

**Jefferson County Marine Resources Committee
WSU Extension, Port Hadlock, Washington
January 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

Present:

Michael Adams, District 3, Vice Chair
 John Cambalik, *ex-officio*, PSP
 Judy D'Amore, Environment
 Caroline Gibson, Marine Science Practitioner
 Phil Johnson, *ex officio*, Jefferson County Commissioner
 Steve Lewis, Alternate – Recreation Pending
 Anne Murphy, District 2
 Pat Pearson, WSU Extension
 Tony Petrillo, Alternate – District 2
 Jadyne Reichner, Water/Beach Watchers (Pending)
 Judy Surber, City of Port Townsend, NWS Rep

Absent:

Hyatt Barnes, Recreation
 Hal Beattie, District 3, Chair
 Larry Crockett, *ex officio*, Port of Port Townsend
 Joth Davis, Commercial Interest
 Robin Downey, Alternate - Commercial Interest
 Andrew Palmer, District 2
 Tod Wakefield, District 1
 _____, *ex-officio*, U.S. Navy, Indian Island

Guests:

Cyrilla Cook, People for Puget Sound

Staff:

Gail Bernhard, Meeting Recorder
 Gabrielle La Roche, Marine Science Practitioner

Michelle McConnell, Jefferson County BCD/SMP Update

Topic	Update or Issue	Decisions/Follow-Up	Responsibility
INTRODUCTIONS/ CALL TO ORDER (Michael Adams)	Chair Michael Adams called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.	Due to the lack of a quorum, those present declared themselves to be a committee of the whole, allowing actions taken to be later approved by a quorum. This was addressed at 6:10 PM upon arrival of Judy D'Amore who completed the quorum.	M. Adams
AGENDA APPROVAL (Michael Adams)	The agenda was approved, with no additions/changes.		
APPROVAL of MINUTES	Minutes of December 4, 2007 were approved, as submitted.		
JEFFERSON COUNTY SHORELINE MASTER PLAN UPDATE RESTORATION PLAN (Michelle McConnell, DCD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on general SMP status and timeline Preview of expected schedule for spring/summer of 2008 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAC and SPAC document reviews have been completed for now; staff will do a complete review as soon as draft with public comments is turned over by consultant. 	G. LaRoche – send copy of minutes for this meeting to Michelle McConnell.
RECONSIDERATION OF MRC SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE FOR PUGET SOUND PROPOSED PROTECTION ISLAND ACQUATIC LANDS RESERVE (G. LaRoche)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gabrielle reported on conversations with Clallam MRC; they may take action after hearing more information at their 2/14/08 meeting. Extensive discussion about reserve boundaries, benefits and costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action is tabled pending further information. JMRC wishes to understand benefits and probable administrative overhead before taking action 	G. LaRoche – continue contact with Clallam MRC and report back any changes
MRC COMMENTS ON FRED HILL PIT-TO-PIER PROJECT (Tony Petrillo and John Fabian)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After briefly researching this project, Tony invited John Fabian of HCCC to share information and comments. Mr. Fabian covered company history, reputation, project plans, public process to date, issues and environmental issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With wide spread opposition, Mr. Fabian does not believe this project should or will be approved. MRC is not in favor of this project. M. Adams and T. Petrillo will draft a letter to the BOCC; MRC will approve letter at future meeting. 	M. Adams & T. Petrillo – draft a letter to BOCC voicing MRC opposition to this project.
PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP (Gabrielle LaRoche)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Agenda Inventory Cambalik liaison position extended by PSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee jointly filled in the matrix due Jan 31, 2008. 	G. LaRoche – final edits to matrix and possible collaboration with P. Pearson on joint response with Water/Beach Watchers.

