PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Monday, 27 April 2009 9:00 AM – Noon
U.S. Geological Survey Washington Water Science Center Office
934 Broadway, Tacoma

DRAFT SUMMARY

OF THE MEETING'S DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Tracy Collier, NOAA; **Rich Doenges**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources; **Rob Duff,** Washington State Department of Ecology; **Tom Eaton**, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; **Maryanne Guichard**, Washington State Department of Health; **Heather Kibbey**, City of Everett; **Mel Oleson**, The Boeing Company; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Ron Shultz**, Washington State Conservation Commission; **Randy Shuman**, King County; **Ken Stone**, Washington State Department of Transportation; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; **Gary Turney**, USGS Water Resources Science Center; **Terry Wright**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE AGREES ON INFORMATION TO PROVIDE TO THE LEADERSHIP COUNCIL FOR DETERMINING A GOVERNANCE MODEL FOR THE COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM

Following up on the Governance Committee's 25 March 2009 meeting with three members of the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council—Bill Ruckelshaus, Martha Kongsgaard and Bill Wilkerson—and responding to the 22 April letter from Partnership's Executive Director, David Dicks, the Governance Committee agreed on the information it can provide to the Leadership Council to assist it in deciding on a governance model for the coordinated monitoring program for Puget Sound. On 27 or 28 May the Leadership Council is expected to select one of the two governance models that the Governance Committee recommended to the Legislature and Partnership in its December 2008 report. The Governance Committee will prepare the information and submit it to the Partnership by 15 May.

Information that Governance Committee members agreed to produce and submit to the Partnership includes:

Estimated Costs: Rather than compare the specific operational costs of the two governance models that the Governance Committee developed and recommended in its report, the Committee agreed to highlight for the Leadership Council the seven proposed responsibilities or functions of

the monitoring program's staff, which are listed and described on pages 17-18 of the December report. The Committee also agreed to provide the Leadership Council with at least one example of a non-profit institute to indicate a comparison of the costs between housing the coordinated monitoring program at the Puget Sound Partnership or at a non-profit institute. A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), an alliance of King County and eastside cities for funding affordable housing, has recently become a non-profit institute after having been an intergovernmental partnership since its founding in 1993. Primarily because of additional legal costs, it is estimated ARCH's annual operating budget will be about five percent more as a non-profit institute than as a partnership of the jurisdictions.

Cost Savings and Efficiencies: Committee members agreed that a fundamental premise of the coordinated monitoring program is that it will be more cost-effective and efficient. Therefore, the primary messages the Committee agreed to communicate to the Leadership Council are: 1) Monitoring throughout Puget Sound needs to be expanded. 2) Through coordination and collaboration, the region can attain a better value for the same investment, while leveraging resources to support the expansion. 3) Coordination will reduce duplication of effort, thereby reducing costs while producing more effective and credible results.

In addition, the Committee will draw attention to the Stormwater Work Group, which is now implementing its work plan, as a means for demonstrating over the next year, and in subsequent years, that collaboration produces efficiencies and gets more "bang for each buck" that is invested in monitoring.

Following a brief discussion of the future contributions of local governments to the coordinated regional monitoring program, one suggestion was that the funds spent by Phase I jurisdictions on NPDES permit-required monitoring could be contributed to this program if, as desired, regional coordination reduced these monitoring costs for the jurisdictions. Another suggestion was that the total budget of PSAMP could be considered in calculating the costs of monitoring and the funding of the coordinated regional monitoring program. There was not a consensus among the group for including these points in the materials for the Leadership Council; they were offered as future considerations.

2009-'11 Proposed Work Plan: The Committee reviewed the five-page work plan drafted by Scott Redman and Karen Dinicola (dated 27 April 2009). As a result of the discussion, the Committee agreed on these points:

- The work plan that the Committee submits to the Partnership by 15 May should be approximately two pages.

- There is no need to include Task 1 in the materials that are submitted to the Leadership Council because it describes the work elements and deliverables that the Governance Committee is preparing for the Council before 27-28 May.

