WHITE HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSES ELIMINATING CRITICAL FUNDING FOR PUGET SOUND ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY AND PROTECTION

The recently released White House budget proposal zeroes out Environmental Protection Agency geographic funds nationwide for 2018 and may eliminate the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF), managed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association. Other cuts are also proposed that will affect our region's ability to reach our shared goals.

This is not the final word on the budget by any means—there is a long road between this proposal and the enacted budget. Between here and there stand some very committed legislators and other leaders who are ready to fight for what is in the best interest of our

region and our state. Our values and dedication to protecting clean water, saving endangered species, having a thriving and sustainable agricultural sector, ensuring safety and resiliency in the face of climate change, and honoring our treaty responsibilities are shared by all Washingtonians. We remain undeterred in our efforts to carry out the Puget Sound Partnership's mission—to support our partners in recovering and protecting Puget Sound and the quality of life we all hold dear.

Following are common questions that we're receiving about the proposed cuts, and our responses.



How much of the Puget Sound Partnership's total funding would be eliminated under the President's budget blueprint?

Of the \$28 million in 2016 EPA geographic funds, the Puget Sound Partnership received \$2.8 million. The table below provides an overview of the Partnership's funding. The National Estuary Program base funds are not identified for elimination in the White House blueprint budget. These

funds, which annually have totaled about \$600,000, support the Puget Sound Partnership operations, including Boards, communications, and other elements of Puget Sound recovery that are considered backbone – guiding, supporting, and measuring the work of our partners.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017*
EPA Base Funding	\$ -	\$418,000	\$594,000	\$640,000	\$800,000	\$599,000	\$597,000	\$512,000	\$538,000	\$600,000	\$600,000
EPA Geographic Funds to Puget Sound to Puget Sound Partnership for planning, monitoring, Action Agenda	\$ -	\$450,000	\$6,850,000	\$ -	\$6,000,000	\$470,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,800,000	\$2,850,000	\$5,592,800	\$2,560,000
EPA Geographic Funds to Puget Sound to Puget Sound Partnership for Stewardship	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,000,000	\$1,010,785	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$989,215	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
PCSRF to Washington State	\$13,218,361	\$35,886,797	\$20,803,479	\$25,155,104	\$27,141,534	\$27,519,066	\$17,691,958	\$33,494,474	\$16,290,079	\$19,101,213	\$7,641,354
PCSRF to Puget Sound/Hood Canal	\$5,487,477	\$22,361,367	\$12,829,357	\$12,526,767	\$14,062,823	\$13,064,128	\$8,487,904	\$18,513,877	\$9,626,074	\$11,334,693	\$3,087,789
PCSRF to Puget Sound Partnership	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$814,162	\$814,162	\$839,162	\$689,162	\$806,379	\$641,404

^{*}Anticipated vEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency PCSRF = Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund

If implemented, how would the proposed federal budget cuts affect Puget Sound recovery?

The health, economic wellbeing and resiliency of the people of our region are inextricably tied with that of Puget Sound. Extensive effort, investment and learning have, to date, brought us to a critical point; when the rate of recovery and restoration is starting to outpace ongoing degradation. Terminating the multitude of actions that it takes to point this complex system in the right direction at this time will not only result in backsliding, but also in failing to achieve the full benefits of past investments, as well as the unraveling of extensive governance systems that have been painstakingly built.

These are effective, non-regulatory efforts that are built to serve the needs of local, regional and state partners, and have leveraged \$24 for every federal dollar invested. If discontinued, the resulting degradation will result in economic as well as environmental costs and likely necessitate stricter regulatory approaches in the future to compensate for lost time. In the

interim, some irreversible harm is likely. For example, the Puget Sound resident orca population is likely to fall below recoverable limits and certain species of salmon may be lost. Partners at every level and from multiple sectors, as well as 19 sovereign tribal nations with treaty rights, depend on these funds and the outcomes they produce.

The table below shows how the \$28 million in 2016 EPA geographic funds was allocated to entities engaged in Puget Sound recovery. All entities receiving geographic funds are required to use these funds to implement the Puget Sound Action Agenda. Managed by the Puget Sound Partnership, the Action Agenda is the overarching planning document that charts the course to Puget Sound restoration. The EPA geographic funds are the only federal funding source directed specifically to Puget Sound recovery. This primary focus is lost without the EPA geographic funds.

