauren Driscoll – absent today – death in family.
- WSAC conference update – good reception on our VSP presentation.
- Regional meetings next month – change in venue for the Lacey meeting – now in Olympia at the Red Lion. Kelly McLain says she can’t make the Olympia meeting.
- Stacy Polkowske – moving to Ecology, Matt Muller will be here. Matt isn’t here today – death in family.

9:10 am: Walla Walla County – continue review and vote. December 4 is the deadline.
Bill Eller reviewed where we are with regard to the review of the Walla Walla County work plan. Still outstanding issues with Elements (c)-(e) and (i). The work group since addressed those issues with amendments to the work plan that were provided back to Technical Panel since the last meeting. All members were polled individually by the facilitator for their thoughts on the amendments. All felt they satisfied the concerns raised.

Technical Panel vote taken: unanimous approval of the Walla Walla County VSP work plan by the Technical Panel members present (Lauren Driscoll absent).

9:20 am: Begin formal review of the Stevens County work plan - County presentation on work plan monitoring, goals and benchmarks - Erik Johansen, SC Land Services Director, Cecily Van Cleave, SCCD Natural Resource Technician, and Adam Cares, SC VSP Coordinator.
Adams Cares begins this presentation. Highlights the RCW 36.70A.720 (1)(a) – (l) elements. Also points out special considerations of Steven’s County’s work plans. Begins to go through each element

Element (a):
Brian Cochrane asks about Element (a) and how the elements in the plan(s) referenced and why/how they were important/included to the work plan.

Adam Cares says that can be looked at.

John Stuhlmiller says could also say why that plan wasn’t incorporated in the work plan.

Kelly McLain agrees with John. Were plans applicable or not, and why/why not?

Element (b):
Adam Cares summarizes their efforts related to Element (b).

Stacy Polkowske asks about tribal participation and whether or not the tribes ever participated.

Adam Cares says the tribe did participate, but not as official work group member. Participation was sporadic.

Eric Johansen says the county has a policy on public participation and that was used in this process. The tribes were invited from the start, but the invitation was always open.

Brian Cochrane says the county’s policy might be good to include in the work plan appendices.

Element (c):
Adam Cares summarizes their efforts related to Element (c). CAO reviewed for functions and values of critical areas. CPPE was used. Described the efforts to document BMP implementation and participation numbers.

Element (d):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (d).

Eric Johansen says the Technical Panel staff included state agency representatives, when available.

Adam Cares says there is a section for outreach after plan approval.

Element (e):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (e). CPPE tool used to pick BMP’s. A baseline inventory of BMP’s was done in the county – ones already being done and ones that would be beneficial for critical areas. Not an all-inclusive set of practices.

Eric Johansen says a lot of the practices have over-lap. Tried to gain simplicity by focusing on a few practices – also helps with the reporting later.

Adam Cares talks about table 5-1 and how the practices were picked. Goals and benchmarks were done for each critical areas. Adam uses the CARA table as an example.

Brian Cochrane asks about Table 5-1. Asks if those are cumulative or just new. Table 5-1, page 45. More clarity about what is already there versus what is new. Annual participation rates.

Adam Cares says 2021 is total – will make a notation there about that so as to avoid confusion.

Stacy Polkowske asks about Table 6-2 in the adaptive management trigger column. When does degradation become significant and how are the thresholds related to the other tables?

Adam Cares says Table 6-2 is related to effectiveness monitoring rather than participation rates.

Element (f):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (f). Technical assistance providers.
Element (g):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (g). Highlights page 37 where the stewardship checklists are discussed. The work group was concerned about how those records would be kept – confidentiality. Discussed wetlands and the use of the definition in the checklist, rather than the term.

Brian Cochrane asks how the checklist is implemented.

Brandon Roozen asks about the quality control of the checklist.

Adam Cares says filling out the checklist would be guided by the conservation district staff.

Eric Johansen says we wanted to set up varying levels of VSP participation based on the confidentiality concerns of the work group members.

Brian Cochrane says you should track the level of the participation on the checklist for recording and data gathering purposes.

