

A PUGET SOUND COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 13 February 2008 9:30 AM – 12:15 PM
Tacoma Nature Center, 1919 S Tyler St., Tacoma

Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO ATTENDED: Chris Burke, City of Tacoma; Luanne Coachman, King County; Bob Cusimano, Washington State Department of Ecology; Dana de Leon, Tacoma; Karen Dinicola, Ecology; Leska Fore, Statistical Design; Gary Gill, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL); Kris Holm, Business Groups, including Boeing; Heather Kibbey, Pierce County; Deb Lester, King County; Doug Navetski, King County; Andy Rheume, City of Seattle; Jim Simmonds, King County; Mike Stephens, Washington State Department of Transportation; Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound; Bruce Wulkan, Puget Sound Partnership; and the facilitator, Jim Reid.

THE PRINCIPAL THEMES AND AGREEMENTS OF THE MEETING

Two important agreements resulted from this meeting:

1. We agreed that the work of the Technical Advisory Committee is a key element of the overall work of the Puget Sound Monitoring Consortium. As such, our scope should not be limited to developing “pilot project” proposals, important as that work is. We can make a valuable contribution to the development of the framework for the coordinated monitoring plan that needs to be part of the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda. We should also address other issues and responsibilities that are part of our mission.
2. The “pilot project” proposals that we reviewed and discussed are substantive, well written, and credible. Because they all have merit, we agreed to send a letter to Melodie Selby of Ecology asking for a *preliminary* reaction and response to the proposals (not a decision about which to fund), and to seek clarification about the amount of money available to fund these projects and whether or not Ecology might have additional sources of funding to sponsor them. Depending on her responses, we will decide whether or not to prioritize and recommend a few of them. And we will need to determine how to build support for this set of proposals or for a smaller set.

Responding to these agreements, Bruce Wulkan of the Puget Sound Partnership voiced a theme that had been expressed the previous day at the Governance Committee by Sarah Brace and Scott Redman: The Partnership welcomes the efforts of the Consortium to define and develop a coordinated monitoring plan, and there is flexibility in how the Partnership meets the legislative mandate for monitoring. So it appears there is a vital role for the Consortium, including the

Technical Advisory Committee, to play in this endeavor, and in helping the Partnership produce the Action Agenda by early September.

STEPS TO FOLLOW-UP OUR AGREEMENTS

Regarding our first agreement, we briefly discussed developing a more expansive work plan and meeting more frequently. Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid will consult with committee members to draft a broader and deeper work plan. *(Facilitator's note: After this meeting a revised work plan was written for the Governance Committee and listed the work of the Technical Advisory Committee in reviewing and discussing the "pilot projects." That work plan, which is labeled the work plan of the Puget Sound Consortium, can be further revised to incorporate the more comprehensive work of the TAC, particularly relating to partnering with the Governance Committee to design and develop the monitoring plan.)*

Regarding the second agreement, Jim Reid is drafting the letter to Melodie, will circulate it for comment among all of us on the TAC, and once approved by us, will send it to her. He and Karen will also informally talk with Melodie to alert her that the letter is coming.

The letter to Melodie will be accompanied by the proposed pilot projects. After a thorough discussion of each one, Committee members responsible for authoring them were given the opportunity to revise them, if needed, based on Committee feedback and suggestions. The revised proposals are due to Jim Reid by Thursday, 21 February, at the end of the business day.

Here are a few ways the Committee commented that proposals might be revised, if appropriate:

1. Tie the proposal more directly and clearly to the work of the Puget Sound Partnership, the Washington Monitoring Forum (WMF), or other initiatives. For example, might proposal #5 (BiBi) help advance the work of the WFM and its committees, and, therefore, be even more relevant, urgent or supportable?
2. Suggest how the pilot project might be eventually expanded to address broader issues than those in the proposal. For example, could #1 (Stormwater SOPS) be expanded beyond stormwater once implementation of the pilot with its original, narrower focus yields lessons learned?
3. Focus more specifically on a goal and set of objectives, rather than leave the proposal too broad and appearing to contain "something for everyone." For example, might #4 (Stormwater Toxicity Study) produce better science and be more likely to receive funding if the issues or sites were more narrowly focused?
4. Highlight long-standing conflicts that could be resolved by implementing the pilot, or how the lessons learned from its implementation could generate a wider range of tools and techniques for use in addressing similar problems in the future.
5. Clarify what a certain level of funding will produce, and what is the justification for funding the pilot at a "Cadillac" versus "Chevrolet" level.