

PUGET SOUND COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 9 April 2008 9:30 AM – 1 p.m.

University of Washington Tacoma
The Tacoma Room (GWP Room 320)

Final Summary

OF THE COMMITTEE'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

Attendees and the organizations they represent:

Sarah Brace, Puget Sound Partnership; **Paul Bucich**, City of Federal Way; **Allison Butcher**, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; **Paul Crane**, City of Everett; **Bruce Crawford**, NOAA; **Karen Dinicola**, ECY and the Governance Committee's project manager; **Rob Duff**, ECY; **Leska Fore**, Statistical Design; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL); **Julie Hall**, Seattle Public Utilities; **Bob Johnston**, U.S. Navy and Science Panel member; **Doug MacDonald**, unaffiliated; **Fran McNair**, WDNR; **Kit Paulsen**, City of Bellevue; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **Ron Shultz**, Washington State Conservation Commission; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Groups and the Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; **Rob Wilson**, Environmental Protection Agency; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE REFINES DRAFT PROPOSAL, INCLUDING THE TWO GOVERNANCE MODELS

The Governance Committee will present its findings and two governance options to the Puget Sound Partnership's Science Panel in preliminary form on April 15th and as more formal recommendations on June 19th. The Committee meeting was devoted to making specific suggestions for editing the nine-page paper and the PowerPoint that describe the two options in preparation for the April 15th presentation. (*Note:* Karen is making changes the Committee suggested; the revised paper and PowerPoint will be distributed to the Committee early during the week of April 14th.)

Beyond specific language changes, these were major concepts or issues that the Committee discussed in regard to the two governance options:

1. Local government representatives reiterated that among their interests in a regional monitoring program is the need for it to help satisfy their NPDES monitoring requirements.
2. Whichever model is chosen, decision-making power, and roles and responsibilities, need to be clearly delineated and defined. Under the Puget Sound Partnership model, how do we give an "imperfect bully pulpit" the authority to produce tangible results? What components need to be part of the structure to ensure that monitoring and assessment remain high priorities, and over time are not diluted by competing priorities? For the Private Institute

model, how do we structure and maintain open and “two way” lines of communication between the myriad of stakeholders and the Steering Committee and Technical Work Groups, which are key components of the model?

3. For either model, who has the final say in decisions about allocating and expending funds, and how are the interests and needs of a variety of parties met through how funding is spent?
4. Staffing of monitoring and assessment under either model needs to be increased. The Committee’s recommendations need to illustrate a new business model, i.e., more efficient use of existing resources coupled with additional resources to produce desired results. Much of the program’s staffing will rely upon the stakeholders’ existing resources, used even more efficiently through better coordination and more consensus decisions about goals and priorities. Yet that won’t be enough. An increase in the level of staffing devoted to monitoring and assessment is needed, and part of our challenge will be to convince decision-makers, particularly private sector representatives, that it is in their best interests to staff this program at the level required to produce the desired results.
5. A somewhat related topic was also discussed: The independence of the staff, or the independence of the program, i.e., the ability to produce credible science, and to comment on how it is applied in an objective, perhaps even “watchdog” manner. What would it take to provide or protect this independent voice no matter which model is selected?

TAKING THIS PROPOSAL TO THE NEXT LEVEL

During the discussion of the draft paper and PowerPoint, a few ideas were generated about how to proceed after the initial briefing of the Science Panel, including:

- The Committee, primarily Karen Dinicola, is extensively briefing key stakeholders about our evolving development and analysis of the two governance options. But to get their undivided attention, more formally solicit their ideas and suggestions, and build deeper support for the regional monitoring program, the Committee should consider convening a meeting of representatives of these groups between the two presentations to the Science Panel.
- While not trying to pressure the Science Panel, the Committee might want to suggest to the members of the Panel questions for which their answers would help us in refining the options before making recommendations to them in June. Among the questions that were suggested were: 1) What are your initial reactions and responses to these two options? And does it appear to you that more options are needed? 2) What additional information do you need to be able to effectively discuss and assess them? 3) Might these options support initiatives and efforts outside the Puget Sound Partnership’s mandate? 4) What kinds of work groups might assist your work? Does the structure we are developing appear to meet your needs, or do we need to consider other structures or reporting relationships to allow the work groups to achieve your interests and needs?

Karen, and whomever else from the Committee who attends, will report to us the key themes and issues of the discussion following the April 15th update to the Science Panel of our work.

COMMENTS REQUESTED ON PILOT PROJECTS BY FRIDAY, 25 APRIL

The Committee did not have time during the meeting to review and discuss the five pilot projects recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee and a subset of the Governance Committee.

In preparation for today's meeting, facilitator Jim Reid sent to all Committee members descriptions of the five proposed projects, the remaining two which were not recommended at this time, and a "big picture" explanation of the reasons why these five are recommended.

Committee members are requested to review the descriptions and send their comments on the projects to Jim Reid by April 25th. More specifically, can you indicate whether or not you can endorse this package being submitted to the Department of Ecology (which has \$400,000 to fund the initial set of pilot projects)?

If you have any questions, please call Karen at 360.407.6550 or Jim at 206.324.2061. They will either answer your questions or direct you to the appropriate person on the Technical Advisory Committee.

THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S NEXT MEETING IS FRIDAY, 9 MAY 2008

We will meet on the Tacoma campus of the University of Washington from 9:30 – 1.