Topic	Update or Issue	Decisions/Follow-Up	Responsibility
PROJECT COMMITTEE REPORTS (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eel grass Protection – software update status; partnering with DCD on brochure Soft-shore Protection – art work ready for use in outreach Olympia Oyster – midyear reports due Discussion of committee process & possibly more reliance on e-mail 		<p>G. LaRoche – mail drafts of work plans and reports</p> <p>All – review and comment via e-mail</p>
PROCEDURES FOR RESPONSE TO OBSERVER COMMENTS (M. Adams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of desired rules for non-agenda items; time limitations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion approved to create procedures with three minute limit per person and maximum of 10 minutes at the beginning of meeting; all others deferred to end. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M. Adams – draft procedures for by-laws
PROCEDURES FOR COMMENTING ON PROJECTS (M. Adams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Adams proposed a 3 step process for voting on a position or comment, drafting a letter to the BOCC and then approving the letter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal was supported by those present, with possibility of an individual sending out a draft in advance, if time is short. 	All – Verify if formal policy statement and procedures are needed.
JMRC Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MRC members reviewed and edited section 1, which had been drafted and mailed out in advance Discussion of process: approving in whole or chunks, and possibility of more efficient e-mail collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed section 1 	All – Send comments and input for sections II. To V. to Gabrielle before next meeting.
OBSERVER COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caroline Gibson – State bill pending on formation of two new coastal MRCs 		
FUTURE AGENDA PLANNING (ALL)	<p>Next Regular Meeting – set for February 6, 2008</p> <p>Exec. Committee – Tuesday, January 29, 2007 8:30 AM, WSU, Port Hadlock</p> <p>NWS Meeting –January 25, Blynn</p>		
ADJOURNMENT	The business meeting was adjourned at 8:18 PM.		

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS (Michael Adams)

Chair Michael Adams called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Those present included: Gabrielle LaRoche, Hyatt Barnes, Steve Lewis. Hal Beattie arrived by 6:05 PM. Caroline Gibson, Tony Petrillo and Judy D’Amore arrived by 6:08 PM

OBSERVER COMMENTS (None)

Steve Lewis noted that there is a parliamentary procedure for taking action in a meeting where there is no quorum. Those present may declare themselves to be a committee of the whole. Any action that is taken is can later be approved when a quorum is present.

Steve Lewis moved that the members present (Adams, Barnes, Lewis, Beattie, and LaRoche) declare themselves to be a committee of the whole. The motion was seconded by Hyatt Barnes and approved, all in favor.

AGENDA

A revised agenda had been sent out prior to the meeting. There were no revisions to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Michael Adams moved and Steve Lewis seconded for approval of the minutes for the previous meeting, December 4, 2007 as submitted. The motion was approved, all in favor.

JEFFERSON COUNTY SHORELINE MASTER PLAN UPDATE RESTORATION PLAN
(Michelle McConnell, Jefferson County Department of Community Development)

Michelle McConnell recalled that Margaret Clancy (Adolfson) had reviewed the SMP Restoration Plan at the previous meeting.

She said the STAC (SMP Technical Advisory Committee) and SPAC (SMP Policy Advisory Committee) had completed their reviews of pertinent documents. The STAC had been reviewing the SMP Restoration Plan; the SPAC had reviewed the committee working draft of the Shoreline Master Program. Over the course of three months, the SPAC met 10 times (once with the technical group) and the STAC had met once on their own. She said that 13 formal comments had been received from outside the policy and technical groups, and these revisions were now being processed by the consultant ESA Adolphson. She said the revisions were significant overhauls of the original document, and that there had been lots of input from both the committees. She noted that Michael Adams had submitted the comment matrix early in the process.

She described the timeline. Release of a revised version is expected within two months. The revised document is expected from the consultant by March. There will then be an internal staff review. The next major event will be public outreach, a Community Planning Workshop, in the spring, possibly in May. This will include various stakeholders and interest groups from throughout the County. The idea is to collect input and support for the plan proposal that will eventually be passed in September to the Planning Commission and then to the BOCC. She noted that there has been considerable public interest so far; the current distribution list numbers about 275 e-mail addresses.

Michelle McConnell said she was looking forward to the MRC comments on the Action Agenda and the MRC Strategic Plan. She also mentioned that she and Gabrielle are keeping each other informed.

[Judy D'Amore arrived at 6:08 to complete the quorum.] Chair Adams explained that the group had been acting as a committee of the whole, and could now reaffirm the approval of agenda and minutes.

Michael Adams moved and Steve Lewis seconded to approve the previous actions of the committee of the whole. Motion passed, all in favor with none opposed.

