PugetSoundPartnership
our sound, our community, our chance

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008
NW Marine Fisheries Science Center, Seattle

Science Panel Members Present:
- Joel Baker
- Guy Gelfenbaum
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Usha Varanasi
- Katharine Wellman

Leadership Council Members Present:
- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Dan O'Neal

Staff Present:
- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Cullen Stephenson, Deputy Director
- Sarah Brace, Science Manager
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Science Panel
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant to the Tribes

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 the Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record.

Action Items:
- Approval of 2008 Meeting Schedule

Meeting Summary:
- Introductions
- Role of Science Panel Discussion
- Monitoring Coordination Briefing
- NOAA Briefing on Risk Assessment and Indicators Work
- Action Agenda Development – update
- General Panel Business

10:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER – Bill Ruckelshaus, Leadership Council Chair
Chair Ruckelshaus welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel, gave an overview of the Partnership, and reviewed the agenda for the day.

He talked about his experiences with different science panels and how science is needed to inform the decision-making and accountability.

INTRODUCTIONS AND PANELIST MEMBER INVOLVEMENT IN SCIENCE IN PUGET SOUND
Usha Varnasi welcomed everyone to the Northwest Fisheries Science Center; they have been doing science in this location for 75 years. She is the Director of Science and Research for NOAA. She talked about the mandates before NOAA and the work being done in the Puget Sound. The last two years have been focused on bringing people and scientists together to recover Puget Sound.

Robert Johnston feels it is a great honor and a huge responsibility to be on this panel. He is an oceanographer with the US Navy currently assigned to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton. He has about 25 years of experience working on environmental issues for the Navy and has recently been working on a watershed-scale monitoring and modeling study for Sinclair and Dyes Inlets. He noted that he grew up on the Sound in Bellingham, Washington. Key points he wanted to make were the need for partnering at the watershed scale, the need for feedback between monitoring and modeling to improve the understanding of ecological systems, and the need to inform decision-makers with simulation scenarios.

Joel Baker just moved to the area. He is a Professor at the University of Washington Tacoma, formerly he was with the University of Maryland where he headed up a research group studying the transport of organic chemicals and their use as markers. He grew up on Lake Eerie. He discussed his interest in the linking of air and water and movement of chemicals between air and water. When he read about the Partnership, he was very excited about coming to the Puget Sound and he believes this is the right way and that the right questions are being asked. It is the right time and political atmosphere to restore the Sound. He hopes that the Partnership will step back and not do things the way that have been done in the past and that the Science Panel will be instrumental in this “out-of-the-box” thinking.

Katharine “Trina” Wellman is thrilled to be part of the Science Panel. She is a social scientist and she thinks the Partnership can really make a difference. There will need to be trade-offs and this is where the social science comes in. Economic value of environmental assets is her specialty. Grew up in Maine on the ocean. She has a passion for water but especially the Puget Sound. Recently worked on Deschutes economic impact work. Looked at environmental aspects if the dam was removed and what would change in recreation, water quality, etc. also working on Washington State mollusk production – looking at costs and benefits and trade-offs. Need to ask the right

questions and work with the stakeholders. Need to do the social marketing, figuring out the incentives for getting people to do the right things for the Sound.

Tim Quinn is the chief scientist for the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Division and works on the upland piece of the puzzle. He is a native Northwesterner and has been working on Puget Sound issues for awhile now. He is also working on an international conference on shoreline armoring, the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study, the Intensively Monitored Watersheds (IMWs), and is a member of three state monitoring forums. He is delighted to be on this panel.

John Stark is a Washington State University Professor located at the Research Center in Puyallup. His focus is on pesticide movement and the health of rivers and streams. The Salmon Research Center is looking at relative concentrations of chemicals on fish. He is also working on endangered butterflies in California and the effects of herbicides.

Jan Newton is a biological oceanographer for the University of Washington. She is honored to be on the Panel. She grew up on the shorelines of Puget Sound and is interested in how different variables affect the systems. The importance of science and emphasis on partnership are two things that are essential tools for the Puget Sound Partnership to be successful. She talked about all the different groups that she is working with including work with the Hood Canal Dissolved Oxygen Program. Another issue she works on is the Northwest Association of Network Ocean Observation Systems (NANOOS) which is building infrastructure and analysis models for education and outreach. She also teaches and is part of the PRISM cruise program. She invited Panel members to join one of the cruises.

Frank Shipley has a background in biology. In the 80s he worked on coastal systems in the Gulf of Mexico as Director, Galveston Bay National Estuary Program and came to the Northwest in 1995 where he directed the USGS Western Fisheries Research Center for eight years. Subsequently, Frank moved to the USGS Regional Office in Seattle, where he now coordinates the bureau's biological science throughout the western U.S. He serves on the Executive Committee of the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership. The USGS has no regulatory authority, serving as the science agency for the Department of Interior. Frank seeks to help support an ongoing linkage between science and policy, a crucial need for successful restoration of Puget Sound.