Kelly McLain says a checkbox could be added to the checklist to show this, and the level of expertise that was used to fill out the checklist.

John Stuhlmiller asks who would hold the checklist.

Adam Cares says the landowner would hold the checklist.

John Stuhlmiller says that will factor into the data gathering and reporting.

Kelly McLain asks John Stuhlmiller about the checklist and the individual stewardship plans and how the data would be gathered.

John Stuhlmiller says the data would be available at the watershed scale.

General discussion about individual stewardship plans, farm plans, and checklists.

Element (h):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (h). No regulations brought in to protect a critical area – all five use voluntary practices.

Brian Cochrane says a statement at the beginning to say that would be helpful.

Kelly McLain says to add a section on RCW Chapter 90.58 to the work plan as Ecology would want that.

Adam Cares says they used Pacific County’s work plan as a basis here in this section.

Element (i):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (i). Need to establish baselines – those were established in Chapter 3. Not an all-inclusive list. Did our best with the resources we had. Chapter 6 is where this element begins. Participation and effectiveness monitoring were separated out in the work plan. Need to monitor participation and effectiveness. Table 6-1 are the most important parts of the work plan.

Brian Cochrane asks about the adaptive management trigger being higher than the benchmark.
Adam Cares says that is set as a warning that they are too close to the benchmark. You will see that there are some benchmarks separated out for protection and enhancement.

Kelly McLain says that some practices are not inventoried, but after the checklist is done, you should have a better sense of what is out there on the landscape. Those would all be enhancement. Those would be rolled up at the watershed scale.

Brian Cochrane says to think about the kinds of events to be held to reach the greatest number of people. How to get feedback on attending the events.

Eric Johansen says that could be put on the checklist – ask what made them interested in VSP.

Kelly McLain says the definition of agriculture in VSP is different than what is under the Farm Bill or other programs – USDA census of agriculture. Should try to capture how small farms are participating or would participate in VSP. Would assist the work group in determining what kinds of events might be effective to reach non-traditional farmers.

Adam Cares says Table 6-2 was difficult for the work group to generate. What is happening on the landscape scale is difficult to determine. Adam goes through the whole table. Wetlands difficult to quantify in the county. Used the wetlands identified in the PHS layer.

Brandon Roozen asks if the wetlands could be removed from the agriculture lands GIS layer.

Eric Johansen says we did that, but it wasn’t enough.

Stacy Polkowske asks how the PHS data will be used.

Adam Cares says we will use it as a reference to direct us to where we want to look for changes.

Stacy Polkowske says that use of PHS sounds good. PHS isn’t the right tool to use for monitoring.

General discussion on PHS and its use.

Adam Cares continues to go through Table 6-2 and aerial monitoring. Appendix G has the details on aerial monitoring.

Brian Cochrane says you might want to state what the steep slopes definition is – 15%. Link to the CAO.

Stacy Polkowske asks about the methodology of vegetation, item #13.

Adam Cares says it would be up to the technician.

Stacy Polkowske asks about how the grid squares would be measured and used to analyze change. A roll up at the watershed scale.

Element (j):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (j). Adaptive management in tables 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3. Triggers are set and actions as a response. Not too specific at this point. Will mostly consist of more outreach.

Brian Cochrane says there is a little inconsistency in the last statement on page 52 – last sentence related to Table 6-3 and waiting to do the evaluation in year 5.

Kelly McLain says there is also the biennial reporting requirement.
Eric Johansen says we are going to be looking early at the triggers.

John Stuhlmiller says Table 6-3 is when the report is due, but in-between you’ll be looking to see how you are performing.

Adam Cares talks about the reporting timeline and the reports.

Element (k):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (k). No enforcement will be done as per our statement in the beginning of the work plan, and we are trying to break down some barriers and mistrust with work group participants and how they will interact with state agencies. Effectiveness monitoring approach leaves the door open for interaction with state agencies. That is where the communication will take place.

Eric Johansen says it will come out in adaptive management as well. If we see a trend, we can use the communication with the state agencies.