RECONSIDERATION OF MRC SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE FOR PUGET SOUND PROPOSED PROTECTION ISLAND AQUATIC LANDS RESERVE

Gabrielle LaRoche said she had spoken with Doug Morrill, David Freed and Ed Bowlby from the Clallam County MRC. They had met the previous evening to consider this issue, but did not have a quorum. Her understanding was that they had determined that there was little or no impact to commercial fishing or tribal uses and were fairly comfortable with the proposal. The sense was that once the full committee considers the issue on February 14, they were likely to write a letter of support. She said that David Freed had expressed his hope that this would result in something meaningful and not be just an administrative exercise. She said that Cyrilla Cook had hoped to have the letters by the end of the month to be submitted with her packet, but would understand if the MRC needed more time.

Tony Petrillo said he was interested in having the boundary pushed further to the east. Gabrielle said she had mentioned that point in e-mails to Clallam County, but that Clallam had not commented on that. She said that recommendation could be included in a letter of support, if that action is taken. Members reviewed the background of the boundary; Tony Petrillo said he did not see how such a boundary could

serve MRC needs. Steve Lewis said it was likely based on the steep drop off at that location. Maps were retrieved and inspected for characteristics that might explain the proposed boundaries.

Chair Adams asked if the group wished to support the proposal and believe is in common with MRC interests. Steve Lewis said that from the point of view of recreational boating, the only thing of interest was anchoring locations, and did not think that would be impacted. Tony Petrillo said he knew of little activity there, possibly some fishing and some transit of log rafts. There was agreement that there would probably be little impact. Tony Petrillo said he did not really see the purpose; Michael Adams said he saw it as a benign activity, but had also not been able to identify any real purpose. They expressed concern about the possibility of it consuming resources that could be better used elsewhere.

Following a scan of Protection Island/Miller Peninsula area maps, Michael Adams proposed that until further information is available or a compelling reason for action, the item should be tabled. Tony Petrillo and Caroline Gibson agreed. Gabrielle LaRoche asked if the group would like her to pursue specific questions. Michael Adams summarized his understanding: Protection Island would be tied in with the State Park and used as an educational and research area; there is a desire to protect these areas in that regard through DNR. The MRC simply wishes to know what all the benefits are expected to be and what the administrative overhead would be with an end of determining if resources could be better used both at the federal and local levels.

MRC COMMENTS ON FRED HILL PIT TO PIER PROJECT (Tony Petrillo)

Tony Petrillo reported that in researching this, he had found over 800 documents on the Jefferson County website about this project and associated issues. He introduced John Fabian of the Hood Canal Coalition, whom he had contacted for his perspective.

John Fabian gave a summary of the proposed project, major issues and parties involved. He said Fred Hill Materials is a good company. They operate out of Poulsbo, and have done so for 40 years. They have a good relationship with local governments and businesses; they have done a good job of mining and delivering gravel, and have many satisfied customers. They treat their workers well, union representation. The HCCC has no complaints about the company or the mining of gravel. However, they strongly object to the commercialization of Hood Canal and believe that building an industrial port facility on the shoreline of Hood Canal is a move in the wrong direction, particularly at this time when it is unclear how Hood Canal and Puget Sound can be cleaned up from past impacts.

During the mid 1970s, a similar project pit to pier (about 20% of the scale) was proposed in Mason County near the Humma Humma River. It was permitted by Mason County, but opposed by the State of Washington. He said this was before the time of SEPA, GMA and other current environmental laws. The State DOE took the County to court; the shorelines hearings board ruled in favor of the State, deciding the project was not appropriate. He said the case history makes one wonder why this is even being considered at a time when society is so much more aware of environmental issues and threats.

This is a large strip mining operation in a mining district of 690 acres, about one square mile, approved by Jefferson County. Fred Hill Materials has a lease arrangement with Thorndike Tree Farm which is 26000 acres, about 35 square miles. The agreement with Pope Resources would allow them to mine gravel over that entire area. Plans include a much expanded rock crushing facility to enhance the output from the acreage that will ultimately be approved. Also a conveyor belt to the shoreline about 4 miles long (well designed and well studied) connected to a 1000 foot long pier to deep water on Hood Canal that would stand 91 feet tall. The height is for compatibility with large ore ships to be filled with sand and gravel. At the end of the pier there would be a 900 foot teak moorage. The capacity of the conveyor would be 6,000 tons per hour.

