

Puget Sound Partnership

our sound, our community, our chance

Puget Sound Leadership Council Meeting Summary

January 28 & 29, 2008
SW WA Pipe Trades Training Center
Lacey, Washington

DAY 1

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Dan O'Neal
- Bill Wilkerson
- Steve Sakuma
- Martha Kongsgaard

Staff:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Paul Bergman, Communications Director
- Joe Ryan, Salmon Programs Director
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
- Diane Hodgson, Management Assistant to Bill Ruckelshaus
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Bill Frank, Jr.

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting.
A full recording of this meeting is retained by Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record.*

Action Items:

- Elect Vice-chair of the Leadership Council
- Approve Summary of December 17, 2007 Leadership Council meeting

Meeting Summary:

- Action Agenda Development – update and Council guidance
- Communication Plan update
- Land Use Panel Briefing
- EPA Data Report
- Monitoring Program Update
- Data Management Update
- General Council Business

Day 1

9:10 a.m. CALL TO ORDER – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the agenda for the day.

He then discussed the process used in selection of the chair and vice chair of the Leadership Council, while the governor selects the chair of the Council. It is up to the Council itself to select the vice-chair.

Bill Wilkerson made a **MOTION** to elect Martha Kongsgaard to the Vice Chair position. Dan O'Neal **SECONDED** the Motion. The Council **APPROVED** the selection of Martha Kongsgaard as Vice Chair of the Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER UPDATES/COMMENTS

- Martha Kongsgaard has met with King County. Ron Sims is that area's representative as well as the chair of the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) Chair. During her meeting she was updated on the King County storm water plan which is an inspirational document as far as storm water can be.
- Dan O'Neal is covering the Hood Canal Action Area. Teri King is the ECB representative for this Action Area. Teri has begun to work on the inventory and several meetings have been held. There is a Dissolved Oxygen study that has been going on and will be completed in the spring. He is trying to figure out what is happening in the area and what to report on.
- Steve Sakuma covers the Whidbey Action Area. This is the largest Action Area. Gary Rowe is the ECB representative and Linda Lyshall is the Partnership staff liaison. The three met and talked about what is going on in the Action Area. They have discussed different approaches on how to figure out who and how things should be reported and what is going on in the Action Area; kind of a job description for each position. They are meeting on Wednesday with the key people in the Action Area to get their input and do an inventory assessment and explore paths that they think the Partnership should be following – information sharing, networking, and outreach. Very positive so far. Will build the organization as we go.
- Martha Neuman reported for David Dicks on the Central Sound Action Area. A West Sound Watershed Council has been created in Kitsap County. Steve Bauer, ECB representative for this Action Area opened the meeting. This was the first meeting of this group so many met for the first time; they also noted groups who were missing (business, state and federal offices, agriculture, and the Navy). Steve Bauer has asked for a presentation for the ECB members to use when going out to talk. Dan O'Neal asked if the meeting was part of the Ecology grant and Martha reported that yes this was one of the watershed integration grants.
- Bill Wilkerson reported for the Strait of Juan de Fuca Action Area. He will be going to a meeting on Wednesday with Martha Neuman. Steve Tharinger is the ECB Action Area representative for the area. This group is organized and have a

full agenda for the day. He sees the Leadership Council's role as the cheerleaders in leading them into the Action Agenda.

- Diana Gale has the San Juan Action Area and has been actively working in the area. She will report on day 2 of the meeting when she is here.
- Terry Wright reported for Billy Frank on the South Puget Sound Action Area. Dan Wrye is the ECB representative for this area. This group met last week, it is a very good active group. At the meeting the letter that went to the state agencies was handed out. This group believes that what is missing is the "what is needed" question and they will be setting up a meeting to discuss this in their area soon. Terry noted that Billy was clear that the Leadership Council wants to use a collaborative system for the process. This Action Area group is beginning to understand the framework.
- Chair Ruckelshaus handed out a document on land use from the League of Women Voters. He complimented the hard work of the staff in everything that is going on around the Sound. He also reported that the first meeting of the Science Panel was held on January 25, 2008. They do not have a chair yet but are working on this process. They are an outstanding group of scientists and will be a great help in the development of the Action Agenda.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE

David Dicks provided an update on what has happened with the agency since the last meeting:

