

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM  
**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Tuesday, 12 February 2008 10:00 AM – 1 p.m.**  
**St. Placid Priory, Lacey, WA**

# 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; **Pam Bennett-Cumming**, Mason County; **Sarah Brace**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Paul Bucich**, City of Federal Way; **Allison Butcher**, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Tracy Collier**, NOAA; **Paul Crane**, City of Everett; **Ken Currens**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC); **Bill Derry**, APWA Stormwater Managers; **Karen Dinicola**, Washington State Department of Ecology and the Governance Committee's project manager; **Ken Dzinbal**, Department of Ecology; **Rick Doenges**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR); **Tom Eaton**, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10; **Leska Fore**, Statistical Design; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL); **Maryanne Guichard**, Washington State Department of Health; **Bruce Jones**, NWIFC; **Doug MacDonald**, unaffiliated; **Fran McNair**, DNR; **Kathy Minsch**, Seattle Public Utilities; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Melodie Selby**, Department of Ecology; **Pete Schroeder**, Lead Entity Advisory Group; **Ron Shultz**, Conservation Commission; **Russell Scranton**, NOAA; **Ken Stone**, Washington State Department of Transportation; **Heather Trim**, People for Puget Sound and the Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

## **COMMITTEE CONTINUES TO DEFINE ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PARTNERSHIP**

A major focus of this meeting was the role and responsibilities of the Consortium through the end of 2008, at which time it is expected to "sunset." Governance Committee members are working to define the Consortium's role in the context of the monitoring mandate given to the Puget Sound Partnership by the State Legislature when it created the Partnership in the 2007 session.

Two important themes emerged from the discussion:

1. "We are the Partnership, and they are us." Committee members agreed that the tone of our communications to the Partnership should be cooperative and collaborative. We also agreed that the Consortium should develop a monitoring and information-gathering program and the program's governance structure to enable the Partnership to fulfill its monitoring mandate.
2. Where does the role of the Partnership stop and that of the Consortium begin? There may be an assumption at the Partnership that the Partnership will define the functions of a monitoring program, and the Consortium will recommend the form (governance structure) to implement

them. Some Consortium members may be assuming that in designing and recommending a monitoring and information-gathering program, the Consortium will also recommend the functions of the program. Defining the roles and responsibilities of the Partnership and of the Consortium, and how they partner, will be one of the major accomplishments of the next few months. The discussions to define the relationship will involve the Partnership's Leadership Council, Science Panel, and staff, the Consortium members, and other key partners and stakeholders.

Scott Redman of the Puget Sound Partnership kicked off the discussion by delivering a letter to the Committee members from David Dicks, Executive Director of the Partnership, in which David invited the Consortium to move forward in helping develop and design the monitoring program. Scott suggested the Consortium can position a monitoring program to help answer four major questions that the Partnership seeks answers to: 1) What is the current status of Puget Sound and the biggest threats to it? 2) What is a healthy Puget Sound? 3) What actions must we take to move toward a healthy Puget Sound? 4) Where do we start? (*A copy of the letter from David Dicks is attached to this document.*)

Scott also provided the Committee with some key dates for consideration as the Committee finalizes its work plan. On 15 April the Partnership's Science Panel meets, and that meeting could be the opportunity for Science Panel members and representatives of the Consortium to frame key questions about monitoring. In late June the Leadership Council meets to review the draft Action Agenda; the Consortium's recommendations regarding the monitoring program and its governance structure need to be part of the draft document. The Leadership Council is expected to adopt the Action Agenda by 1 September.

Following Scott's presentation, Committee members turned their attention to the charter and timeline that the subcommittee had prepared to help define the Consortium's roles, responsibilities and work products. The Committee provided this direction to project manager Karen Dinicola and facilitator Jim Reid, who will work together to redraft the work plan:

- Precede the purpose statement with a problem statement. The problem statement should include reasons why the need for coordinated regional monitoring is urgent.
- Use a tone that makes it clear that Consortium members seek to be partners with the Partnership.
- Reference other mandates from federal and state government that we are trying to address.
- Use language that will be clear and understandable to a broad audience, including the general public.

Karen and Jim will revise the charter based on these instructions, and send the revised document to the Committee for review and comment. It is expected that at the March meeting the Committee will adopt a charter and schedule.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVISE TWO GOVERNANCE MODELS FOR MARCH DISCUSSION**

The principal decision that emerged from this discussion was the Committee's agreement that it will identify and frame the implications of two governance models for the Science Panel on 15 April, rather than try to reach agreement on and recommend one governance structure.

In January the Governance Committee reduced to two the number of governance models to be studied, and asked the subcommittee to further analyze these two options and report its findings and analysis at the February meeting. The two organizational models are: 1) establish a new monitoring program at the Puget Sound Partnership; and 2) create a new independent Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). Subcommittee members include Sarah Brace, Tracy Collier, Karen Dinicola, Tom Eaton, Kit Paulsen, Joanna Richey, Russ Scranton, Ron Shultz, and Cullen Stephenson. Committee facilitator Jim Reid is performing the same duties for the subcommittee.

The subcommittee presented its analysis of the two options, and a discussion of nearly an hour ensued. Key themes of the discussion included:

- There are similarities between the two options; they have in common a number of strengths and weaknesses.
- The vision and goals of each model should be made clearer and more distinct.
- The basic differences between the two options need to be clarified, including highlighting their different functions. In addition, the relationship between policy and science in each option should be more clearly illuminated and graphically portrayed.
- Some differences between them are likely to be factual, while others may be perceived. Both kinds of differences need to be addressed by the Consortium's analysis.
- Among the considerations that the revised descriptions should address more clearly are: 1) funding sources; 2) efficiencies to be gained; 3) perceptions that each structure might create, and how they would be addressed; 4) challenges of including the needed parties; and 5) resource and contracting needs and opportunities.

Shortly before the meeting, Gary Gill offered a proposal for managing the NGO if that option were to be chosen. The subcommittee will review his ideas as part of its work to further define the two options. Paul Crane offered to assist the subgroup in reworking the graphic portrayals of each option.

Based on the Committee's direction, the subcommittee will spend the remainder of February revising the options. Committee members will receive the revised documents in early March to be able to review and consider them before the next meeting of the group.

#### **THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS THURSDAY, 13 MARCH 2008**

The Governance Committee's next meeting is from 9:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. at the Tacoma Room of the University of Washington, Tacoma. An agenda and the revised documents from the subcommittee will be sent to all Committee members on approximately Friday, 7 March.