Brian Cochrane says we need more on the communication path with the state agencies.

Kelly McLain agrees and suggests adding a sentence like “during the biennial or other data roll up, if more coordination is needed, and if additional conversation is needed, the work group will contact the appropriate state agency.”

Adam Cares says we don’t want to be seen as turning the county in.

John Stuhlmiller says it’s a collaborative process – can talk about it that way. The state agencies are already doing work out there.

Kelly McLain says state agency staff are there, WSDA, WSCC, not in regulatory ways, but in other ways, and this would be a way to connect in that way – non-regulatory. Having something in the work plan that talks about the state agencies that would help with monitoring or other collaborative assistance would be helpful farther down the line.

John Stuhlmiller says this element is about assisting state agencies, not an admission of failure by the county.

Adam Cares says maybe table 6-3 isn’t the place to put that kind of statement, but could add it somewhere else.

Kelly McLain says adding a sentence that talks about the open collaboration with the state agencies on this would be helpful.

Brian Cochrane asks if the individual stewardship plans and checklists going to be useful on the statewide level – that is something that we will need communication and collaboration on.

Element (l):
Adam Cares summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (l). Table 7-2, page 58.

Brian Cochrane asks that there be a statement that “other reporting requirements” be added to the work plan.
10:45 am:  Break

11:00 am:  Continue formal review of Stevens County work plan

Adam Cares talks more about vegetation monitoring and why they are doing that in the plan. Table 6-2 and aerial monitoring protocol.

General discussion on the protocol and how that would work. Scale for analysis can change if need be. Want to pick up both positive and negative changes.

Stacy Polkowske asks what amount of change triggers ground-truthing?

Adam Cares says that is in our thresholds.

Eric Johansen says any change in the aerial detection would trigger further investigation.

Adam Cares says there isn’t a percent change that we are using, but are using positive and negative based on the detection. The technician would do that analysis.

Stacy Polkowske says at least 10% of the analysis areas will be reviewed on the ground - how would those be prioritized.

Adam Cares says the technician would do that analysis. We have not yet set that.

Stacy Polkowske says if the 10% could be focused on those that had the greatest change.

Brian Cochrane says the changes could be graded so that you could determine which had the strongest changes. Changes could be ranked.

General discussion about reviewing the changes, what that means for the watershed analysis, and ground-truthing.

Eric Johansen says there should be more detail in the reports on the progress then what can be presented here.

11:30 am:  Lunch

12:15 pm:  Begin formal review of San Juan County work plan - presentation on work plan monitoring, goals and benchmarks

Linda Lyshall begins this presentation. Highlights unique agriculture in San Juan County – small agriculture community on islands. Focus of work plan is on six islands in the county. Discusses the five goals of agriculture economic viability.

Jennifer Thomas talks about the intersection of agriculture and critical areas and the uniqueness of San Juan County. 250 agricultural operators in the County.

Also covers the RCW 36.70A.720 (1) (a) – (l) elements. Also points out special considerations of San Juan County’s work plans. Begins to go through each element-

Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to these Elements. Presents a handout that expands on the table on page 15 of the work plan. Section 5, page 51 of the work plan. Maintain and enhance the critical areas was what the work group decided on. Marine shorelines removed from VSP consideration due to the large amount of marine shorelines in the county, and the concern of the work group with regard to agriculture and shorelines. Aquaculture also not part of the VSP - SMA will
apply to them. Entire county is a CARA, so all of the county is a CARA. FEMA flood maps were adopted for frequently flooded areas.

Element (a):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (a).

Kelly McLain asks how the two plans on page 32 are incorporated into the work plan – could add a sentence or two about that.

Element (b):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (b). Table of participation. Did targeted outreach to the tribes. The tribes were optimistically supportive, but we never asked them to make a decision. We had strong involvement from the environmental organizations.

Linda Lyshall says Table E-1 is a summary of what we are going to monitor.

Brian Cochrane asks how the reader of the work plan knows the stakeholders who crafted the work plan were the right stakeholders to be crafting the work plan.

