

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, 27 September 2007 9:00 AM – 12:30 PM  
Tacoma Nature Center, 1919 S Tyler St., Tacoma

# Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

*ATTENDED:* Sarah Brace, Paul Bucich, Luanne Coachman, Karen Dinicola, Ken Dzinbal, Gretchen Hayslip, Kris Holm, Amy Kurtenbach, Dana de Leon, Heather Kibbey, Doug Navetski, Kit Paulsen, Tony Paulson, Jim Simmonds, Dan Smith, Joanne Snarski, Heather Trim, Richard Tveten, and the facilitator, Jim Reid.

### THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

This was the first gathering of local, state and federal government representatives who are interested in the work of the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program's Technical Advisory Committee, and who may be interested in serving on the committee. Most everyone in attendance served on the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee, which met from October 2006 until March 2007, when it submitted its Report and Recommendations to Jay Manning, Director of the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Governor's Monitoring Forum.

The principal goal of the meeting was to define the committee's mission and goals, particularly in relation to the purpose of the Program's Governance Committee (which meets for the first time on October 3<sup>rd</sup>).

### THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S CHARTER

We defined the Technical Advisory Committee's charter as including these three purposes:

1. Champion and advocate for the implementation of the recommendations in the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee's March 2007 report. The report recommends creating a Puget Sound Basin Regional Monitoring Program.
2. Collect, analyze and disseminate credible and useful information about the Puget Sound Basin's freshwater, marine environments, and aquatic habitat to strengthen policy and management decisions that affect the Basin.

3. Assist the Governance Committee in refining the questions that need to be asked and answered about the health of the Puget Sound Basin and what is needed to improve it. (The Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee developed and recommended “Framework Questions” in its March 2007 report [p. 12-14] that should serve as the starting point for achieving this goal.)

The group’s discussion reiterated a major theme of the March 2007 report: The missions of the Puget Sound Basin Regional Monitoring Program *and* the Technical Advisory Committee must be broad and expansive. They must address a number of disciplines and be of value to a wide range of decision-makers. But to ensure success, the Technical Advisory Committee in particular should initially focus on more narrowly defined initiatives or projects, such as those that help jurisdictions meet their NPDES requirements when the permits come up for renewal in a few years. But again, this effort should not be confined to stormwater because a cooperative regional monitoring program has broader interests, needs and purposes.

To achieve the purposes listed above, we discussed this goal for the committee:

- Within three years demonstrate the success of and attract new interest in a cooperative, multi-party regional monitoring program by implementing two or three “on the ground” initiatives.

In addition to beginning to define the Technical Advisory Committee’s charter and goals, we also discussed criteria by which “pilot projects” might be selected. Many of the criteria are already in the March 2007 report; they are stated or implied in The Recommendations (p.1-2), The Executive Summary (p. 3-6) or the Mutual Interests (p. 9- 11). Our discussion highlighted these possible criteria: a) build capacity; b) ensure the program’s continuing success; c) simple rather than too complex and complicated; d) voluntary participation; e) flexibility; f) will help illuminate and “test” the program’s organizational structure; and g) help address the requirements of Phase I and Phase II permits.

## **POTENTIAL STEPS IN ACHIEVING THE COMMITTEE’S MISSION AND GOALS**

During our discussion, three potential initiatives were mentioned:

1. Expand King County’s Benthic Indicators of Biological Integrity (BIBI) database throughout the Puget Sound region.
2. Assess the Best Management Practices (BMPs) currently in use and whether or not they are addressing factors that are undermining the health of Puget Sound and helping to improve its health. This study would assess such questions as: What is killing Puget Sound? What is the contribution of stormwater runoff to the problem? What is the contribution of other activities to the problem? What BMPs are currently employed by the jurisdictions around the Sound? How effective or ineffective are they in improving conditions? If ineffective, what new BMPs are needed?
3. Bring together Phase I NPDES permittees to work with Ecology to collaboratively and jointly meet and monitor the requirements of the Phase I permits. The Technical Advisory Committee could facilitate this effort; a project manager might be hired to oversee the effort. And it could be linked to the Framework Question on p. 12-14 of the March 2007 report.

***At our next Technical Advisory Committee, we will brainstorm potential initiative or projects that could achieve the above-stated goal.*** To help stimulate our thinking, Sarah Brace will forward to Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid five scoping papers that the Puget Sound Action Team produced.

Tony Paulson mentioned that the federal caucus is producing an inventory of monitoring efforts and once it is available, he will share it with the group.

### **THE COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS THURSDAY, 18 OCTOBER**

The Technical Advisory Committee next meets on October 18<sup>th</sup> at the Tacoma Nature Center. A major focus of the meeting will be identifying and discussing potential “pilot projects.”

In preparation for the meeting, the five scoping papers from the Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP) will be sent to everyone to review. And Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid will work to recruit other participants, such as representatives of business and Tribes. (Any assistance any of you can offer in recruiting additional people to our next meeting will be greatly appreciated.)

The group's third meeting, which was scheduled for November 8<sup>th</sup>, is being rescheduled due to a conflict for many of the participants. It is now *tentatively* scheduled for November 27<sup>th</sup>.