

PUGET SOUND COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 10 January 2008 9:30 AM – 1 p.m.

University of Washington Tacoma
The Tacoma Room (GWP Room 320)

Final Summary

OF THE COMMITTEE'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Joel Baker, Center for Urban Waters at the University of Washington, Tacoma; **Bill Backous**, CH2M Hill; **Josh Baldi**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Pam Bennett-Cumming**, Mason County; **Paul Bucich**, City of Federal Way; **Tracy Collier**, NOAA; **Paul Crane**, City of Everett; **Bruce Crawford**, Recreation and Conservation Office and the Washington Forum on Monitoring; **Ken Currens**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC); **Bill Derry**, APWA Stormwater Managers; **David Dicks**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Karen Dinicola**, Washington State Department of Ecology and the Governance Committee's project manager; **Rob Duff**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Tom Eaton**, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10; **Leska Fore**, Statistical Design; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL); **Stuart Glasoe**, Washington State Department of Health; **Maryanne Guichard**, Washington State Department of Health; **Julie Hall**, Seattle Public Utilities; **Bruce Jones**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC); **Doug MacDonald**, unaffiliated; **Fran McNair**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR); **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Matt Peterson**, Quadrant Homes and Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Tim Quinn**, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **David St. John**, King County and the Puget Sound Partnership; **Melodie Selby**, Department of Ecology; **Pete Schroeder**, Lead Entity Advisory Group; **Ron Shultz**, Conservation Commission; **Russ Scranton**, NOAA; **Cullen Stephenson**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Ken Stone**, Washington State Department of Transportation; **Stuart Toshach**, NOAA; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Groups and the Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; **Gary Turney**, USGS Water Resources Science Center; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE NARROWS GOVERNANCE MODELS TO TWO; DIRECTS SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONDUCT FURTHER ASSESSMENT AND REPORT THE FINDINGS IN FEBRUARY

At its third meeting on 10 January 2008, the principal decision of the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program's Governance Committee was to narrow to two the number of governance models it will study. Of the seven options submitted to it by a subcommittee that was established in October, the Committee expressed interest in further researching and assessing the option that would establish a new monitoring program at the Puget Sound Partnership, and the option of creating a new independent Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). These options are numbers 2 and 5, respectively, in the "Proposed Governance Structure Options" matrix, dated 5 December 2007, that the subcommittee presented to the Committee on that date. (The matrix is attached.)

The Committee instructed the subcommittee to further analyze these two options and report its findings and analysis at the next Committee meeting. (*Facilitator's note: In light of feedback received from Committee members, the meeting will take place on 12 February 2008 from 10 a.m. until 1 p.m. at St. Placid's Priory in Lacey.*) As part of the additional analysis, the Committee suggested that applying each option to cases or examples in our area might illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the models. For example, how would it work to apply the structure in options 2 or 5 to efforts to clean up Hood Canal?

The Committee also suggested that the subcommittee's work might be helped by reviewing the legislation creating the Puget Sound Partnership, particularly the section outlining the role and responsibilities of the Science Panel.

The subcommittee's membership consists of: Sarah Brace, Tracy Collier, Karen Dinicola, Tom Eaton, Kit Paulsen, Joanna Richey, Russ Scranton, Ron Shultz, and Cullen Stephenson. Committee facilitator Jim Reid will perform the same duties for this group.

In narrowing the options to two, Committee members speculated that the final recommendation of the group might be a hybrid of options 2 and 5 with, perhaps, some elements from the other options, such as option 7.

DAVID DICKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP, ADDRESSES THE COMMITTEE

At the invitation of the Governance Committee, David Dicks, the newly appointed Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), met with the Committee to begin discussions about a potential role for the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program in helping the Partnership fulfill its legislative mandate for monitoring.

David outlined the Partnership's three key responsibilities: build an Action Agenda by 1 September 2008; educate and engage the public; ensure accountability through an effective coordinated monitoring program.

In building the Action Agenda, the Partnership will answer these questions: 1) Where are we today? (What is the baseline)? 2) What are the key threats to the Puget Sound? 3) Where do we want to be in the future? (How do we define success?) 4) What do we do to progress from the current situation to a healthy Puget Sound? (Where do we start? And how do we confirm that we are making progress?)

In engaging and educating the public, David sees the need for a "punch line" that clearly, compellingly and credibly tells the story about the condition of the Puget Sound so that the citizens of our region and state more accurately understand problems and challenges facing it. He also said that the nature of the governance of coordinated monitoring needs to be somewhat tailored to public engagement and education interests, needs and issues.

In building structures and mechanisms to ensure accountability, David sees an obvious link to the work of the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program. And he added that the Partnership does not need to "reinvent the wheel" if other processes or forums are working well, particularly in light of the Partnership's ambitious schedule.

Finally, David stated that during the next couple weeks the Partnership will develop a scope for performing its key functions and responsibilities, and will provide it to us so that we can consider and recommend how the work of a coordinated monitoring program could assist the Partnership in achieving its mandate for accountability through effective, coordinated monitoring.

DEBRIEFING DISCUSSION WITH DAVID DICKS RAISES ISSUES ABOUT THE ROLE OF A COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM

Following David's appearance, Committee members shared with one another what they thought were his key messages. This discussion evolved into an elaboration of the role of a coordinated monitoring program for the Puget Sound, and concluded with the agreement to explore and assess two governance options (numbers 2 and 7 on the matrix).

These are the highlights or themes of the Committee's discussion after David departed. There wasn't any attempt to reach consensus.

- The role for a group like the Governance Committee would not be to conduct monitoring, but to structure decision-making to enable the parties and stakeholders to get from where we are today to where we need to be in the future in a coordinated, cooperative manner. This structure needs to provide the connection ("loop back") between policy-making and policy-makers and monitoring and the scientists and technical people who conduct it.
- In building that decision-making framework and organization, there may be some need to "talk content," meaning that some involvement in monitoring could be part of the group's work.
- Our highest value won't come in telling others what to do, which, in fact, we should avoid, but in helping to facilitate discussions between those who are conducting monitoring, and in helping them be able to know and understand who is doing what.
- In responding to the Partnership after it provides us with its scope, we will need to ask "What is realistic to achieve by September first, and what needs to be done in 2009?"
- In examining governance structures, we should be asking: 1) Who decides what data are collected? Is it one agency? 2) Who collects it in the field? Likely multiple agencies. 3) Who compiles, stores and makes it available? Likely a coordinated effort. 4) Who interprets it and communicates it?
- We need to consider short- and long-term interests, needs, goals, resources, and steps.
- As this group prepares to further assess governance models, we should ask "What are the decisions that this group needs to make?" Among them are:
 1. What is the scope of monitoring (based on David Dick's feedback)?
 2. In what ways are existing monitoring efforts insufficient? What gaps are there?
 3. What is the governance structure?
 4. What is the phasing?
 5. What changes need to be made by end of 2008 (within existing efforts)?
 6. Where will the governance body be housed?

7. Who will do the monitoring?
8. What will be the explicit link to the Partnership, to others?
9. How will the information be conveyed to decision-makers and to the public?
10. How will adaptive management occur?

THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS TUESDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2008