Kelly McLain agrees and says something could be added to the second paragraph on page 12.

Element (c):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (c). Table in section 4 has a hierarchy for participation. Table 5 also has a break out of information through the use of the icons. Protection is required, enhancement encouraged.

Element (d):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (d). Technical assistance.

Element (e):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (e). In section 5 – lots of detail there.

Brian Cochrane says he didn’t see benchmarks for CARA’s and geological hazards outside of participation or BMP’s. Need to look at the universe of participation (lift and non-lift) or some other indicator to see what is going on with that resource.

Kelly McLain says available data from the Department of Health data could be used.

Linda Lyshall says there is groundwater monitoring in the county that could be used.

Kelly McLain says there should be existing sources that could be used.

Jennifer Thomas says geological hazard was tough.

Brian Cochrane says those need to be identified and defined and that would get you to what needs to be monitored. For small critical areas, a physical survey could be done.

Linda Lyshall says that could be captured in farm planning.
General discussion on how CARA’s and geological hazards could be monitored.

Kelly McLain says page 8 – WSDA should be listed, not USDA. Page 54, second paragraph and second sentence might need an edit at the end of the sentence.

Element (f):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (f). Page 61 has a discussion of this. Could be the conservation district or someone else.

Element (g):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (g). Appendix C is the individual stewardship plan checklist. Linda Lyshall’s staff developed that.

Linda Lyshall says they modified Chelan’s individual stewardship plan.

Brian Cochrane says there should be a catch-all on the individual stewardship plan for non-NRCS BMP’s to account for the “art” of farm planning. Might want to expand that section of the individual stewardship plan.

Kelly McLain agrees. Could say, “are there other BMP’s you are implementing to meet the work plan goals?”

Element (h):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (h). Page 37 has a discussion on the regulatory backstop for VSP. Section 3.3 provides an overview of the regulations. The summary on page 37 is the result of about 30 hours of work group discussion. It was a difficult discussion.

Brian Cochrane says his reading of the discussion on page 37 that there are no other requirements separate from VSP to satisfy the VSP requirements. Perhaps put a statement in there to explain that you choose not to bring in any other regulations for VSP.

Kelly McLain agrees with Brian. Something like “We choose to cover all of our critical areas with VSP and chose not to include any regulations, except for the marine shorelines we left in the SMA” could be added.

Brian Cochrane says Section 3.3 and Appendix F to highlight the fish and wildlife areas refers to the individual stewardship plan, but don’t see the connection there to the individual stewardship plan.

Jennifer Thomas says the vision is that the farmer would come to the technical assistance provider and the technical assistance would determine suitable habitat.

Kelly McLain says that will help with staff turnover at the technical assistance provider if that is in the individual stewardship plan.

Element (i):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (i). Baseline monitoring. We tried to list out specific metrics for each of the subcategory for each critical area.

Brian Cochrane asks about baseline participation monitoring – page 87 says it will be established.

Kelly McLain says section 5’s tables with different icons, native plantings shouldn’t be number of people would equal VSP participation.
Brian Cochrane says the amount of plantings is important for the critical areas, but not really useful for participation.

Kelly McLain says there needs to be a better connection between the monitoring and the goals.

Stacy Polkowske asks about the metric for stream function – number of cattle crossings over streams. Did you discuss fish passage as a metric.

Brian Cochrane asks about the last paragraph on pg 56, second sentence – “could” be used. There are menus of metrics to be selected – it is unclear how the menu will lead to an understanding of what is going on in the county. The users select of the metric. Each participation chooses what they want to use a metric.

Jennifer Thomas says the connection needs to be made better.

Kelly McLain asks if you are tracking in the baseline wetlands that are farmed in the individual stewardship plan process. If they were farmed in 2011, they could be farmed today.

Jennifer Thomas says yes. But, there are lots of false-positives.

Brian Cochrane says on page 62, the last paragraph – stream reach definition based on each participants parcel. How will SVAP will be clarified and rolled-up at the watershed level. How will it be reported out on the critical area function. What will you do with SVAP?

