

Sediment Phthalates Work Group and Policy Member Meeting Notes October 9, 2006

ATTENDEES

John O'Loughlin	City of Tacoma	joloughl@cityoftacoma.org
Karen Larkin	City of Tacoma	klarkin@ci.tacoma.wa.us
Kris Flint	EPA	flint.kris@epa.gov
Lori Cohen	EPA	cohen.lori@epa.gov
Bill Moore	WA Dept. of Ecology	Bmoo461@ecy.wa.gov
Kathryn DeJesus	WA Dept. of Ecology	Kbco461@ecy.wa.gov
Jim Pendowski	WA Dept. of Ecology	jpen461@ecy.wa.gov
Janice Adair	WA Dept. of Ecology	jada461@ecy.wa.gov
Jeff Stern	King County	Jeff.stern@metrokc.gov
Bruce Tiffany	King County	Bruce.tiffany@metrokc.gov
Pete Rude	City of Seattle	Pete.rude@seattle.gov
Martin Baker	City of Seattle	martin.baker@seattle.gov
Kate Snider	Floyd Snider (facilitation)	kate.snider@floydsnider.com
Erin Murray	Floyd Snider	erin.murray@floydsnider.com

This meeting summary was prepared by Kate Snider and Erin Murray. It is based on a transcription of the flip charts used during the meeting to document the discussion. Action items are identified in ***bold script***.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

This was the fourth meeting of the Sediments Phthalates Work Group and second of the meetings involving the policy members. It took place at the Thea Foss Waterway Old Fire Station in Tacoma. The purpose of this meeting was to present the policy members with Work Plan documents and discuss commitment to and funding for the project.

AGENDA

- Presentation of the Scope and final review
- Presentation of the Work Plan and final review
- Presentation and discussion of Communications strategy
- Discussion of funding and staff resources
- Review and signing of the Letter of Agreement

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY DISCUSSION

The draft communication strategy was presented and discussed. Key points made in the discussion are listed below:

- The press and community leaders are interested in the formation and purpose of the Work Group. It is very important to get the message out soon about the objectives of the Work Group—stressing the advisory and collaborative problem-solving nature of the group. The member organizations are working together to define the scope of the problem, and determine how to tackle the issues.

Floyd/Snider to develop 1-page summary of talking points that can be used by Work Group member organizations to help deliver the message about Work Group purpose within their organizations and to the community. These talking points should also describe the types of recommendations that the Work Group is likely to develop.

- Discussed further the idea of using existing forums that many of the Work Group members and stakeholders (e.g., Citizens for a Healthy Bay, Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition) are already involved in as a platform for getting our ideas out to the regulated community and public. The goal is to get phthalates as an additional agenda item in those existing meetings.

Communications Lead

In lieu of a consultant, Jim Pendowski suggested a new hire at Ecology that could step in to the role as the Work Group's communications lead. This individual will be working ½ time with the Toxics program and, therefore, will have sufficient time to devote to the Work Group and phthalate issue at hand.

- It was shared agreement among the attendees that an agency person would be best suited as the communications "point person".

Floyd/Snider to coordinate with Kathryn on the specifics of coordinating with this individual as the Communications Lead.

- This individual needs to know and be in contact with Public Information personnel for all of the member organizations.
- It is expected that he/she will have sufficient time to get educated and "up to speed" on phthalates and the goals of the Work Group.
- This "point person" would attend all meetings, prepare the Work Group with materials, track and document outreach activities.
- It is going to be important to track the communications process closely to ensure we have enough/right resources for the task.
- The formal spokespeople for each organization are the policy leads.

Floyd/Snider will adjust the scope in Section 6.1 and the resource allocation to identify Ecology as providing the Communications Lead.

CLARIFICATIONS ON INFORMATION REVIEW FOR TECHNICAL STUDY AREAS

- For compilation of data within each defined study area, the lead will request existing information from all the Work Group members, and other available sources, develop a bibliography, and present to the group to develop shared understandings on the topic.
- The information presented will not be “new” but will be compiled by integrating multiple sources and data from existing studies.
- Additional data generated from continued sampling and pilot studies will be incorporated.
- There are opportunities to coordinate with Puget Sound Partnership, especially regarding their air deposition study.
- It is recognized that there are information sources from other geographic locations that can be used to add insight and information relative to Puget Sound.
- The Work Group members will perform “peer review” for the presented information during the process of review and discussion.

COMMITMENT TO PROJECT

- The estimated consulting fee for the project is \$68,000.
- Ecology will provide a total of \$50,000.
- King County, the City of Tacoma and City of Seattle will each contribute \$6,000 to cover the remaining balance.
- The City of Tacoma will be responsible for contracting the work, and will invoice the member organizations for their contributions.
- The Letter of Agreement was signed by all member organizations.