The impetus for this method is to reduce the heavy costs of shipping gravel. The vast majority of gravel operations in the country are regional because long distance transport is too expensive. Larger mining operations have multiple scattered operations. Fred Hill is trying to jump the trucking barrier by using ships and barges. Their immediate aim is to cover the Puget Sound Area but long term they plan to ship to San Francisco, San Diego, Honolulu and Singapore. Mr. Fabian said that the pace of market development would determine the growth potential, but the operation is being designed for filling two 60,000 ton ships per day. He noted that the company had spoken openly about the huge scale of operations in the earlier stages, but no longer does so. The barge sizes will be about 400 feet long by 100 feet across, yet they plan to have them pass under the east end of the HC Bridge without impacting traffic. He maintained that that was a totally impractical and unsafe assumption, except under ideal conditions.

He noted that there are 60 organizations opposing the project, including: Democratic Party in Jefferson, Kitsap and Clallam County, virtually every environmental group in the State, 4 tribes, sporting groups and community groups. He said the HCCC would be surprised if it ever receives a permit, and any permit would immediately be challenged in court.

The opposition of the U. S. Navy to the project was also discussed. Mr. Fabian said that many of the concerns raised by the HCCC over the last five years had been downplayed by proponents, but that the Navy seems to be carrying more weight on these matters.

He explained that the real issue is the ecology of Hood Canal/Puget Sound and whether it is wise to further jeopardize the health of these vital bodies of water. He mentioned some of the existing problems, such as low dissolved oxygen. He said that of the 70% of residents that are already opposed, most would cite the danger to the bridge as most important. He said that, personally, he considers that to be a secondary issue. The primary issue is whether this would be a wise use of precious water resources. He explained that the pier would be built on a piece of land that is zoned as rural residential; he expressed incredulity that any decision maker would allow an industrial port to be built on that type of property. An Environmental Impact Statement is being prepared, which would go to a hearing examiner to determine if an exception should be made to allow this industrial port facility to be built on residential property. That sums up the status of the project at this time.

Tony Petrillo asked if any other document had been issued by the Navy Environmental Coordinator at Bangor; Mr. Fabian said there were none to his knowledge. Michael Adams said that the Navy position had been clear from the start and the one document he had read had serious objections and potential to contain or halt the project. There was a brief discussion about the extent of military influence, including mention of the siting of the Denver Airport. Mr. Fabian added that the Kitsap Realtors Association had come out against any industrialization on Hood Canal south of the bridge, which was another important ally.

Steve Lewis made two comments. He said that to have no industrialization, little property development and low traffic along Hood Canal made recreational boating so much more enjoyable. On the other hand, from a gross regional point of view, he would prefer to have one large gravel operation than a bunch of smaller ones scattered about. Mr. Fabian said the site in DuPont, largest in the state, produces 3.5 million tons of gravel per year, and can be expanded. The Fred Hill Proposal would be 10 million tons per year, or three times that size.

The MRC thanked Mr. Fabian for his presentation and his help in understanding the project.

Gabrielle LaRoche asked for an indication from the MRC as to direction related to this project. Mr. Lewis asked for a show of agreement that the MRC does not believe this project is a good idea, and should not be allowed to move forward. Members verbally agreed. Tony Petrillo proposed, based on a conversation with Phil Johnson, that a letter should be drafted, reviewed, revised, and submit to the BOCC as a recommendation. Michael Adams noted that this dovetails with his approach to the SMP

project, i.e. to focus on protecting the most pristine and unique areas while they are still able to be protected, rather than in need of restoration. He volunteered to draft a letter and Tony Petrillo offered to work with him. They agreed on the approach of tying it to current state and local efforts and documents: SMP, CAO, Army Corps of Engineers, etc. The draft will be brought back to the whole committee before action is taken. Hal Beattie noted that given the mission and goals of the MRC and the fact that the Pit to Pier plan has virtually no benefits for Jefferson County, but plenty of risks and environmental costs, he does not see how the MRC could do otherwise than recommend against it. There was a brief discussion of other issues to be followed up by Michael Adams and Tony Petrillo. Gabrielle LaRoche asked to be kept informed for coordination purposes.

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP – ACTION AGENDA

Phase I: Inventory and synthesis of existing data and work, due January 31, 2008

1. What is the role of the MRC?
2. Briefly Describe MRC programs related to protecting and restoring Puget Sound

Gabrielle LaRoche said that three documents had been e-mailed previously. She distributed copies of a matrix entitled Action Agenda Inventory. She noted that the right most column, Scientific Research and Monitoring, was missing.