Guy Gelfenbaum is a coastal oceanographer with USGS in Menlo Park, California. A former graduate of the University of Washington, his interest is in sediment dynamics – linking the geological side with the other sciences. He is a member of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP). This program is finding an interface with science and policy. PSNERP did a lessons learned with other restoration efforts. The Shoreline Armoring Workgroup will look at effects of nearshore armoring. He also works on the effects of catastrophic hazards on coastal ecosystems such as earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanoes.

Chair Ruckelshaus talked about how the need for coordination of work is critical. The amount of work going on in Puget Sound is enormous and pulling all the work together is part of what the Partnership needs to do. There is a need for broader understanding

of what is going on and coordinating the efforts to make sure the information is shared and the right people know what others are doing. Through the Puget Sound restoration effort, a Federal Caucus has been created, as well as a state and environmental caucuses. The tribal governments have been meeting for many years as well as local government groups. We now need to see how all the efforts go together.

ROLE OF SCIENCE PANEL AND RELATIONSHIP TO LEADERSHIP COUNCIL AND ECOSYSTEM COORDINATION BOARD

David Dicks welcomed everyone. He provided an overview of the Partnership and status of the Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, Science Panel and where staff is in the process:

- The Puget Sound Partnership is the newest state agency
- David reports to two bosses – the governor and Bill Ruckelshaus (Leadership Council)
- There are three things for the Partnership to do: Build the Action Agenda which will answer the four big questions, create a communication and outreach plan, and finally create an Accountability and Monitoring system
- Need the Science Panel's assistance on the Action Agenda
- Need a strategic science plan
- A data collection system is needed
- The Science Panel needs to create a biennial science workplan – will need to figure out what some of this means and what needs to be done exactly
- The Partnership and Science Panel will need to figure out the best way to get information for review out and comments back in a timely manner
- Key Partnership staff were introduced to the Science Panel:
    - Tammy Owings is the Special Assistant to the Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
    - Sarah Brace is the science manager for the agency
    - Cullen Stephenson is the Deputy Director for the Partnership
    - Martha Neuman is the Action Agenda Director

Bill Ruckelshaus provided his overview of the new agency and organization:

- The Science Panel is an independent group and this is critical to the success
- Need to have good science to make policy decisions
- Need to have a lot broader public support and so need to have the science translated to the local level – so that people realize that what they do effects where they live
- Talked about the Salmon Recovery Plan and how it was created at the local level and how the salmon plan needs to be incorporated into the overall Puget Sound plan
- Tight deadline for getting the Action Agenda out but this is a living documents so will be adjusting over time

MONITORING COORDINATION EFFORTS – Sarah Brace, Science Manager (See meeting materials for detail.)

Sarah provided an overview of the current monitoring efforts going on around the Puget Sound.

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed how many monitoring efforts are happening around the Sound and how they need to be coordinated. He believes monitoring is key to the success of the Puget Sound Partnership. This is the only way to see if we are making progress and to justify the costs. This is an area that the Science Panel can really help with.

The Panel discussed monitoring issues and how it is easy to monitor things but harder to make sure the right things are monitored and linked to the accountability. Need to figure out a better way to explain what the monitoring is so the public will understand the importance in spending the money to monitor. They also talked about the different types of monitoring, ways to gather data, identify gaps, ability to deliver the data needs in an usable way, and the need to build the system right from the beginning.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, talked about two things: The March 26 South Sound Science Symposium (handout provided) and the Monitoring Consortium, a governance group that needs input from the Partnership on what needs to be done in the Puget Sound.

ACTION AGENDA – Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director (See meeting materials for detail.)

Martha provided a briefing to the Science Panel on what the Action Agenda is, what questions are being asked, and the timeline to get the Action Agenda done.

The four questions being asked in the Action Agenda are:

- What is the status of Puget Sound's health and what are the biggest threats to it? This will be a synthesis of the Puget Sound status and threats information
- What is a healthy Puget Sound? Definition
- What activities are currently underway? A summary of current programs
- What actions must be taken that will move us from where we are today toward a healthy Puget Sound by 2020? This portion of the Action Agenda will compare status and threats to current programs to determine what actions are on track to address threats, where do we need more action, and what actions need to be realigned?

This first version of the Action Agenda is due on September 1, 2008. After September, work will start on implementation of priorities, measuring the progress, and adapting and refining the Action Agenda.

Martha reviewed the upcoming workshops and topic forums explaining that the topic forums will address issues at a topic level. She explained that a private sector consultant will be leading these forums but will also need to have the scientists weighing in on the topics.

Martha would like to have the Science Panel members provide names of those they believe should be included in the different topic forums and on the small teams that will be writing the specific sections of the Action Agenda.

