

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Thursday, 18 September 2008 9:00 AM – Noon
USGS Office, 934 Broadway, 3rd floor, Tacoma

SUMMARY

of the Meeting's Key Discussions and Decisions

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Pam Bennett-Cumming, Mason County; **Allison Butcher**, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Bruce Crawford**, NOAA; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Monitoring Consortium Project Manager; **Rich Doenges**, Washington Department of Natural Resources; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; **Rob Duff**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Fran McNair**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources; **Mel Oleson**, The Boeing Company; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **Susan Crowley Saffrey**, City of Seattle; **Ken Stone**, Washington State Department of Transportation; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; **Gary Turney**, U.S. Geological Survey; **Rob Wilson**, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator

COMMITTEE HEARS UPDATE ON FORMATION OF STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Karen Dinicola reported to the Committee that the Stormwater Work Group is having its first meeting on 9 October. At the meeting the Work Group is expected to discuss the charter, bylaws and work plan through June 2010 that were developed by the “Core Team” over the summer.

A question was raised about the Work Group process perhaps getting too far ahead of the Puget Sound Partnership. Scott Redman, lead staff to the Partnership’s Science Panel, answered that the Work Group is not too far ahead because its initial efforts could help lead the way to the Partnership gaining a better understanding of “all the parts of” stormwater monitoring, including what agencies and organizations are monitoring stormwater and how they approach it.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSES RELATIONSHIP OF STORMWATER WORK GROUP AND PSP STUDIES

The discussion about the Stormwater Work Group’s near-term work plan led to a conversation about the vision for the Puget Sound Partnership’s monitoring program. Some of the key points of the discussion were:

- The Partnership’s six goals and associated outcomes will serve as indicators of success and help define status and trends monitoring.

- The Partnership hopes that the Stormwater Work Group will address effectiveness monitoring.
- Its Science Plan will help address the Partnership’s needs and interests, and guide how the organization coordinates with other agencies. The Plan will also recognize the additional needs of other parties.
- For the first biennium the Partnership will focus its science and monitoring activities on four general study areas, one of which is stormwater (the others are future scenario modeling, the marine food web and forage fish, and large ecosystem restoration projects like the Nisqually Delta dike and Elwha dam removals)
- These studies, along with an analysis of existing monitoring programs, are intended to help establish the coordinated monitoring program.

COMMITTEE PROVIDES DIRECTION ON THE REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

The Consortium is due to provide a report to the Legislature on its achievements and activities during the current biennium. The report is due in December.

As a result of the Committee’s discussion, here are the key points of direction given to Karen and Jim for drafting the report:

- Describe the essential components of a coordinated monitoring program, including the importance of synthesis and integration to ensure a strong link between technical and scientific information and data and policy and management decisions.
- Describe the two governance options and the criteria to be considerations for determining where to house the program.
- Recommend continued funding of the Stormwater Work Group.
- Highlight the “pilot projects” that are underway, and emphasize that once they are completed, their findings need to be widely disseminated.
- Emphasize the Consortium’s cooperation with the PSP, particularly with the Science Panel.
- Recommend that efficiencies need to be achieved by better coordination of existing resources for monitoring, and that even then additional staffing will be needed to ensure the program’s success.

The report is also expected to mention the common interests of the parties that unite them in recommending a coordinated monitoring program. And it should acknowledge that the key parties have unique interests. To define those particular interests, the following people were tasked with summarizing them for the report: Scott Redman will develop the Partnership’s interests; Heather Trim will produce the interests of the environmental community; Allison Butcher, Mel Oleson and Kris Holm will define the interests of business; and Joanna Richey, Susan Saffrey, Pam Bennett-Cumming and others from local governments will describe the interests of the cities and counties.

The Committee asked that the report be short and “punchy,” with more of the context and details placed in appendices.

The Committee then discussed to whom the report should be submitted, what forums or groups should be briefed on it by the Consortium members, and the timing of such briefings. The Committee members identified the following groups for presentations: legislative committees (in January?), the Partnership's Leadership Council (in January?), the Science Panel (at its December 16-17 meeting?), the Ecosystem Coordinating Board (in early January?), and the Washington Monitoring Forum. Regarding the legislature, the report might be presented to committees headed by Representative Upthegrove and Senator Rockefeller.

At the Committee's 15 October meeting the Committee will define a more specific strategy for presenting the Consortium's report, including the key messages that need to be communicated.

Finally, the consensus of the group was that after the report is delivered to the legislature and these briefings are conducted, the Governance Committee's purpose will, for the most part, be accomplished and the committee should sunset. The Governance Committee is open to reconvening if requested by the Partnership to provide further advice, analysis, or recommendations for establishing a monitoring program for Puget Sound. The Governance Committee may also continue to assist the Partnership in identifying ways to utilize the capacity of the Consortium member organizations to implement integrated, coordinated regional monitoring.

The Consortium itself will not sunset because of the continuing work of the Technical Advisory Committee, which is expected to complete the "pilot projects" by 30 June 2009, and the on-going work of the Stormwater Work Group. The latter is likely to be an ongoing component of the regional coordinated monitoring program.

COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS ON WEDNESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2008 AT UW TACOMA CAMPUS, 9:30 – 11:30