She read the explanatory information and instructions aloud. She noted that the responses should be at the program level, not the project level. The committee then worked through the matrix, with Gabrielle taking notes electronically.

She reported that John Cambalik had sent his regrets that he could not attend the meeting due to a long planned vacation. She reported that his position had been extended by PSP and that he would be present at future meetings. She had also contacted various county departments about possibly collaborating, but due to time constraints, each department will be responding independently.

Michael Adams and others worked through the matrix, noting input/entries for various cells of the matrix, which were recorded for later editing and updating. Note: There are no capital programs.

There was a brief discussion about Action Area (Hood Canal and Admiralty) versus county jurisdictions; Gabrielle will translate for the matrix. Funding information can be lifted from the project descriptions. Chair Adams noted that much of the activity is volunteer based.

Michael Adams noted, for those who did not know, that he and Pat Pearson were working on developing an education and outreach website. Anyone with curriculum they wish to share with the general public can submit material to this.

Gabrielle will work out with Pat Pearson if it is possible to merge the responses for Beach and Water Watchers since there is a great deal of overlap.

PROJECT COMMITTEE REPORTS

Eelgrass Protection – This committee will be meeting on Wednesday, January 16. Tony shared information based on a meeting with Jefferson Marine. He had obtained samples of what the eel grass bed boundaries would look like on electronic charts. And he had asked for some indicator, such as a little sign, that would pop up if a vessel wandered into an eel grass area. Michael Adams said that it was more likely, with software like Admiral, they would have an icon pop up if a cursor was passed over an eel grass area. The next step would be to communicate with Snohomish County, and have a pilot program. He wondered NOAA would be interested in partnering.

The Eelgrass Committee will also be working with the Community Development Department on a better more user friendly brochure for obtaining mooring buoys, which will also have educational material about eelgrass.

Steve Lewis noted that the permitting process has been largely ignored. Michael Adams commented that the DNR has been changing its enforcement policies. Gabrielle LaRoche explained that DNR and the County zoning enforcement officer had done an inventory of buoys in Mystery Bay. There is general acknowledgement that education and outreach, which has been lacking, is critical to getting support and cooperation from boaters. Gabrielle pointed out that the strategy of partnering with DCD and combining eel grass education with a more accessible permitting process should be more effective.

Soft-Shore Protection – Gabrielle LaRoche reported that this committee had not met recently, but needed to regroup and establish a new chair. A next important step is to follow through on plans for the art work which has been completed. The only member present was Tony Petrillo. Other members mentioned were Pat Pearson, John Cambalik, and Tod Wakefield (who is out of the country). Gabrielle mentioned that since Tony is the NWS representative, perhaps he should not be expected to serve on the committee as well. Michael Adams said that other MRC members could at least share their expertise, and offered a suggestion that much of the committee work could be done through e-mail. Gabrielle noted that that process would be a change but if the whole committee agreed, it was fine with her.

Olympia Oyster – Michael Adams noted that the QAQC plan had been sent out as draft. He said a number of comments had come back from the committee. Gabrielle LaRoche said that the mid-year reports would be due the following week: both work plans for the calendar year and an annual report of achievements from the past year. She said she had been working with Pat Pearson on them; drafts will be mailed to everyone for review and input.

Michael Adams noted that the OlyOyster committee works well with e-mail and has not needed to meet in person. There was a brief discussion about responsibility, efficiency and participation. Gabrielle was concerned that committee work not all fall to her in the absence of in person work sessions. Michael commented that if members could not find the time to participate in the work, or perhaps think about why they are on the MRC.

Gabrielle LaRoche said that the first test would be feedback from everyone on the 2008 work plan and 2007 annual report. Michael Adams asked how many members had full versions of Acrobat. Most had only the Reader software. Since the group seems to be split between PC and Mac users, Gabrielle said she normally sends out Word (doc) documents and Acrobat (pdf) documents if she expecting extensive comments. She will accept comments and suggestions in whatever form they are given.

