

SCIENCE PANEL MONITORING PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE

“CONVERSATION” PLANNING MEETING

Friday, July 11, 2008 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
University of Washington Tacoma
The Tacoma Room (GWP Room 320)

Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING’S KEY DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees:

Bruce Crawford, NOAA; **Bob Cusimano**, Ecology; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; **Gary Gill**, Battelle PNNL; **Stuart Glasoe**, WDOH; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Ron Shultz**, Washington State Conservation Commission; **Randy Shuman**, King County; **Heather Trim**, People for Puget Sound; and **Gary Turney**, USGS.

SUBCOMMITTEE AGREES TO OBJECTIVE OF “CONVERSATIONS”

The objective of planning “conversations” is to engage technically knowledgeable stakeholders in developing the monitoring components of the Puget Sound Partnership’s Strategic Science Plan and Biennial Science Work Plan. A conversation is not intended to imply a one-time engagement, but rather a process with defined endpoints. Conversations can include forums, briefings, updates, ongoing task forces, etc.

SUBCOMMITTEE WILL DEVELOP A STRAW DOG FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT FOR THE FIRST “CONVERSATION”

Following an in-depth discussion of the concepts and approach described in the agenda, the subcommittee agreed that what is most needed right now is a draft document that describes a long-term framework for monitoring in Puget Sound and justifies the biennial science work plan. This document would be developed as a suggested approach for the Science Panel to consider adopting. It needs to encompass status and trends and effectiveness monitoring, and should include or propose a process for some analysis of existing capacity to implement the necessary monitoring, perhaps by requesting that existing programs make adjustments. Other “conversations” will follow the development, review, and vetting of the framework document. A complete proposal for a comprehensive monitoring plan would be completed by June 2010.

In order to develop the initial draft document, two parallel efforts are needed:

- We need to draw out the assessment questions, or monitoring objectives, being addressed by existing, Sound-wide, ongoing monitoring programs. More questions will be identified by Partnership staff in the course of reviewing the revised Topic Forum papers and by the newly

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

formed Stormwater Work Group; and the set of four questions detailed in the Consortium's March 2007 report should also be included. The assessment questions include both status and trends and effectiveness monitoring efforts.

- We need to describe multiple important frameworks for approaching a long-term ecosystem monitoring program:
 - A biological framework, based on a trophic pyramid (habitat requirements could also be described);
 - A geochemical mass-balance framework that addresses pollutant inputs and pathways to/through water, sediment and air;
 - A human health framework that addresses the quality of air, water, and shellfish; and
 - A framework that identifies the stressors to the ecosystem (the DPSIR approach).

Once these two portions of the document have been drafted, we need to “map” the questions to the frameworks and provisional indicators. The final, completed straw dog will be distributed to participants in advance of a conversation forum where the frameworks would be reviewed; the mapping of the assessment questions is discussed; and gaps are identified. The product of this forum would be a revised document that includes a complete proposed set or spectrum of assessment questions for the next 20 years.

After this first forum, work would continue to prioritize (for the Biennial Science Work Plan), and to identify existing capacity and strategies for addressing gaps.

NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES FOR FRAMEWORKS

The following subcommittee members agreed to develop written descriptions of these frameworks: biological, Bruce; geochemical, Gary G; human health, Heather; and DPSIR, Scott. They will each attempt to create something for Scott to share with the Science Panel in advance of its upcoming workshop on selecting indicators for measuring and reporting ecosystem health. These four subcommittee members will communicate by phone and email as needed to accomplish this task as soon as possible.

NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES FOR ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

In order to inform the Science Panel's discussion about provisional indicators on Monday July 21st, the subcommittee agreed that by the end of next week (July 18th) the existing assessment questions or monitoring objectives will either be identified and compiled or a path and timeline to accomplish this will be identified by the following subcommittee members:

- Scott will request that Steve Ralph complete his assignment to identify assessment questions for “water resources integrity” (includes fresh and marine, quantity and quality, and aquatic habitat) by the 18th;
- Karen, as project manager of the Stormwater Work Group will describe the process and timeline for delivering assessment questions for stormwater (the Core Team is meeting to explore identification of preliminary questions on July 22nd);
- Scott will request that Ken Currens identify the assessment questions for the salmon recovery effort (MAMA plan) by the 18th;
- Bob will attempt to pull from existing PSAMP documents the information we are looking for, convey our request to PSAMP members, and describe a process and timeline for delivering assessment questions for the existing marine ambient monitoring program;

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

- Other subcommittee members may identify and contribute relevant assessment questions during this time frame.

Scott (with Steve Ralph) will pull these questions together into a single organized document in advance of the Science Panel meeting on August 6th-7th. If time allows, they will also “map” the questions to the frameworks described in the first portion of the draft document, thereby identifying gaps.

DEADLINE FOR COMPLETING AND DISTRIBUTING THE STRAW DOG

The draft document will be distributed no later than August 15th to appropriate, technically knowledgeable stakeholders. Prior to August 15th, Karen will develop an invitation list that includes at least the following: the Science Panel; all Consortium interested parties; PSAMP; PSNERP; CMER; WFM; NWIFC; CMER; the Chinook recovery world (ask Rebecca Ponzio at PSP); John Pierce; and the Canadians (ask Scott). In the invitation, we need to specifically identify the kind of engagement we are expecting from the participants (*i.e.*, the science orientation of the meeting).

PLANNING THE FIRST “CONVERSATION”

The “conversation” where the straw dog is reviewed will be held on Monday September 15th. Karen and Scott will develop an agenda, in consultation by email with the rest of the subcommittee. In organizing the agenda we must have specific points to address and questions to ask the participants, such as:

- Is the framework right?
- Are the assessment questions right?
- Is the “mapping” right?
- Does the document justify current and future biennial science work plans?
- How should we approach implementation?
 - Have we identified the main stable programs and sources of money to build on?
 - How might we ask existing programs to modify their current activities?

Karen, with Partnership staff or consultant assistance assigned by Scott, will identify a venue. Karen and Scott will also identify what facilitation services are needed and see to it that they are provided.

NEXT MEETINGS

The Science Panel may provide feedback on the straw dog at its meeting on August 6th-7th.

The subcommittee will meet again by phone, if needed, on the afternoon of Monday August 11th. Scott will arrange a conference call to begin at 1:00.

The “conversation” where the straw dog is reviewed will be held on Monday September 15th.