

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 9 July 2008 9:30 AM – Noon
University of Washington Tacoma
The Tacoma Room (GWP Room 320)

Draft Summary

OF THE COMMITTEE'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Pam Bennett-Cumming, Mason County; **Doug Bulthuis**, Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve; **Allison Butcher**, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Paul Crane**, City of Everett; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Monitoring Consortium Project Manager; **Rob Duff**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Tom Eaton**, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; **Stuart Glasoe**, Washington State Department of Health; **Julie Hall**, City of Seattle; **Kris Holm**, Association of Washington Business (AWB); **Bruce Jones**, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission; **Mel Oleson**, The Boeing Company; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Scott Redman**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **Susan Crowley Saffery**, City of Seattle; **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; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE DECISIONS FROM THE MEETING

These are the two main decisions made by the Governance Committee at the meeting:

Decision #1:

The Committee agreed that this Friday, 11 July Scott Redman and Karen Dinicola will convene a meeting to discuss and make progress on how effectiveness monitoring and status and trends monitoring can be incorporated into the biennial work plan of the Puget Sound Partnership's monitoring element of the strategic science plan.

- The meeting will take place from 9 a.m. – noon at the University of Washington Tacoma campus in the Tacoma Room.
- All Governance Committee members or their representatives are invited to attend, particularly those members who at the Governance Committee's meeting on 9 May 2008 volunteered to assist Scott and Karen in structuring the series of conversations about topics that will likely be addressed by the monitoring element of the strategic science plan.

- The outcomes of the meeting are intended to be: 1) a list of topics around which the forums could be convened; 2) the process for engaging stakeholders over time, beginning with these forums; and 3) a list of the key stakeholders who should be invited to participate.

Decision #2:

Prompted by its initial discussion of the draft outline of the report to the legislature from the Governance Committee (to be submitted in December) that Karen presented at the meeting, the Committee agreed to:

- Begin to define more clearly the Committee’s recommendations that will be included in that report. The Committee’s recommendations are likely to fall within these areas: 1) governance structure; 2) the future and expectations of the Monitoring Consortium during the next biennium, including its roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the Puget Sound Partnership’s Leadership Council and Science Panel, and how it would work with those and other bodies; and 3) the future work of the Stormwater Work Group, and its roles and responsibilities in assisting the Puget Sound Partnership to produce the strategic science plan’s monitoring element as part of the Action Agenda.
- Authorize Karen and Jim to begin to write the draft report to the legislature according to the suggestions and direction of the Committee, including: 1) clearly and concisely state the value of the Monitoring Consortium and why its work is important to the future of Puget Sound, the public, and the legislature; 2) provide more context—the problems to be addressed and resolved—in the Executive Summary and/or at the report’s beginning (begin with the one-page problem/purpose statement written in February when the Committee began to examine and discuss governance options); and 3) in the Executive Summary and/or at the start of the report, clarify that the role of the Monitoring Consortium is not to replace any existing monitoring efforts, but to connect them to one another, and thus to strengthen them all while making monitoring, which is costly, more efficient and effective.

As the discussion was coming to an end, Tom Eaton reminded the group that in the past the legislature has not funded “stand alone” monitoring budget proposals. To succeed in gaining legislative approval of funding for monitoring, we need to make it part of a more complete or comprehensive proposal of actions to address the needs of Puget Sound and the agencies who are working to clean it up. If we can articulate the benefits of the overall proposal, and those the monitoring component of the proposal, and submit a reasonably priced monitoring plan that has the support of us all, then we increase the chances that the legislature will fund monitoring. The Consortium can play a crucial role in articulating the benefits of monitoring, and helping the Puget Sound Partnership and state agencies in putting together the proposal. And we need to be available to jointly advocate for it when the legislature considers it.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS AND ACTIONS FOLLOWING THE MEETING

During the course of the meeting, Committee members suggested these steps or actions:

1. Add to the Consortium’s webpage the pilot project grant agreements that Ecology has executed with the project leads. Schedule a meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee

(TAC) in October as part of the formal feedback mechanism from the pilot project activities to this committee.

2. Place on a future Governance Committee agenda a discussion of information management and exchange, including a briefing on the EPA Exchange Node project that the Puget Sound Partnership and the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) are undertaking to be able to exchange information on the Puget Sound. In addition, the BIBI database pilot project and the state hydrography layer project could be highlighted as other examples of how information could be shared among jurisdictions, and how the exchange of information might work under the two governance models the Committee previously developed.
3. Circulate among the Governance Committee members the paper that Bill Wilkerson, chair of the Washington Forum on Monitoring, proposed to write in which he indicated he would suggest that the Puget Sound Partnership be the lead for monitoring in the Puget Sound region, with the WFM serving as support to the Partnership.
4. Begin to re-energize the committee's process to develop recommendations for governance of a coordinated monitoring and assessment program for Puget Sound to be presented to the Puget Sound Partnership. Schedule meeting dates through November to support these discussions.

MONITORING CONSORTIUM BUDGET UPDATE

Rob Duff informed the committee that the Water Quality Program at Ecology is experiencing a severe shortfall in the permit fee account that was to provide half of the \$800K proviso for the current biennium and anticipates cutting about \$200K of the budget for this effort. Ecology has committed \$400K to the four pilot projects and the Stormwater Work Group, and the agency is committed to continuing to support the Governance Committee and will ensure that project management and facilitation services provided to this committee by Karen and Jim will continue to be provided at least through the end of this biennium (June 30, 2009).

NEXT MEETING

The Committee's Next Meeting is on Wednesday, 13 August, 9:30 – Noon at the University of Washington Tacoma.