- Staffing – the agency is pretty much to full staff – Joe Ryan, salmon manager will give an update on where we are with the shared strategy integration later in the meeting
- The salmon recovery plan has had a lot of really good work that has been vetted and is a good base for the Action Agenda although it doesn't cover everything that the Action Agenda will need to cover, it will be a good start
- Chris Townsend has been hired as David's policy assistant – he will be on staff in a couple weeks
- Staff has been working on developing a monitoring program. There is a need to have some kind of central monitoring system to account for what is going on and to find a way to bring some coherence. There will be a longer discussion on this issue on Day 2 of the meeting when Sarah Brace provides an update. Chair Ruckelshaus reported that the Partnership is charged with holding everyone accountable on achieving their tasks so this is something that we must have
- The first meeting of the Science Panel was on Friday, January 25. This is a good group of scientists. We will need to figure out how to keep this group independent but also work closely with the Partnership in the production of the Action Agenda
- Budget – There is \$2.2 million in governor's budget, which is now before the Legislature
- The Partnership is a state agency but will also have the non-profit aspect so are a hybrid of a typical state agency

- There is a weekly Joint Natural Resource Cabinet meeting to discuss bills that may effect natural resource agencies
- Legislation – There are several bills that could affect the Partnership, highlighting three:
 - One bill is a dredging bill that would give the Partnership regulatory authority,
 - Another is a marine reserve system sponsored by Senator Rockefeller, one concern with this bill is the workload issue and it would also give the Partnership regulatory authority. Staff is working with Senator Rockefeller on this bill since it is an important issue and needs to be addressed in the Action Agenda in some way, and
 - Final bill takes money from the Port of Seattle and gives it to the Partnership to develop the Action Agenda.

The Council discussed the Legislative session and what process the Leadership Council should use to handle legislation. Every day Council members get asked to support someone's plan or issue. The Council does want to keep apprized of what is going on with the Legislature but do not want to have a special meeting each time there is an issue. For this session the message is to slow down and wait for the Action Agenda to be completed. There was a suggestion to have a subcommittee for staff to consult on legislative issues. Once this Legislative session is over will need to figure out how to address legislation in the future. Katy Johansson, Jim Cahill, and David are the main staff working on the legislation with Cullen's assistance.

- David has met with many key legislators talking about the Action Agenda
- The confirmation hearing for the Leadership Council members was held on January 18. Bill Ruckelshaus, Martha Kongsgaard, Dan O'Neal, and Billy Frank Jr. attended this hearing. Senator Rockefeller would like to have a second hearing with Diana Gale, Steve Sakuma, and Bill Wilkerson since they were unable to make it to this hearing
- The Partnership has a new Web site (www.psp.wa.gov). Jon Bridgman created this site and is still working on getting a few more things completed, when done it will be really robust and interactive
- The Action Agenda is moving along, a team of consultants has been hired to facilitate the Action Area workshops. The four questions seem to be the right questions to be asking
- The Communications Team has been doing a great job and will report on activities later in the meeting
- One thing the Communications Team has been working on is a five-minute flash video called "Shifting Baselines" to be used during presentations and posted on the Web page. This will be ready in the next couple weeks
- Chair Ruckelshaus and David have both meet with the Governor in the last couple weeks. David was very encouraged with his meeting with the Governor.

Chair Ruckelshaus reported that he also had a good meeting and the Governor is very supportive of what the Puget Sound Partnership is doing

- The federal government has provided \$20 million for the Action Agenda work, still working on the exact wording of the agreement
- In general the Partnership is in good shape with great staff

Joe Ryan, Salmon Manager

- Discussed the status of the shared strategy work
- He will be hiring two salmon project managers
- At its December meeting, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) allocated \$42 million for project in the Puget Sound along with the money that was for statewide salmon recovery
- Will need to develop another project list for the next round of salmon grants
- Has been working on monitoring needs

Martha Kongsgaard asked how the timing of the 2020 deadline for the Action Agenda meets with the Salmon Recovery Plan. Joe reported that the salmon plan is a 50-year plan. The Council discussed the possible need to reconcile the two dates. This may not be a problem as the salmon will need to go through several life-cycles before we will know what is happening and the Partnership work may accelerate the salmon recovery efforts. Monitoring will be able to show if we are getting results. Will be working to merge the salmon recovery and the health of Puget Sound by selecting projects that will help both. The salmon plan does not cover harvest and hatchery issues and this will need to be addressed at some time. Will need to make sure local officials continue to be involved in both the Salmon Recovery Plan and the Action Agenda.

