

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 12 November 2008 9:30 AM – 12:20 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:

Allison Butcher, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Bruce Crawford**, NOAA; **Rich Doenges**, Washington State Department of Natural Resources; **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; **Heather Kibbey**, City of Everett; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **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 PROVIDES ADDITIONAL DIRECTION ON THE REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

The Consortium is due to provide a report to the Legislature on its activities, achievements, and recommendations in December. After reviewing a latest draft that Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid produced, the Committee provided this additional direction in the development of the report:

Governance:

- To reflect the Governance Committee's mission and mandate, the group agreed that the governance recommendation, currently listed in the draft report as the third of three recommendations, should be presented first. Use the chart produced last spring to illustrate the two governance options the Committee is recommending.
- In explaining the recommendation, emphasize more clearly or strongly the theme of multi-jurisdictional cooperation, collaboration, and coordination.
- Put the "overarching" recommendation that appears on page 4 of the draft summary in the Executive Summary.
- Make clearer that the coordinated monitoring program is envisioned as a forum for informing, educating, sharing, and collaborating, and that coordination among various levels of government and private and non-profit organizations should leverage resources, create efficiencies, and produce both higher quality data and more credible management decisions.

It is not intended to take over or replace existing monitoring forums or infringe on the authority of any jurisdiction to meet its monitoring mandates.

- Emphasize more fully the limitations of existing capacity of jurisdictions and organizations to conduct monitoring, and include a proposal for cost-sharing arrangements among them to get “more bang for the buck.”
- Because the legislation that launched our process referred to the program in San Francisco Bay, reference it in the report and include in an Appendix the summary we previously produced of the key features of the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI).
- Tie the recommendation to the Partnership’s Action Agenda.

Staffing:

- Remove from the report requests for specific levels of staffing for specific assignments or tasks. Instead, emphasize the functions of the work that will be done. Propose that because of the Committee’s research and analysis of organizations around the country facing similar monitoring challenges, comparable levels of resources, including staffing and funding, are needed to initiate, build, operate, and maintain a Puget Sound coordinated monitoring program. Cite the staffing and funding statistics from such organizations as SFEI, and clearly draw the parallels between those organizations and our proposed coordinated monitoring program.

Work Groups:

- Make clearer that the coordinated monitoring program is envisioned as a forum for informing, educating, sharing, and collaborating, and that coordination among various levels of government and private and non-profit organizations should leverage resources, create efficiencies, and produce both higher quality data and more credible management decisions. It is not intended to take over or replace existing monitoring forums or infringe on the authority of any jurisdiction to meet its monitoring mandates.
- Propose that work groups may take different forms and have different missions. They could be ongoing or ad hoc, focused on an issue or topical or for the purpose of caucusing, and intended to conduct monitoring or to inform stakeholders about the monitoring efforts of individual jurisdictions or agencies or clusters of them.
- In presenting the accomplishments of the pilot projects, acknowledge that they started as “grassroots” efforts by small groups of cities and counties, and were then supported by the Consortium and Department of Ecology.
- Shows connections between the Consortium’s efforts in the 2009-’11 biennium to the Action Agenda.

Funding:

- In the current draft of the report there are three recommendations; the first two address staffing and funding (note: the Committee prefers the 6 November revised language of recommendations 1 and 2 over the original language of the 5 November draft). Combine these into one recommendation with three parts, and broaden the title beyond “funding” to “resources and sustainability.”
- The three parts of this recommendation should be that the Legislature: 1) Maintain existing or current levels of funding for state agency monitoring efforts. As part of this recommendation, propose that the \$800,000 carry-forward proviso for the activities of the

Consortium that is being shifted from the Department of Ecology's budget to the Puget Sound Partnership's budget be earmarked for the Consortium's work, including for the Stormwater Work Group. 2) Approve the Partnership's funding requests for ecosystem science activities. 3) Direct state agencies, either through the Consortium or in some other way, to work with federal and local government agencies, and private and non-profit groups to develop cost-sharing arrangements to create efficiencies, reduce duplication of effort, stimulate multi-organizational coordination, produce higher quality data, and produce more credible management decisions.

- The cost sharing is likely to include both a common pool of funds for regional monitoring activities and funds that are contributed to support specific projects or activities. As an example of where cost-sharing could achieve the outcomes listed above, cite the NPDES process.
- In presenting this recommendation, specify some of the outcomes the Legislature should expect from providing the capacity to launch the program, and the resources, including funding and staffing, to sustain it over time.

