

PUGET SOUND MONITORING CONSORTIUM

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 9 May 2008 9:30 AM – Noon

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:

Joel Baker, UW Tacoma and Science Panel Chair; **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; **Bruce Crawford**, NOAA; **Bill Derry** (CH2MHill), APWA Stormwater Managers; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology) Monitoring Consortium Project Manager; **Rich Doenges**, Washington Dept. of Natural Resources; **Rob Duff**, Ecology; **Leska Fore**, Statistical Design; **Gary Gill**, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; **Stuart Glasoe**, Washington Dept. of Health; **Julie Hall**, City of Seattle; **Doug MacDonald**, unaffiliated; **Matt Peterson**, Quadrant Homes and Master Builders Association; **Lynda Ring-Erickson**, Mason County Commissioner; **Joanna Richey**, King County; **Susan Crowley Saffery**, City of Seattle; **Ron Shultz**, Washington State Conservation Commission; **Cullen Stephenson**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Ken Stone**, Washington Dept. of Transportation; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Caucus of the Puget Sound Partnership; **Gary Turney**, USGS Water Resources Science Center; **Rob Wilson**, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and **Jim Reid**, facilitator.

COMMITTEE ACCEPTS INVITATION TO ASSIST IN DEVELOPING THE MONITORING PLAN

The Puget Sound Partnership's Science Panel Chair, Joel Baker, invited the Puget Sound Monitoring Consortium to assist the Partnership in developing the monitoring components of the strategic science plan. Following a ninety-minute discussion that was summarized by one Committee member's comment that this is an invitation to "contribute meaningfully to the substance of the strategic science and monitoring plans," the Governance Committee members accepted the invitation.

Partnership staff and the Science Panel asked the Consortium to partner with them to convene conversations about the development of monitoring strategies for each of five topics: water quality, water quantity, habitat and land use, species and food web, and human health. The purpose of these conversations, which will take place in June and July, is to obtain stakeholder input to guide the Partnership's development of monitoring strategies.

Before making the decision, the Committee identified and discussed a number of options for its future role. Some Committee members suggested that by identifying two governance options, the Governance Committee has fulfilled its mandate and could disband. Others modified that idea to suggest the Committee go on hiatus until later this year or next year, when it might be appropriate to resume discussions that are pertinent to its mandate to recommend the governance structure needed to achieve coordinated regional monitoring. Other Committee members expressed concern that in accepting the Science Panel's invitation, the Committee or Consortium could be taking on too much responsibility for a short period of time. Some of the members who expressed this concern felt that the Committee could engage in a few but not all the topics to ensure that it does a good job; water quality and topics related to it were mentioned. And some members offered the idea that the Technical Advisory Committee may be the body that engages with the Science Panel because of the members' technical expertise. A different view was expressed when some members pointed out that the Governance Committee has broader representation.

In accepting the Science Panel's invitation, the Governance Committee agreed that the Consortium will provide a forum for convening these conversations. Consortium members, or representatives of their organizations whom the Consortium members help identify and recruit, will ensure that a wide range of perspectives and interests are represented and heard during the course of these conversations.

According to the Science Panel's schedule, the strategic science plan will be submitted for printing on 1 November 2008, so the early to mid-summer timing of these conversations will inform the science plan's monitoring element.

The Consortium's project manager and facilitator, Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid, respectively, will work with Scott Redman, a Partnership staff member to the Science Panel, and the Partnership's consultants, Steven Ralph and Ken Currens, to determine the specific next steps to convene these conversations. In addition, at the end of the meeting a number of Governance Committee members volunteered to help determine the process by which the Consortium can most effectively assist the Science Panel. The Committee members whom Karen and Jim will involve in this process discussion are: Allison Butcher, Bruce Crawford, Rob Duff, Leska Fore, Gary Gill, Doug MacDonald, Joanna Richey (or another representative of King County), Susan Saffery, Ron Shultz, Gary Turney, and Heather Trim.

COMMITTEE JOINS WITH TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN AGREEING TO A BROAD SCOPE AND PROCESS FOR FORMING A STORMWATER WORK GROUP

The Governance Committee's second major agreement of the meeting was endorsing the establishment of a stormwater work group. Specifically, the Governance Committee, in similar fashion to the agreement of the Technical Monitoring Committee on 7 May, agreed that:

- Stormwater extends beyond water quality issues to other topics: it is an important driver/pathway in nearly every conceptual model being developed by the indicators work group for the six Partnership topics.
- The work group will address stormwater in a manner that is inclusive of water quality, habitat, and human health. It will not be limited to addressing Municipal NPDES permit issues; it will include other types of permittees, and also the full range of local jurisdictions and land uses from rural to urban.

- The new work group will keep an eye on “the big picture” while focusing on identifying what monitoring needs to be done to ensure that we reduce harm from stormwater.
- The new work group, in light of its work in developing a governance structure for addressing stormwater issues, will evaluate the two governance models defined by the Governance Committee, and any additional models that may emerge from the evaluation, and make recommendations to the Governance Committee. Following the Committee’s review and discussion, the recommendations will be presented to the Department of Ecology, the Puget Sound Partnership, and the State Legislature.
- The work group will not be *ad hoc*; it will have clearly identified, diverse membership and include key entities not currently represented in this Committee.
- The work group will consider whether to have both technical and policy committees, similar to the way PSAMP is currently structured.
- The work group will specifically connect the conversations taking place in June and July for developing the monitoring strategies of the strategic science plan to the mission, purpose, and range of issues and questions to be addressed by the stormwater workgroup.
- A “core” group will be identified to draft the initial work group scope and membership.

A purpose of the stormwater work group could be to help develop a monitoring plan that enables us to know whether or not we are reducing harm caused to Puget Sound by stormwater. The work group’s efforts could be helpful to the Puget Sound Partnership and Science Panel as it develops monitoring strategies, to the Department of Ecology as it prepares for the next round of NPDES permits, and to a variety of federal, state, and local agencies, and to business organizations, as they meet a variety of monitoring mandates.

Some of the key ongoing issues or questions that could be included in the stormwater work group’s focus include: the number of forested acres; the number of miles of road; the total amount of impervious surfaces; the amount of natural soil in a given area that has been or is being taken away because of development or other similar factors; stream flow data; and the percent of pre-1995 development that has been retrofitted to meet current standards.

Among the parties that the Committee members suggested be included in the stormwater work group are representatives of: PSAMP; the Conservation Districts; the WRIA forums. A number of Committee members also requested that Bill Moore of Ecology be involved.

The Committee agreed to define the charter of the stormwater work group—its purpose and functions, the roles and responsibilities of workgroup members, and its relationship to the Science Panel—before undertaking identifying and “chartering” any additional workgroups.

As the meeting concluded, it was suggested that the “core group” that will develop a draft charter should consist of approximately eight to ten people. They will likely submit to the Governance Committee the draft charter in mid-summer, once the June-July conversations on the five topics have taken place.

Karen and Jim will work with the Governance Committee members to identify the “core group” members, the process for developing the stormwater workgroup charter, and the timing of presenting it to the Governance Committee.