ACTION AGENDA PROCESS AND OUTREACH PROGRAM UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS – Martha Neuman, Molly Adolfson, and Pat Serie (See meeting materials for details.)

- Pat provided an overview of her firm and Molly provided an overview of her firm and work they do
- Martha reviewed the four questions and development process to complete the first Action Agenda by September 1, 2008:
 - What is the status? Mary Ruckelshaus' work to synthesis existing sound-wide efforts will be used to answer this question
 - What is a healthy Puget Sound? The Science Panel supports the Legislative definition as it could take forever to define a healthy Puget Sound. Will be working with the indicators and benchmarks to define the ecosystem health and what needs to be done to get from point 'a' to point 'b'
 - What actions do we need to take? The inventory results will provide a high level baseline on what is being done currently, roles, and responsibilities.

The inventories are due February 11 and will be reviewed during the Action Area workshops

- Trying to do two processes at the same time – public outreach and action agenda review and development
- Topical workshops will be scheduled and use existing white papers and work that has been done in the last year and a half as a starting point for discussion

The Council discussed the need to figure out ways to gather information from business organizations and other private sectors such as agriculture, forestry, and Boeing. Discussed possibility of asking these groups to provide a narrative on their land use practices, what they are contributing to the protection of Puget Sound, and what problems they see. Could send them the four questions also. These groups will want to show what they are doing to help the environment and may have a lot of ideas on how to do things differently. Need to find a way to see this as a positive opportunity to do the right things and get those who are not doing the right thing to start doing the right thing. Steve Sakuma talked about some of the permitting costs he has in the agricultural business. He is getting charged \$20,000 for his NPDES permit, so he is getting charged to do the right things. Talked about the fact that if you can't articulate the problem clearly it is hard to get the public support.

- Topic forums will be on human health and prosperity, water quality, water quantity, land use/habitat, biodiversity and food web
- These topic forums will build on existing work and then have the large workgroups assist with goals, compare current status, and prioritize criteria
- Topic forums will be convened in the Action Areas starting with small core working groups pulling together the materials and then taking the information to the larger group to address science and policy questions
- Anyone can participate in the forums and the materials will also be on posted on the Web for comment so everyone can be involved

Steve Sakuma would like to make sure there is a purpose statement for each of these forums to keep them focused and on track. Will want to make sure the time is best spent. Martha Neuman agreed with the need to keep the groups very focused and to set aside issues needing to be addressed in the second year plan or with another topic session. Molly noted that although much of this type work has been done in the past, in many ways this is a first due to the timeframe. It needs to be inclusive but still keep the core group focused on the topic.

- Discussed how the process for the topic forums will work. The core group will create a three to five page document for each topic forum using the four questions and existing information. This will then be taken to the topic forum meeting for feedback and input from the larger group, to find out what we know about the problem and what is being done to work on this. The documents will

then be refined to end up with clear synthesis for each topic to include in the Action Agenda and get to the Science Panel for review

- Don't want to start from scratch and this is a way to not start from scratch but to take what has been done to date and build off of it
- Martha noted that there are additional topics that will be needed to be worked on such as monitoring, funding, climate change, education, and research modeling
- Some will need to be used to inform the larger topics and some are their own topic
- Martha Neuman believes another focus group should be added to address monitoring as a separate topic
- Need to do more work on how to set priorities and develop report card
- Each of the Action Areas will have a focused workshop series to pull people and interests together, review questions and add local perspectives. These workshops will be conducted using the Action Area teams consisting of a Leadership Council member, the Ecosystem Coordination Board Area representative, and Partnership staff
- Martha reviewed the Proposed Roadmap to Completion for the Action Agenda
- The Science Panel has suggested a large forum with breakout groups on specific topic discussions since so many of the topics are interrelated
- One task for both the Leadership Council and Ecosystem Coordination Board is to figure out who the key people are and to recruit them to get them to the Topic Forum and Action Area meetings
- There is a sharepoint site that has been set up so that there is a central point where documents are available for the internal team to work on
- Martha Neuman talked about one of the differences with the Partnership is the human economics side of things. Chair Ruckelshaus talked about the current work being done at the World Resource Institute and that this group will be presenting at the next Leadership Council meeting on either March 3rd or 4th and may possibly include the Ecosystem Coordination Board and Science Panel members for this workshop. This work is on how you can value the water, air and land on an economic level

COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY AND UPDATE - Paul Bergman, Rick Desimone, and Dan Kully (See meeting materials for details.)