The small teams will summarize:

- What is the current approach to the topic
- Gap analysis, and
- What is really needed to address each topic

John Stark asked about the education focus group. Cullen Stephenson explained ECO-net which the Partnership took over coordination of on January 24. This is a group of about 250 educators so far. They have been encouraged to start communicating on Puget Sound issues.

Talked about the definition of a healthy Puget Sound and the need to get set goals to reach. The goals need to be sustainable once they are met which is part of the educational role.

The Panel talked about how the topics are interrelated and maybe having one large forum that covers all the different topics having both concurrent workgroups and individual work sessions over several days may be a way to make sure all the issues are integrated. This was discussed as a possibility.

As part of its duties, the Science Panel will provide peer review for the Risk Assessment and Indicators development. It was suggested to have Sarah develop a process for peer review and route it to the Science Panel for comment. Discussed the tight timeline and how there will not be a lot of time for peer review and will need to acknowledge that problem up front. May need to wait for peer review on some of the issues until the next version of the Action Agenda.

Martha would like to be included on all the Science Panel meeting agendas to be able to provide updates and keep the Panel informed and get feedback on the Action Agenda.

NOAA BRIEFING – Mary Ruckelshaus, Sandie O'Neill, and Tracy Collier (See meeting materials for detail)

Mary Ruckelshaus, chief scientist to the Puget Sound Partnership, provided an overview of the integrated ecosystem assessment process. The total assessment will probably take two years to complete but will be providing various components along the way including:

- Species and food webs

- Habitats and processes
- Water Quality
- Water Quantity
- Human health and well-being

Sandie O'Neill talked about the environmental indicators, which are attributes associated with specific ecosystem elements that are used to characterize and communicate the condition of the ecosystem. Environmental indicators may be used as a powerful tool to raise public awareness on environmental issues to strengthen public support. Good indicators must be understood and of interest to many people. They must tell a story that resonates with the public and policy makers.

Need specific goals and objectives for the Puget Sound to be able to decide on the correct indicators.

Phase 1 of indicators with provisional indicators will be ready by the end of April. The initial list of indicators may be very large and then would choose a subset of indicators for specific needs such as for the report card and for communicating to the public.

Mary then provided an overview of the risk analysis/threat assessment process.

There was concern with the timeline and that it may be too late to change things if the Science Panel has to wait to give comments until the risk analysis is completed. Asked if a working draft of the document could be sent out to get Science Panel feedback sooner rather than later.

Mary invited any Science Panel member who is interested to be part of the steering committee. The Science Panel members can be as involved as they would like. She noted that the risk analysis will come back to the Science Panel for discussion at the February meeting. Tracy reported that the same goes for the indicators list and the Science Panel will get the proposed approach before any decisions are made. The provisional indicators developed with existing information will be provided to the Science Panel by the end of March.

The question was asked on what would happen if areas are healthy? What will be the priority – do we protect or clean up? Mary explained how the indicators will be laid out but what to do will be part of the policy discussion.

PANEL BASICS

Nomination of Chair and Vice-chair

It is up to the Science Panel to decide the chair and vice-chair of for the Panel. If there is not a consensus in the next week or two on who should be chair and vice-chair, then the group needs to decide how to choose the chair and vice-chair.

Talked about what will be asked of the Science Panel members, the chair, and attributes of a good chair.

The Science Panel members should get involved with the whole process but only as involved as they want to be and where they feel comfortable that they can continue to be objective and independent as a Science Panel member.

Chair Ruckelshaus provided his thoughts on what attributes he believes a chair should have:

- Be collaborative – enjoy working with others
- Enjoy a certain amount of detail
- Make progress toward a common objective
- Should enjoy working toward a common objective
- Should have a vision for the whole thing – how to use science – the "what is science's role in this social process?"

2008 Meeting Schedule
Jan Newton **MOVED** to adopt Resolution 2008-01 the proposed 2008 Science Panel Meeting Schedule. Usha Varnasi **SECONDED**. Panel **APPROVED** Resolution 2008-01 as presented with meetings on February 26, April 15, June 19, August 7, September 25, and December 16, 2008.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT
Teri King, Hood Canal Action Area Representative to the Ecosystem Coordination Board, would like to have the August 7 Science Panel meeting to be at Hood Canal. The Ecosystem Coordination Board will be meeting in the Hood Canal Action Area for its June 25 meeting.

Alan Mearns, Senior Staff Scientist at NOAA and member of the Marine Resource Committee, worked in San Francisco on its monitoring program. He explained how this community collected the data and explained that they included the industry and business as well as government agencies so that the data belonged to the whole community. He talked about a book called "Waste Water Management for Coastal Urban Areas" and suggested the Science Panel look at this book.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked everyone for participating in this meeting.

3:40 p.m. ADJOURN

Science Panel Approval

_____ _____
Science Panel Chair Date

Next Meeting: February 26, 2008
NWIFC Conference Room
Lacey, Washington