

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 10 December 2008 9:30 AM – 12:00 PM
University of Washington Tacoma
Tacoma Room (GWP 320)

DRAFT SUMMARY

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS, AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Pam Bennett-Cumming, Mason County; **Rob Duff**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Stuart Glasoe**, Washington State Department of Health; **Kris Holm**, Business Caucus and Association of Washington Business, including The Boeing Company; **Bruce Jones**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission; **Fran McNair**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **Susan Crowley Saffery**, 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; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE REACHES AGREEMENT ON FINAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

The Consortium is due to provide a report to the Legislature on its activities, achievements, and recommendations in December. After a little more than two hours, and discussion of a number of “big picture” concepts as well as the editing of specific sentences and words, the Governance Committee reached agreement on the final report. As a result, it will be posted on the Consortium’s website next Monday, the 15th, and project manager Karen Dinicola will begin to distribute it to key stakeholders and interested parties, including two legislative committees.

This is a brief summary of the “big picture” issues discussed by the Committee as it reviewed the final draft of the report.

1. **Avoid “scope creep.”** Committee members agreed the language of the report must reflect the Consortium’s mandate to focus on and address monitoring and assessment, and not unintentionally expand to begin to address, or appear to address, the broader science program needs and concerns, and interests and responsibilities of the Puget Sound Partnership, or, for that matter, the science conducted by other agencies and jurisdictions. So, for example, the Committee agreed to a change on page 12 of the report, inside the box entitled “What are the Topical Work Groups?,” so that the sentence reads “Topical work groups provide a forum for key stakeholders to determine *monitoring and assessment* (not “science,” as the draft stated) needs by geography or issue and to oversee collection of the data to help improve our understanding of the ecosystem.”

Another example: Two paragraphs below, the phrase “regional science plans” was changed to “regional monitoring and assessment plans” for the final report.

Committee members acknowledged there is not a clear line between the focus on monitoring and assessment and on broader issues of science, and they expressed comfort with the Puget Sound Partnership’s Science Panel someday extrapolating lessons or recommendations from the report and applying them to its science plan or to other initiatives. But for this report the Committee agreed on more precise or tighter language to avoid appearing to comment on the broader science mandate of the Partnership and others. Thus, Karen was instructed, and has since gone through the report to ensure that its language reflects the Committee’s focus on monitoring and assessment.

2. **Provide two governance options only.** With the common interest of focusing the Legislature and Puget Sound Partnership on the two governance models presented, described, compared and contrasted in the report, the Committee reached consensus to remove from pages 7 and 14 of the report any mention of the possible selection of a “hybrid” governance model. The Committee recognizes it is advising the Partnership, and that its advice may not be taken. But the members agreed to recommend only two options and not insinuate that a different one is, at this point in time, acceptable to the Committee.

The Committee also asked that Karen provide a phrase or sentence on page 7 to more fully explain how these two models came about and why they, as opposed to others, are recommended. She has done so for the final report (see page 7).

3. **Support existing funding levels and the transfer of the funds from Ecology to the PSP.** During the 2007-’09 biennium, the Department of Ecology was appropriated \$800,000 through a budget proviso to support the initial work of the Consortium. The Governance Committee, in its earlier deliberations, had agreed to support maintaining this amount of funding for the Consortium in the 2009-’11 biennium, as well as the proposed transfer of the funding from Ecology to the Puget Sound Partnership.

Karen and Rob Duff recently learned and notified the Committee that the Governor’s proposed budget does not transfer the funds from Ecology to the Partnership. Furthermore, Ecology has indicated that half the money, which came from the collection of fees, would no longer be available.

As the Committee focused on the language of its second recommendation, and more specifically, on the text of the third bullet in that recommendation (see page 2 of the Executive Summary), there was concern that the report did not reflect these budget realities.

The Committee agreed that the amount of the current biennium’s appropriation, \$800,000, is needed to advance the work of an integrated, coordinated regional monitoring and assessment program in the next biennium. Thus, the language of the final report should remain as it was in the draft. But the Committee agreed to add a sentence that calls for the funds being transferred from Ecology to the Partnership (see new language of final report, page 2). The Committee believes that the Partnership is more likely to be able to secure federal grants that would ensure the funding for the monitoring and assessment program in the next biennium remains at the level it was during the 2007-’09 biennium.