- Paul recognized Bill Wilkerson and Martha Kongsgaard who have been helping him on the communication subcommittee
- The communication goal is to raise public awareness regarding threats to the Sound and channel energy and resources into the necessary actions
- Can't do all things Puget Sound related but need to focus on the goal

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if any of the Leadership Council have any changes to the goal. Bill Wilkerson likes the goal. He doesn't want it to get too big but keep it targeted

on specific actions. Dan O'Neal asked if this is the goal or phase one? Paul reported that this is the overarching communication goal and will have objectives in the future.

Dan asked when will the necessary actions will be identified. Paul noted that this will happen as the Action Agenda is developed. The Council discussed how this is a goal for the whole agency not just the communication goal as channeling the energy and resources is not just the communication, could put "help" in front of the "channel energy ..."

Rick noted that if the communication plan is done right, it should be seamless and the communication plan will be informed by the rest of the tasks. Decided that the goal is linked to the greater effort and should be kept as is.

- Challenge on the low public awareness of the problem and how to get the information out and understandable by the general public. This is a multi-year effort and we are starting in a good position as there is strong public support in leaving the Sound healthy as a legacy
- Dan asked if the plan is also to communicate what not to do? Discussed need for a sticker on good or bad for the Sound and need to get down to very specific behavioral changes. Will need to show the public why doing things one way is not good for the Sound and to provide them alternate ways to behave
- Two step process: first is development and delivery of the Action Agenda, and the second phase is to raise the public awareness of problems and actions. Will get more to the public awareness step after the Action Agenda is out.
- Will be talking about the health of the Sound in general in the first stage and then after the Action Agenda is out, will get to the specific behavioral changes
- Need to have a list of things people can do now so when they ask what can they do to help we'll be able to give them something to do. There are a lot of existing materials that could be used
- Need to get the non-profit up and going so that people can support with donations but need to clearly define what the non-profit will be doing
- After September 1st, will start communicating what's in the plan and what that means including doing editorial boards

The Council talked timing of the release during the political campaign. Won't want to spend a lot on advertising but need to make sure the politicians are aware, that people know enough about the issue to put the health of the Sound into their thinking when electing the leaders, and for the politicians to be able to use the Action Agenda.

- Paul reviewed the communication themes and noted that the themes will be used in the materials they develop for everyone to use when attending meetings
- There are a lot of communication groups working in the Sound and these efforts need to be coordinated. The first meeting is scheduled for February 6

- The Partnership has taken on the EcoNetwork, previously lead by Ecology, it is an environmental educators partnership and has over 200 members currently
- Should start setting up Puget Sound Partners but first need the definition of what a partner is and how to become a partner
- Talked about how saving the Sound is first a way to communicate what “the Sound” means – is it the water, the nearshore, the region, or crest to crest?
- “Our Sound, our community, our chance” is our tag line
- May want to talk more about water issue “snow cap to the white caps” since water is the common element that holds it all together. People understand the basic hydrology of water, the concept of the whole thing being in trouble is harder to understand
- Need support to protect the Sound into the future not just a one time fix
- Key actions in the next six months include: research, public awareness, Action Agenda development, Ecosystem Coordination Board, Science Panel, and Leadership Council support, and to charter and organize the non-profit

PUBLIC COMMENT

- No public comment

LAND USE PANEL

- Cascadia Land Conservancy – Gene Duvernoy
- The Nature Conservancy – Bill Robinson
- Puget Sound Regional Council – Norman Abbott

Chair Ruckelshaus introduced this agenda item asking the panel members to introduce themselves.