PROCEDURES FOR RESPONSE TO OBSERVER COMMENTS

Chair Michael Adams recalled that he had allowed the observer comments to take much more of the previous meeting's time than reasonable and apologized for that. He noted that the MRC does not really have policies or procedures for handling Observer Comments. He cited the standard operating procedure of another group that allows for ten minutes of observer comments at the beginning of the meeting, with a limit of three minutes per participant. There was general agreement time limits were important and needed, with three minutes being common practice. Caroline Gibson suggested that guest speakers be given at least ten minutes. Others agreed that perhaps that agenda time be flexible, but determined in advance. Steve Lewis suggested that visitors be encouraged to coordinate their comments to avoid a lot of repetition. Michael Adams said the MRC is an advisory body to the BOCC, but does not wish to

become a forum for personal issues. Referring to the instance of the previous meeting, he said that after further investigation, he did not believe the MRC to be the most appropriate conduit for that issue, even though they had pursued several other ways of resolving their problem. He said that, in terms of education and outreach, the MRC can point people in the right direction “in a kind way”. He said the policies and procedures should be in place that will allow an appropriate response, but not require the MRC to take action on every item. Since it is a public meeting, people should be free to attend and participate and there will be a public record.

Steve Lewis suggested a category whereby information is simply passed through to the BOCC without comment. It was noted, however, that the MRC is also expected to filter information and public input for the BOCC.

Caroline Gibson said she agreed with the three minute limit. She said she would be reluctant to make a blanket policy on whether there should be feedback on comments; she said that would depend on the issue and the individuals on the committee. She added, regarding the previous meeting, that she had taken several calls at PMCC from the speakers, and had invited them to the meeting and suggested a three minute timeframe. Since they had been requesting a letter of support from the MRC, she had seen it as appropriate to speak with the whole group.

After additional discussion, Michael Adams moved that Observer Comments be limited to three minutes per speaker, taking the first three or four at the beginning, and any additional at the end of the meeting. Any action or response will be at the discretion of MRC members on a case by case basis. The minutes will provide a record of the comments and any discussion, in any case. Steve Lewis seconded the motion. Hal Beattie noted that the de facto practice has been to allow five minutes at the beginning of the meeting, not ten. After brief consideration, it was agreed that agendas will allow a total of ten minutes for the Call to Order, Introductions and Observer Comments at the beginning of the meeting. The motion was approved, all in favor.

Caroline Gibson wondered if other MRCs have written policies that could be adopted for the Jefferson MRC. Gabrielle said she would check on that.

PROCEDURES FOR COMMENTING ON PROJECTS

Chair Michael Adams suggested that for plans or projects of interest (such as the Pit to Pier or Black Point Resort) that come to the attention of the MRC, there should be a vote of the committee before taking action, such as a letter or formal comment. Once the letter or comment is drafted, there should be another vote for approval of the letter. He said that the frequency of such opportunities is likely to increase with the pressure on development in the County. He added that he believes that such issues should be placed on the agenda, and then treated as an action item to be voted on.

Tony Petrillo asked if members thought there would ever be a development project that the MRC would support. For example, could a much smaller Black Point-like resort be considered worthy of support? There was a brief discussion about factors that might make that project supportable: smaller size, buffering, mitigation and restoration tradeoffs.

Judy D’Amore said she agreed with Michael Adams suggestion. Gabrielle LaRoche noted the not infrequent instances where quick turnaround is required. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that members are free to send out a draft in advance of the meeting, which could help to expedite the process and allow business to be completed in one meeting. However, there must be no compromise on the opportunity for public comment, and the agenda item must be included in the public notice of the meeting. Members were unanimously in support of this arrangement.

JEFFERSON COUNTY MRC STRATEGIC PLAN

Gabrielle LaRoche noted that partly because of the holidays, the subcommittee had not been able to meet to work on this. She had e-mailed brief outline/draft of the strategic plan. She said she hoped some progress could be made by addressing the plan in pieces, following the model of Island County.

Gabrielle said the first section, I. Purpose, was done and asked whether members would like to vote on adopting all or part of I. during this meeting. Michael Adams said he would prefer to vote on / adopt the entire document at once, because in his experience, changes to one part can ripple out and require changes in other parts that have already been reviewed. Steve Lewis said that the Purpose section was relatively broad in nature, so that it may be possible to agree on language that need not be changed later.