Related to this, the Committee also asked that Karen examine the language in the report that discusses how funding will be used so that it makes clear that funding will support programs

as well as staffing. The interest of Committee members is to ensure that legislators are not led to think that all funding for the monitoring and assessment program would go to staffing, but instead understand that the report calls for funding programs, too.

Finally, the Committee also agreed on changes to specific words and phrases, including the deletion of some words, to ensure the meaning and intent of its recommendations are as clear and understandable as possible.

COMMITTEE IDENTIFIES REPORT RECIPIENTS

After reaching agreement on the final report, the Committee spent a little time compiling a list of people and groups who will receive it. Karen will continue to build on the list as she researches the key stakeholders and interest groups who should receive it. Committee members are also encouraged to share with her names and addresses of individuals and organizations that should receive it.

In addition to Committee members and everyone on the Consortium's mailing list, here are some who will receive the final report:

- Members of the Senate Water, Energy, and Telecommunications Committee. Chair: Sen. Phil Rockefeller. Members: Senators Murray (Vice Chair), Honeyford, Delvin, Fraser, Hatfield, Holmquist, Morton, Oemig, Pridemore, and Regala. And the Committee's staff people, including Jan Odano and Karen Epps.
- Members of the House of Representatives Ecology and Parks Committee. Chair: Rep. Dave Upthegrove. Members: Representatives Rolfes (Vice Chair), Sump, Dickerson, Dunshee, Eickmeyer, Kristiansen, O'Brien, and Pearson. And the Committee's staff people, including Jaclyn Ford and Jason Callahan.
- Members of the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council and PSP Executive Director David Dicks.
- Members of the Puget Sound Partnership's Science Panel.
- Members of the Washington Forum on Monitoring.
- Government Affairs directors and staff people at State agencies and various associations.
- State agency directors.
- The County Executives of King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Whatcom Counties, and Council or Commission members and chief administrators of the other Puget Sound Basin counties.
- The Mayors and key council members of cities throughout the Puget Sound Basin.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE PREPARE PRESENTATION TO KEY STAKEHOLDERS

In the last fifteen minutes of its meeting, the Governance Committee discussed future presentations of its report and recommendations to key stakeholders, including the legislative committees and the Puget Sound Science Panel, which is scheduled to hear from the Consortium next Tuesday, the 16th, at 3:45 p.m. at the Cherberg Building on the State Capitol campus in Olympia.

The primary direction from the Committee was to use the now agreed-upon Executive Summary as the basis for the Consortium's oral and written presentations, including a power point.

Following adjournment of the meeting, the ad hoc subcommittee which was appointed by the Governance Committee in November met to further plan the future presentations, especially next week's appearance before the Puget Sound Science Panel. Attending the subcommittee meeting were Rob Duff, Kris Holm, Kit Paulsen, Joanna Richey, Susan Saffery, Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid.

The subcommittee agreed that the presentations should be designed in such a way that any Governance Committee member could participate in them. Thus, the script should closely adhere to the language of the report, particularly the Executive Summary. In addition, subcommittee members agreed that an effective, seamless presentation is more likely if the Committee members who will participate in any given presentation rehearse together, either in person or by phone.

The subcommittee members believe that, depending on the amount of time we are given for the presentation, two or three Committee members presenting the report and recommendations is ideal. And a show of strength by Committee members who come to sit in the front row would also add to the message that this report and its recommendations need to be taken seriously.

For the Science Panel presentation next week, the subgroup determined that the presenters should be Karen, as our project manager, one member from local government, and Heather Trim. If any of them cannot make it, Stuart Glasoe, Fran McNair, Rich Doenges and Pam Bennett-Cumming will be asked. And if they are not available, Rob Duff volunteered to rearrange his schedule to speak as a representative of Ecology, while Karen would speak as a representative of all Committee members.

Karen is also revising the power point presentation to reflect the Committee's and subcommittee's direction.

WITH THIS SUCCESS, GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE BIDS ADIEU

Having accomplished its mandate at Noon PST on 10 December 2008, the Governance Committee adjourned for the last time. Following a round of applause for the work of all the members, including many who gave a great amount of their time and creativity earlier in the year as the two governance models emerged and were developed and refined, and sips of sparkling cider, the Governance Committee "sunsetted."

Committee members have said they are willing to participate in briefings of legislative committees and key stakeholder groups, and Scott Redman, the Committee member who is staff to the Science Panel, has suggested he may call upon Committee members periodically.

Thank you all for an outstanding effort that really began in August 2006! Congratulations!