Jennifer Thomas says that SVAP is used by the conservation district staff. It doesn’t take a lot of time or money to use.

Brian Cochrane asks about the metrics for each critical area type, but not the linkage between how baseline will be established.

Linda Lyshall says the USDA and survey data captures that. Also, current farm planning data. It isn’t all in one area.

Stacy Polkowske asks about measuring the stream miles and depending on the data used, how that would be interpreted. Will those datasets be standardized over time?

Jennifer Thomas says at a minimum we should list out what datasets we are using.

Brian Cochrane says explaining that process is what we need.

Kelly McLain agrees with Brian. We don’t need the data, but the process.

Brian Cochrane asks about the baseline monitoring for the three critical areas that had options identified. There is a disclaimer about no monitoring if no funding. What happens if no monitoring? Affordable monitoring should be chosen.

Linda Lyshall says funding is needed for monitoring.

John Stuhlmiller says that monitoring should occur, but monitoring will depend on how much funding is available.

Kelly McLain says it goes back to the monitoring that already is going on and how that integrates with the work plan goals and objectives.
Linda Lyshall page 137 E-1 – we already monitor and collect some of that data. Water quantity we are not currently monitoring for. Nor habitat.

John Stuhlmiller says you don’t want to fail out of VSP because you don’t monitor because you don’t have funding.

Brian Cochrane says a suite of monitoring activities is fine, but without choosing which will be funded, you might not be able to monitor everything.

Commissioner McCart says that neither the county nor the agricultural community want to see any counties fail out of VSP.

Element (j):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (j). This is addressed on page 11, Table 2.

Element (k):
Jennifer Thomas summaries the work group’s efforts related to Element (k). This is addressed in Appendix E and page 35. Working with Ecology on storm-water monitoring.

Element (l):
Jennifer Thomas says this is addressed in Table 2, page 10.

Stacy Polkowske asks about where this is explicitly called out in the work plan.

Brian Cochrane says the first sentence in Section 7 is the call-out.

Discussion on when to schedule the next meeting on the work plan. We decided to leave the review on Dec 15th. If any issues, move to Jan 12th. Agency written comments due first week of December. Lauren absent, so can’t guarantee any comments in by the first week of December.

1:45 pm: **Next Technical Panel meetings** –
- December 8, 2017 – cancelled.
- December 15, 2017 – second review – Stevens & San Juan County
- January 12, 2018 – start time at 8 am – Franklin, Douglas (informal)
- Joint with SAC - January 26, 2018 – start time at 8 am – Franklin – 2nd

Bill Eller brings up this topic and explains that we have Dec 8 and Dec 15 open right now. Asks the Technical Panel when they want to hold the next meeting. Next work group meetings: Stevens – Nov 30th. San Juan - Dec 5th. Agency comments due 3 days in front of that next meeting. Technical Panel discusses cancelling Dec 8th and moving the agenda to Dec 15th – both Stevens and San Juan County’s second reviews. San Juan must be done by January 29, 2018 with the Technical Panel review. December 8th meeting will be cancelled. December 15th meeting will be the second review meeting for both Stevens and San Juan County VSP work plans. If neither Stevens nor San Juan Counties VSP work plans are ready for votes, both can be reset to the January 12th meeting as Stevens’ deadline is January 15th and San Juan’s deadline is January 29th.

1:45 pm: **Break**

2:00 pm: **SAC VSP update and issues**
- County and agency FY 17-19 contracts
- VSP regional meetings – Dec 2017
- Work group members attending Technical Panel review meetings
- Remaining counties – schedule to submit work plans to Technical Panel (deadlines published in Nov 2017 newsletter)
  - Joint meetings at end of month in 2018 w/Technical Panel
• Budget – WSCC – 1 FTE for admin, reporting, monitoring – find $; counties / work groups – different – separate pots for admin, monitoring, and on-the-ground projects.
  - Some confusion about the life of the work groups during implementation
  - Technical Panel done after final plan approved.
• Confidentiality – Policy Advisory 01-17 – put this issue to bed, or need legislation? If legislation, who does the heavy lifting on that?
• Other

Bill Eller introduces these topics.