- By eliminating Task 1 from the proposed work plan that will be submitted to the Leadership Council, Task 2 in the 27 April draft will become Task 1. Task 4 in the 27 April version should be moved to become Task 2 in the revised proposal. This means that Task 3 in the 27 April proposal will remain Task 3 in the revised version.

- In presenting these tasks, underscore for the Leadership Council that the first two tasks can be undertaken now to launch the program because they are not dependent on the last task, which revolves around selection of the governance model. (Were the Council to not select a governance model in May or in the foreseeable future, the Puget Sound Partnership could still launch the coordinated regional monitoring program by starting to implement the first two tasks.)

- To start implementing Tasks 2 and 4 of the 27 April proposed work plan (which will be Tasks 1 and 2 of the revised edition), an oversight group is needed. If the coordinated regional monitoring program is housed at the Puget Sound Partnership, that oversight group will be called a "Steering Committee" and the Committee could be established immediately. If the program is housed at a non-profit institute, a "Proto Board" would be needed as an interim step leading to the establishment of a final Board of Directors.

- Whether a Steering Committee is immediately established or a Proto Board is put in place, there does not need to be any loss of time in beginning to implement Tasks 1 and 2 (Tasks 2 and 4 in the 27 April proposal). Therefore, the deadlines proposed in Task 3 (Task 3 in the 27 April version) should be moved up.

  The proposed deadlines for Path B (Establish the Program at the PSP) under this task should be changed as follows: 1) eliminate 3Ba; 2) change the completion date for 3Bb from June 2010 to September 2009; and 3) change the completion date for 3Bc from June 2010 to December 2009.

  The Committee did not suggest specific dates for Path A (Establish an independent institute), but the dates should be moved up to illustrate that the work could get underway even before the Legislature establishes the institute and a Board is appointed.

- In reviewing Task 3, Path B, 3Be, Committee members noted that a supplemental budget request may need to be submitted to the Legislature in 2010 to fund the program in 2011.

- Also in Task 3: Add the development of the monitoring and assessment strategy as a deliverable by the end of 2011, and include the hiring of staff and obtaining funding to produce it.

- For Task 4 in the 27 April proposal (Task 2 in the one to be submitted to the Leadership Council), state that work groups will be established over time. With a small number of work groups at the start, the program will be launched in a focused manner before expanding over time. The expectation is that between two and five would be initially established. The revised work plan should mention those work groups that currently exist and thus could begin operating next year: the Stormwater Work Group, Chinook Recovery Monitoring and Adaptive Management Team, and PSAMP. In addition, a work group on toxins could also be established.

- As part of the materials to present to the Leadership Council, create a separate chart of near-term staffing needs. In Task 2 of the 27 April proposal (which will become Task 1 in the work plan submitted to the Leadership Council), there is mention of a "lead staff." Propose that an additional FTE should be hired to coordinate outreach to stakeholders. Add estimated costs of the tasks in which staff will be engaged.

- While some work groups cannot be commissioned until the indicators are determined, some are not dependent on the indicators, and could be created before they are determined.

- Furthermore, in discussing work groups, mention the need for the technical committee to be convened to assist work groups to communicate with and perhaps meet with one another to advance coordination across disciplines. Such coordination will help avoid duplication and create efficiencies.

As the Committee finished its review of the draft work plan, the members also agreed that:

- If the non-profit institute were selected as the model by which the coordinated regional monitoring program is governed, the PSP would need to sponsor it, meaning that it would need to advocate for its establishment at the Legislature in 2010. The Partnership's Leadership Council and staff could develop and advocate for legislation, and call on the variety of stakeholders to advocate for it at strategic opportunities.

- Through Committee member Scott Redman the Committee will offer to provide personal briefings of Leadership Council members between the middle of May and the Council's meeting on the 27th and 28th.

Karen and Scott will revise the work plan as indicated above, and produce the other information that the Committee agreed should be submitted to the Leadership Council on or before 15 May.