Michael Adams pointed out examples that he thought should be more specific, to avoid possible disagreements about general statements. Hal Beattie suggested allowing general statements supported by specific examples. After further discussion, the following changes were agreed upon:

I.A The marine waters of eastern Jefferson County are in trouble as evidenced by declines in salmon, orcas and marine birds, degraded water quality in Discovery Bay and low dissolved oxygen levels in Hood Canal.

Michael Adams asked where the Vision statement came from. Gabrielle noted that it came out of the work done at the first (2006) Rosario retreat. Caroline Gibson noted that the 2020 date was based on the Puget Sound Initiative framework. There was some discussion about the wording and the feasibility of meeting that vision, but it was left unchanged.

Gabrielle said that the Mission statement was taken from an archived MRC document, which she had broken into bulleted items, as requested, for better readability. Michael Adams suggested that the second bullet be changed to “Build local through education, *outreach* and citizen involvement.” He also suggested an additional mission: “to inform our local board of county commissioners with regard to areas of concern”, i.e. to serve as an advisory group to the BOCC. Gabrielle suggested the language: “Recommend actions to the BOCC to remedy issues consistent with our advisory role.”

Michael Adams suggested adding the Hood Canal Coordinating Council under item 9, as well as 8, which was accepted.

[Judy D’Amore said she had to leave the meeting at 9:03 PM, so Tony Petrillo asked to insert the following news from NWSC. Ginny Broadhurst, previously serving as Interim Director, has been selected as Executive Director of NWSC. After an interviewing and evaluation process, she was unanimously recommended to the Governor’s Office for the position.]

Hal Beattie commented that under A. Problem and Opportunity there is no mention of habitat and that much of the problem (of salmon declines) stems from habitat degradation. Also, there is no mention of species diversity, which is key to marine health. And, in reference to OlyOysters, species health is an issue. He said the four items of water quality, habitat, species diversity and species health should be included in the problems to be addressed. Gabrielle said they would be added in.

Michael Adams said he sees the MRC as being responsible for the entire near shore environment. Hal agreed that if this is going to be the guiding document, that should be included.

Carolyn Gibson suggested “The marine environment of Eastern Jefferson County is in trouble”, then expand on that. It was agreed that the previous change should be *degraded water quality*, without specifying Discovery Bay.

Tony Petrillo requested that *local marine issues* under Mission be changed to *local marine environmental degradation and restoration issues*. After a brief discussion, members agreed to *local marine environmental issues*.

Gabrielle LaRoche read the final bullet: *Recommend actions to the BOCC to remedy issues consistent with our advisory role*.

The estimate for the final document was about ten pages for five sections. Michael Adams requested that, as an experiment, the group support Gabrielle in getting comments to her within the next three weeks for the following areas: II. Assess current conditions; III. Goals and Objectives; IV. Develop Action Plan; V. Evaluation. There was verbal agreement from those present. Gabrielle suggested that for Goals and Objectives, there are Northwest Straits Benchmarks, and the Goals from the PSP Action Agenda. There was agreement that MRC goals should line up with these two sets of materials, to be in a position for funding.

OBSERVER COMMENTS

Caroline Gibson noted that her organization, PMCC, had been contacted earlier that day to support a bill being introduced in Washington to fund two new MRCs on the outer coast, one in Grey’s Harbor; Michael Adams said the other was in Willepa Bay She said she would be speaking with the Director of Surf Rider Foundation the following day -- they are one of the sponsoring organizations. She also mentioned People for Puget Sound and the San Juans BOCC as supporters. Tony Petrillo asked about the funding source. Gabrielle said that currently the funding source is CZM 310 funds which come through NOAA to DOE to the MRCs, which are fixed. Michael Adams mentioned that legislation passed last year allowed the formation of additional MRCs by local jurisdictions but did not provide for funding. Tony Petrillo noted that the three major oceanographic regions that have different issues. However, Jefferson County does have a coastal component and should have some representation there. Carolyn said she would investigate further and report back.

AGENDA PLANNING

- Members were asked to submit agenda items to Gabrielle for the February 5 meeting by Monday February 4. Meeting will be held at WSU
- Next Executive Meeting is set for Tuesday January 29, 2008 at WSU at 8:30 AM
- Next NWS Meeting will be held on Friday, January 25 at Jamestown Tribe Center in Blynn, Clallam County.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Adams adjourned the meeting at 8:18 PM.