Explains that all the county and agency VSP contracts have been processed and are in place.

The VSP regional meetings are coming up on December 7th in Olympia and December 13th in Spokane. The December 7th meeting had to change the location to Olympia from Lacey as the Farm Bureau building in Lacey is undergoing renovation and cannot be used. A notice was sent out in the VSP newsletter explain the venue change and asking for RSVP’s for that meeting. RSVP’s are due by November 22nd.

In the November 2017 VSP newsletter, the Commission clarified its position that VSP funds could be used to pay for the attendance (mileage only) of one VSP work group member to attend the first review meeting on a VSP work plan if that work group member was designated as the representative of the work group for that meeting. This would allow a work group member to receive mileage for the cost of travel to the Technical Panel meeting here in Lacey for purposes of that first meeting.

The SAC agreed to monthly meetings that coincide with the last meeting of the month of the Technical Panel. Joint agendas for both the SAC and Technical Panel will be created for those meetings.

VSP budget and funding issues were discussed. FTE costs are different in each county. A sliding scale for scope of cost-share might be established. There is a need for baseline funding now and more later as implementation progresses - more for those who need help.

We should identify which counties to have conversations with about using existing funding at the conservation districts. Some counties have high benchmarks for existing programs, which might equate to more funding. CREP is an example. More CREP could be done. Existing voluntary incentive program funding should be beefed up – more funding added and more federal funding sources used to fuel VSP implementation. However, existing programs have strings, so we need to make sure the counties have that expertise to work through those issues.

Mark Clark says we need to have some capital dollars that can roll over between the biennia. Some level of base funding – not for projects. There should be funding to manage the work plan. For some implementation costs, there should be regional cost-savings for similar monitoring efforts.

Commissioner McCart says the focus should be to send folks to existing funding. Don’t want any counties to fail. Don’t want to lose out into the regulatory environment.

Jay Gordon talks about EQIP money being there, but not enough NRCS personnel to get that money out the door.

Mark Clark says we’ve set up the conservation district to do NRCS work that NRCS can’t get to.

Commissioner McCart says the USFS can work with DNR in an agreement. Could pursue that sort of thing with NRCS.
Mark Clark says we have a task order process with NRCS that fits that, it is a 75% to 25% contribution rate. We need to know what the numbers are in VSP for the amount of work that needs to be done.

John Stuhlmiller says Whitman just crafted a contract for that work – can use that as a basis. Can use the 5 year check for that, not the 2 year biennia. The 10 year check is the first kick-out process.

Commissioner McCart says there are off-ramps for counties. Turn-over at the county level. County work groups needs to be continually engaged.

Brandon Roozen says the Puget Sound Partnership and others are moving forward agendas that are opposed to VSP at the federal and state levels.

Discussion on that and BMP’s for state agencies. Floodplains by Design and other programs. VSP funding may be in jeopardy from these other efforts.

There is a Puget Sound Caucus that the conservation districts have. Need to draw them in – the ones that have VSP in them – to ensure they are engaged in VSP in the policy making process.

Coastal Caucus – WSAC – counties – could convene a group to address all these issues.

John Stuhlmiller – perhaps something from SAC is needed – to PSP and other Puget sound entities - don’t forget about the counties in Puget sound – love to converse, collaborate with you on VSP, BMP’s and implementation of VSP as we move forward with voluntary incentive programs to protect critical areas. The good of VSP – the $16M is at risk of we don’t move forward with VSP implementation. Why is VSP worth moving forward – worth funding into implementation?

The issue of individual stewardship plans confidentiality was brought up by Bill Eller and posed to the SAC – has that issue been adequately addressed by SAC Policy Advisory 01-17 that was put out a few months ago? The SAC felt that the issue has been resolved for the near future and that work groups should continue to follow the Policy Advisory and that should be the path forward. SAC not moving forward – covered in the policy statement.

3:00 pm: Adjourn