Gene Duvernoy, Cascadia Land Conservancy

- Provided a video on the how the Puget Sound is nature’s funnel and it all rolls down hill
- In the next 100 years the Puget Sound Basin will experience population growth equivalent to 15 cities the size of Seattle
- Believes we need to conserve 1.3 million acres (1 million in working forests and farm and 265,000 parks, natural areas and shorelines) to keep the economics as well as environmental benefits in balance
- Need to make living in cities and towns livable so that people want to live in the cities and towns
- Bottom line 1.3 million acres will cost about \$7 billion
- Need to develop Urban area strategies to efficiently mitigate impacts and attract people by:
 - Redirecting development
(*Transfer of Development Rights*)

- Approaching development differently (*Conservation Villages*)
- Building differently
(*green roofs, membrane waste water treatment*)
- Request to Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council:
 - Endorsement of Cascade Agenda Strategies
 - Link Urban Infrastructure investments with Transfer Development Rights
 - Recommend authorization of Conservation Village demonstration projects
 - Study future costs of sprawl

Bill Robinson, The Nature Conservancy

- Mission to preserve the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive
- Three year goal is to:
 - Create 10 new parks and natural areas
 - Restore 100 miles of shoreline through on-the-ground restoration
 - Protect 1,000 miles of shoreline through improved policies
- About 45 preserves in Washington State
- Conversion of land to public ownership and conservation easements
- Public engagement and action to clean up Puget Sound
- Want to work with the Partnership to have a coordinated effort
- The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy: sustaining our natural resources:
 - Guide investments
 - Incentives and markets
 - Land use and development
 - Science and information
 - Education and Public Engagement
 - Achieving Results
- Land Use gaps and opportunities:
 - Local Jurisdictions lack capacity and scientific information about land use
 - Compliance and enforcement is inconsistent
 - Mitigation could be more effective
 - Innovative approaches could be adopted
 - Biodiversity concepts could be better integrated in to management of public lands

Norman Abbott, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)

- Provided an overview of the PSRC
- Early final draft of Vision 2040 was provided
- All parts of the Vision are connected to water quality in some way
- Wanted to make sure the Partnership review the Vision 2040 prior to asking the public to do something since the action may already be in the vision and been agreed to by local governments

- There is a lot of future work listed in the Vision 2040 document but don't have the ability to do all the actions listed and will need to prioritize
- This is a regional table used to reach local governments
- Contribution has been a regional agreement that links both economics and environment
- Process in constituency building has been successful but has taken 3 years, the Partnership doesn't have three years so could build on their constituency
- People-prosperity-planet is the tag line
- Have developed actions including compact development policies
- Council reviews the transportation aspect of all growth management plans in the region

Questions from the Council:

Martha Kongsgaard asked about the future of the Biodiversity Council.

The recommendation in the plan is to identify a place to permanently house the Biodiversity Council.

Dan O'Neal asked Gene about working their program through the Puget Sound Regional Council since it covers Pierce County also.

Gene reported that the PSRC will be very much a part of the four county market plan.

Bill Wilkerson asked about the one chart Gene had with the \$7 billion purchase price for land, what is the Cascade Land Conservancy's plan to pay for this?

Gene reported that the chart has a breakdown of how this will be met over the next 20 years and he believes the Cascade Agenda will be able to get this amount through a variety of different ways including changes in rules, public funds, private funds and market place initiatives. The chart is a value number not actual cost.

Talked about the need to try to use the same indicators and measures in all the different plans to avoid confusing the public. Once the Leadership Council has its indicators in place, other groups will start to align their indicators. Need to have someone out front to provide the leadership in developing indicators. The Leadership Council will need to have help with getting the right indicators and that are simple enough for the public to understand. The draft Vision 2040 already has a list of benchmarks listed, which may be helpful.

David asked the three groups what the most useful thing the Leadership Council could do to advance the work that has already been done?

- Norman's elected officials don't feel that the vision costs but the need is funds to assist the cities to absorb the growth
- Gene would have the Leadership Council make sure to show the cost of urban sprawl. It is cheaper to prevent than to pay for. Would ask for a strong statement of support for the Cascade Land Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy, and Vision 2040 and the development of a partnership between all the groups

Chair Ruckelshaus believes it would be difficult for the Leadership Council to support the complicated plans of these groups but could support the process, recognize that we are all working toward the same end, and make sure the three groups work as closely as possible in the development of the Action Agenda.

Bill Wilkerson recalled the discussion the Council had during its morning session on how to have a narrative for the different sectors and maybe need to help staff to write the same narrative for each of these groups to say what they are doing. Need to find a way to describe some of the activities that we believe are important to the Sound.

Gene said the Cascade Land Conservancy would be willing to have a staff person designated to assist the Partnership to work on the narrative.

