

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, 18 October 2007 9:00 AM – Noon  
Tacoma Nature Center, 1919 S Tyler St., Tacoma

# Draft Agenda

### THE MEETING'S GOALS:

1. Review the results of the Governance Committee's first meeting.
2. Agree on criteria for selecting "pilot" projects.
3. Brainstorm potential "pilot" projects and determine next steps in scoping those that the Advisory Committee decides to further explore.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Note:** Refreshments will be served beginning at 8:45 a.m. so please come early to enjoy them and be ready to start the meeting promptly at 9:00. Thanks!

- |      |      |   |                       |
|------|------|---|-----------------------|
| I.   | 9:00 | Welcome, Introductions, Review Today's Agenda   | Jim Reid, facilitator |
| II.  | 9:10 | A Briefing on the Governance Committee's Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Seven Technical Advisory Committee members, including Karen, attended the Governance Committee's meeting on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. Karen and they will highlight the Governance Committee's key discussions and decisions, including any impacts of its decisions on our work.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Are there questions, reactions or responses?</i></li></ul> | Karen Dinicola        |
| III. | 9:40 | Agree on Criteria for Selecting "Pilot" Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>What criteria shall we use to initially select "pilot" projects?</i></li><li>▪ <i>Review previous suggestions and brainstorm new ones. See attached list of previously mentioned criteria.</i></li><li>▪ <i>Discuss and agree on a set of criteria.</i></li></ul>   | Everyone              |

IV. 10:00 Brainstorm, Then Narrow List of “Pilot” Projects Everyone

- **Reference: The seven 27 July scoping papers from the Puget Sound Partnership.**
- *Considering the criteria, what kinds of projects will enable the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program to achieve its charter and goals?*
- *Brainstorm potential “pilot” projects.*
- *Apply the criteria to narrow the list to those the Advisory Committee is interested in scoping.*

V. 11:20 Identify Next Steps in Scoping “Pilot” Projects Everyone

- **Reference: March 2007 Report and Recommendations of the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee**
- *Define “scoping:” Whose participation is needed? What are the costs and from where would funding come? Is guidance, assistance or support needed from the Governance Committee? How might the parties collaborate and communicate to ensure success?*
- *Are there other political, operational or financial considerations to include in the scoping of each project?*
- *Identify who will be involved in scoping each project.*

12:00 Adjourn

### **The Technical Advisory Committee’s Next Meeting is Tuesday, 27 November**

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Criteria for Selecting “Pilot” Projects (see next page)

*These “attachments” may be accessed by going on-line to Ecology’s website:*

[http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/links/ps\\_monitoring.html](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/links/ps_monitoring.html)

2. Puget Sound Partnership 27 July 2007 Scoping Papers
3. March 2007 Report and Recommendations of the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee Meeting
4. Final Summary of the Technical Advisory Committee’s 27 September 2007 meeting
5. Draft Summary of the Governance Committee’s 3 October 2007 meeting

## **ATTACHMENT 1:**

### **CRITERIA FOR SELECTING “PILOT” PROJECTS**

The following are criteria that were mentioned by the Technical Advisory Committee members during the meeting on September 27<sup>th</sup> or were offered as friendly advice by the Governance Committee on October 3<sup>rd</sup> or were developed as part of the March 2007 Report and Recommendations of the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Monitoring Advisory Committee

At the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting the members will review this list, clarify the meaning of any that are not clear, combine duplicative criteria, subtract from or add to the list, and reach consensus on a set of criteria by which The Technical Advisory Committee will select projects.

#### ***Potential Criteria:***

1. Builds capacity.
2. Ensures the success of the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program.
3. Simple rather than too complex or complicated.
4. Implements the Program’s monitoring priorities.
5. Flexible.
6. Illuminates or “tests” the Program’s organizational structure.
7. Addresses Phase I and Phase II NPDES requirements.
8. Does not depend on a governance or management structure being already in place.
9. Involves multi-party, interjurisdictional coordination.
10. Can lead to relatively quick successes, thus creating momentum for continuing and building a coordinated monitoring effort for the Puget Sound basin.
11. Attracts voluntary participation of parties who are interested in, affected by, or likely to benefit from monitoring. (March 2007 Report; “The Recommendations,” #4.a., page 1)
12. Assists regulators and the regulated in working together more collaboratively. (March 2007 Report; “The Recommendations,” 4.d., page 2)
13. Fills in geographic and informational “gaps.” (March 2007 Report; “The Executive Summary, #2, page 4)
14. Achieves federal and state mandates while addressing the key “big picture” questions about the health of the Puget Sound basin. (March 2007 Report; “The Mutual Interests: Achieve Monitoring-Related Mandates,” page 10)
15. Enhances credibility of monitoring and the data generated by it in the eyes of policy-makers, technical experts and the public. (March 2007 Report, “The Mutual Interests: Strengthen the Credibility, Trust and Transparency of Monitoring Activities and the Data Generated from Them,” page 10)

16. Wisely invests resources. (March 2007 Report, “The Mutual Interests: Strengthen the Credibility, Trust and Transparency of Monitoring Activities and the Data Generated from Them,” page 10)
17. Makes a difference in improving both water quality and the protection and preservation of fish and wildlife habitat. (March 2007 Report, “The Mutual Interests: Strengthen the Credibility, Trust and Transparency of Monitoring Activities and the Data Generated from Them,” page 10)