Other "Process" Issues:

- Ensure that the tone or message of the report signals that the coordinated monitoring program is to inform and educate, and to stimulate sharing and cooperation. The program is not intended to take over or replace existing efforts.
- Review the tone to make sure it is not too "state centric."
- Finally regarding tone, use positive statements rather than double negatives.
- Eliminate redundancies in the report. For example, combine "The Context for These Recommendations" on page 5 and parts of the Introduction (page 3) and sections of The Consortium's Recommendations (pages 4 and 6-9). Also, rather than have the recommendations appear three times in the report, have them appear once in the Executive Summary and once in the report.
- Use graphic devices such as "text boxes" and charts. The group agreed a chart to illustrate the governance options would help explain and compare them, while suggestions for "text boxes" included "Essential Components of the Program, Regardless of the Governance" (page 15 of current draft), a statement that the coordinated monitoring program does not replace or reduce the authority of agencies whose monitoring activities are mandated, some of the functions of the coordinated regional monitoring program, or a definition of what the Committee means by accountability (is existing work accomplishing the right thing, or do we need to do different things or do things differently?).

NEXT STEPS TO FINALIZE THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee identified three products that must be finalized to meet our goals of submitting our report and recommendations to the Legislature in December, and ensuring that our recommendations are included in the Action Agenda and the Biennial Science Plan. The three products are:

1. **A revised Executive Summary.** *Karen and Jim revised and sent it to the Governance Committee members on Thursday afternoon, 13 November.*

2. **A revised report, including appendices.** *The revision of the report based on the Committee's direction as outlined above should reach Committee members on approximately 20 November.*
3. **A letter from the Consortium to the Partnership requesting that our recommendations be included in the Action Agenda.** The Committee agreed that the Consortium should send a letter to the Partnership asking that it more specifically reference our recommendations for forming an integrated, coordinated regional monitoring program for the region. Specifically, the Committee decided to ask that our recommendation that the Partnership choose a governance structure for the program by 30 June 2009 be included in the Action Agenda. In addition, the Committee will comment on how our recommendations support the Biennial Science Plan, and express gratitude for the Plan's acknowledgment and support of the work of the Stormwater Work Group. *Karen drafted the letter and sent it to the Governance Committee members on Thursday afternoon, 13 November.*

COMMITTEE APPOINTS SUBCOMMITTEE TO PREPARE BRIEFINGS AND OVERSEE OUTREACH TO KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Governance Committee members in attendance appointed a representative subcommittee to develop the presentation that will be made on behalf of the Committee to legislative committees and at forums or meetings of key stakeholder groups. In addition to project manager Karen Dinicola, subcommittee members include: Bruce Crawford, NOAA; Rob Duff, Ecology; Kris Holm, the business community; Kit Paulsen, Bellevue; and Heather Trim, environmental groups.

The Committee expects to present its report in January to two legislative committees, the Senate's Water, Energy and Telecommunications Committee, chaired by Senator Phil Rockefeller, and the Ecology and Parks Committee of the House of Representatives, chaired by Representative Dave Upthegrove. Facilitator Jim Reid has been in touch with the legislative staff people who serve the two committees, and he and Karen will work with them to schedule the Governance Committee's presentations to these legislative committees. *(Note: The report and recommendations will not be presented to legislative committees when they meet in Olympia in early December.)*

The Committee's report and recommendations will be presented to the Washington Monitoring Forum on the afternoon of December 3rd, and to the State Caucus on December 8th. Both presentations will be in Olympia. And the recommendations will be presented to the Partnership's Science Panel during its two-day meeting in Olympia on December 16th and 17th.

It is the job of the subcommittee to: 1) develop an overall presentation about the Committee's recommendations, including developing a power point as one tool to communicate the recommendations; 2) determine how to tailor the presentation to specific groups; 3) determine which grouping of Committee members would be most effective in making presentations (the Committee agreed that four to six presenters would be unwieldy, but a couple presenting on behalf of the entire Committee could work); and 4) call upon the rest of the Committee members as needed (for example, after subcommittee members draft the power point presentation, they will circulate it among the entire Committee for review).

Caucus representatives are asked to request that the presentation be added to the agenda to upcoming meetings of the federal, business, and environmental caucuses and perhaps the AWRA

stormwater managers committee that Karen, and for a few, Kit, presented the model options to in March and April.

Committee members are asked to suggest to the subcommittee any stakeholder groups that should be briefed about the report and recommendations, potential dates for such briefings, and people within those groups who should be contacted to help us get on their calendars.

**THE COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS ON WEDNESDAY, 10 DECEMBER, FROM 9:30 - NOON,
AT OUR USUAL MEETING ROOM ON THE UW TACOMA CAMPUS**