The group then discussed transferable development rights and timeline. Discussed where they have failed it is due to how cumbersome they have become. Need to have a strong GMA and government support. Talked about how transfers of development rights work and ways for success and causes for failure.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the group for their presentation and agreed with the need to work together to protect the environment.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

4:40 p.m. **RECESS FOR EVENING**

Puget Sound Leadership Council
Meeting Summary

January 28 & 29, 2008
SW WA Pipe Trades Training Center
Lacey, Washington

DAY 2

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Dan O'Neal
- Bill Wilkerson
- Steve Sakuma
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Diana Gale

Staff:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
 - Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
 - Sarah Brace, Science Manager
 - Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
 - Diane Hodgson, Management Assistant to Bill Ruckelshaus
 - Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Bill Frank, Jr.
-

8:30 a.m. CALL TO ORDER – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the presentations and actions taken on day 1 of the meeting and the agenda for the day.

EPA'S PUGET SOUND INFORMATION CHALLENGE – Molly O'Neill, assistant administrator and chief information officer (See meeting materials details.)

Molly introduced the presentation providing background on the project and reasoning behind it. The team that came with Molly consisted of Linda Travers, Mary McCaffrey, Harvey Simon, Scott Frazer, and Jerry Johnston.

Jerry provided the presentation.

- First step was to identify broad categories of information important to the plan, suggested themes, and used a WIKI on the internet
- Bill Ruckelshaus was the keynote speaker on November 14 conference via video conferencing
- Mash-up camp was used as a way to drop in and learn about new technologies for bringing together multiple data sets and Web sites

- There were multiple ways to contribute data including e-mail, Web, fax, and phone
- Only open for 36 hours
- Provided updates throughout the 36 hours
- Created keyword "PugetSoundInformationChallenge" for tagging data resources
- URL is www.Pugetsound.epageo.org
- Used different search engines and smart searches
- Data was contributed from a variety of sources one being NASA
- Over 175 contributions of information were made
- Contributions came from several communities (scientists, librarians, federal agencies, states, not-for-profit scientific consortia and the private sector)
- Contributors used several methods to share info but no one used the telephone
- Lessons learned – technology can engage people and encourage their contributions, but people don't want to see technology get in the way, learned about data access, Web 2.0 technologies can be used as tools to assist the mission of multi-stakeholder driven environmental protection partnerships
- For this exercise they weren't asking specific questions but testing to see if this would work
- Monitoring of the data was done by the three staff and very little was removed from the data that was entered
- Talked about the need for someone to host a Web site to enter information such as best practices, tools, etc.

Jerry reported that the Fish and Wildlife Service is working on something like this for ESA but they aren't opening it up to the public for input. Watershed Central is a new system being developed in EPA office of Water.

Talked about different ways to gather, maintain, and host data sources such as this. Chair Ruckelshaus thought that the Partnership may be a spot to host a site since the Partnership has no regulatory authority.

Jerry suggested using Government Core as the meta data requirement to set standards to use on sites like this.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked Molly and her team for doing this exercise which will help the Partnership and the need to stay in touch.

INDICATORS WORK UPDATE – Sandie O'Neill and Tracy Collier (See meeting materials for details.)

- Sandie provided an overview of the indicators work that NOAA has been working on
- Indicators must be understood and of interest to a lot of people

- There will need to be high level “report card” indicators for the public but more detailed indicators below this high level indicator
- Bill Wilkerson asked how to select an indicator – for example he is wary of using salmon as an indicator since there are so many variables that go behind the salmon. Sandie explained that with some indicators, such as salmon, have other indicators behind the high level indicator such as habitat and water quality
- Some of the data on shellfish is available on the Web through the Department of Health but not all the sites are available at this time
- Starting to build potential management options through the indicator work

There was concern with the number of indicators. Need to limit the number of indicators and would suggest only having 5 or 6. Need to narrow down the big list and get down to the workable number to use in the report card.

How to select indicators:

- Specific goals and objectives
- Conceptual models to build a common
- Develop criteria and framework

Have developed narrative goals for the Puget Sound and these are listed in the statute from these goals will identify indicators for each goal.

Will develop framework and criteria for each of the indicators (Drivers-pressures-state-impact-response) most focus is on the state and the impact (what is the problem and what is the outcome because of this problem) the framework should assist in deciding on the final indicators and if additional or different indicators are needed.

This is a start on the indicators but will need to start work to improve the indicators. We are in a multi-phase process to work to get to the final indicators. Will start with policy and science farther apart in this first phase but the goal is to refine the indicators as time goes on and get more overlap between policy and science.