FROM ANNUAL FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS: OCT 1, 2015–SEP 30, 2016	FUNDING (IN \$ MILLIONS)	ACTIONS			
Puget Sound Partnership	2.56	The EPA geographic funds help to fund implementation of the Puget Sound Action Agenda to protect and recover Puget Sound. Geographic funds also support planning efforts for ecosystem recovery across nine collaborative watershed groups and seven Marine Resource Committees.			
Stormwater Strategic Initiative Lead:	5.20	The Stormwater Strategic Initiative Lead facilitates implementation of actions to prevent pollution			
Department of Ecology		from urban stormwater runoff. The lead convenes local and regional partners in the development of Implementation Strategies, which direct the spending of EPA geographic funds on ranked Near Term			
Department of Commerce		Actions, or NTAs. NTAs are scientifically vetted project proposals that, if implemented, help to meet specific 2020 Vital Sign indicator targets for improving watershed function within the Puget Sound basin.			
Washington State University					
Habitat Strategic Initiative Lead:	5.20				
Department of Fish & Wildlife		ecosystem recovery targets for the Puget Sound Vital Signs and prioritizes and awards funds to habitat restoration and protection NTAs. These NTAs—over time and collectively—support improved health of the marine and nearshore resources of Puget Sound.			

FROM ANNUAL FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS: OCT 1, 2015-SEP 30, 2016	FUNDING (IN \$ MILLIONS)	ACTIONS
Shellfish Strategic Initiative Lead Department of Health	5.00	The Shellfish Strategic Initiative Lead engages partners and stakeholders in developing and realizing Implementation Strategies for achieving the 2020 recovery targets for the reopening of shellfish and prioritizes and directs EPA Geographic funds to projects that decrease loadings of pathogens, and decrease adverse impacts on shellfish beds from pathogens to Puget Sound.
Tribal Lead Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission	4.00	This award supports activities and strategies aligned with the Puget Sound Action Agenda and that meet high-priority ecosystem restoration and protection needs of tribes across Puget Sound.
Tribal Organizational Capacity	3.70	This award supports tribal government and recognized tribal consortia.
EPA Staff/Operations	1.03	These funds support the EPA staff and programs needed to facilitate research and restoration projects throughout the Puget Sound basins.
Federal Interagency Agreements	0.54	These agreements between the EPA and other federal agencies support projects and programs directly linked to Puget Sound recovery efforts consistent with the Puget Sound Action Agenda, salmon recovery priorities, and tribal habitat priorities plans.
University of Washington, Puget Sound Institute (PSI)	0.63	PSI provides expert advice based on vetted scientific information and principles to support restoration and protection of the Puget Sound ecosystem.
TOTAL	27.85	

The Puget Sound Partnership also oversees activities associated with salmon recovery in Puget Sound. A significant source of money for salmon recovery projects in Puget Sound is the federal PCSRF account.

Without either the EPA geographic funds or the NOAA PCSRF money, only the state-funded Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (or PSAR) program would remain to support Action Agenda and salmon recovery project implementation. PSAR depends on capital budget appropriations by the state Legislature every 2 years. The Legislature allocated \$37 million to PSAR for the 2015–2017 biennium. Increasing demands on the state's capital budget to fund expensive priorities like school construction are reducing the amount of bond capacity available to fund programs like PSAR. PSAR money constitutes matching funds for the federal EPA geographic funds.

Activities currently supported by the EPA geographic funds range from stormwater infrastructure retrofits that keep polluted stormwater out of Puget Sound, to identifying, removing and disposing of derelict fish nets in areas of the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Derelict fish nets and gear are responsible for killing thousands of sea mammals and fish annually.

Of the \$2.8 million in geographic funds allocated to the Puget Sound Partnership, \$675,000 is passed through to nine collaborative watershed groups, and \$800,000 is passed through to the Northwest Straits Commission. The watershed groups implement the Action Agenda at the local level. The Northwest Straits Commission and the associated seven Marine Resource Committees implement the Northwest Straits Initiative.

The federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) provides critical support for salmon recovery statewide. In Puget Sound, the money is distributed to watershed groups for salmon recovery projects in each watershed. The total award of PCSRF statewide for 2016 was \$14.6 million from both state capital bond funds and the federal PCSRF. Puget Sound received about 42 percent of that funding, which totaled \$5.5 million from both state and federal sources (about \$4.3 million from PCSRF). The state provided about \$1.2 million as a match for PCSRF funding.

What are some specific examples of projects funded by the EPA geographic funds?