Martha Neuman will be sending the information out to a broader group in February for review and comment.

The Science Panel had this presentation on January 25 and the Ecosystem Coordination Board will be provided with the information on February 8, 2008.

Phase 1 Provisional Indicators Tasks:

1. Create conceptual models that define key structures and function for the six Puget Sound ecosystem components,
2. Develop criteria and a framework to be used for selecting environmental indicators,

3. Identify, compile, and summarize former, current and proposed indicators for the Puget Sound ecosystem, and
4. Select and evaluate the most suitable environmental indicators based on criteria/framework and the conceptual models.

Phase 2+ will:

- Continue dialogue between policy and science
- Using the criteria and framework developed in Phase 1, refine indicator selection, add new indicators, create synthetic indicators as needed.
- Refine conceptual models.
- Add thresholds to Indicators
- Use Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) to model management scenarios
- Trade-offs must happen between goals

This is not purely a scientific exercise but will have policy decisions when deciding on direction. In most cases it will be a societal value decision.

Discussed timing and the next phases of both the Action Agenda and the indicators. Will need to amend as we go and need to constantly refine both. This work will never be perfect.

MONITORING COORDINATION EFFORTS UPDATE – Sarah Brace (See meeting materials for details.)

- Sarah reviewed the different kinds of monitoring and what each different kind of monitoring means (status and trends, effectiveness, validation, implementation, and compliance)
- Martha Kongsgaard feels that the name “Monitoring” sounds more like bean counting and would see what we are looking for is more the evaluation and accountability process
- Statute allows to continue to work with PSAMP and/or create additional monitoring programs
- Three efforts to coordinate monitoring in the state and region include PNAMP (regional), the Washington Forum on Monitoring (statewide), and the Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Consortium (Puget Sound)
- What is needed to strengthen current monitoring programs?
 1. Link to regulatory community
 2. Broader representation
 3. Secure funding
 4. Political independence
 5. Strategic science program needed to prioritize monitoring efforts
 6. Transparent and trustworthy
- Monitoring is the accountability tool.

Discussed need to start out by describing what is needed, what needs to be included, then make sure the right pieces are there and linked to the indicators, and then worry about where to house this system.

REGIONAL INFORMATION/DATA MANAGEMENT NEEDS AS IT RELATES TO THE MONITORING PLAN – Stewart Toshach (See meeting materials for details.)

Stewart reviewed many of the ad hoc groups that are currently working on information management. He provided a brief overview of each of the groups and provided the url for each web site.

- Principles about data systems:
 1. Information systems are 80% about people
 2. Collect once and reuse
 3. Define information management objectives for both the short term and the longer term
 4. Structure the information – “wedding cake” model
 5. Funding mechanisms do not favor Regional or Puget Sound scale information efforts
 6. Keys to success
- Possible next steps for Partnership:
 1. Include specific data management actions in the Action Agenda
 2. Use a framework/planning process to manage needed change
 3. Support standard information collection, sharing and distribution practices
 4. Adopt changes to investing in information systems

Conclusion: not all sites are of equal level or are they all available and the maps are different.

Diana asked what the reaction would be if formats were developed and standards set how would the groups react?

Stewart responded that it will depend on the group and how much work has gone into their current system. Some would welcome the assistance while others would rebel.

Talked about the need for data systems and how difficult this really is. Will need to assess which data system is needed for each of the indicators and how much data is available for each indicator.

The Federal Caucus can assist with helping the Partnership in developing a data system and need a team to develop a framework.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ann Mosness, Go Wild Campaign

- Provided handout - concern with aquaculture
- Hopes the topic of aquaculture is an issue that is discussed in the Action Agenda
- Recommends use of historic public knowledge in data gathering
- Need peer review of the information

Tim Smith, PSNERP

- Provided an update of the work being done and several topical documents recently developed by the Puget Sound Nearshore Estuary Reserve Program. See meeting materials for details.
- Tim reviewed one of the reports to show the Council how each of the documents are set up
- Each topic contains a conceptual model, data gaps, and uncertainties

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER MEETING MINUTES

Martha Kongsgaar **MOVED** to approve the meeting summary from the December 17 Leadership Council meeting. Bill Wilkerson **SECONDED** the motion. Council **APPROVED** the meeting summary as presented.

12:38 p.m. ADJOURN

Leadership Council Approval



Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date 4/29/08

Next Meeting: March 3 & 4, 2008