

PugetSoundPartnership

our sound, our community, our chance

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel Meeting Summary

September 9 & 10, 2009
Burke Museum, Seattle

Day 1

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Usha Varanasi
- Katharine Wellman

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

Action Items:

- Approval of 2010 Meeting Schedule
- Approval of July 8 & 9, 2009 Meeting Summary
- Science Panel Recommendations to Leadership Council on: a) size of Science Panel, and b) Criteria for selection/evaluation
- Approval of Strategic Science Plan for public review

Meeting Summary:

- Agency Update
- Implementing the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP)
- Briefing on 2010 Puget Sound Science Update
- Briefing on 2009 State of the Sound Report
- Science Panel Review of Ecosystem Status and Trends Analysis for 2009 State of the Sound Report
- Science Panel “Comments on Progress in Implementing” the Action Agenda
- Panel Basics
- Strategic Science Plan
- Food Webs/Forage Fish presentation
- Hood Canal presentation

CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER – Joel Baker, Chair

Science Panel Chair Joel Baker opened the meeting at 10:07 a.m. and reviewed the meeting agenda.

AGENCY UPDATE (See meeting materials for details.)

Lynda Ransley updated the Panel on the work of the agency.

Filling of agency positions:

- Computer Technology and Information Officer position should be filled some time in October – once this position is filled, the data manager position will be hired
- Communications Manager should be in place shortly. This person will lead all the communication, education, and outreach efforts of the agency
- The applications for the Performance Manager are being screened with interviews planned for the end of September
- The application deadline for the Science Program Manager and Monitor Manager closed. Applications are now being screened and will interview soon
- Recently filled two Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator positions (Roma Call and John Meyer)

Natural Resource Agencies Reorganization

Lynda provided an update on the Natural Resource Agencies reorganization efforts. The document providing options is supposed to be released for public review soon.

Leadership Council Chair Bill Ruckelshaus encouraged Science Panel members to review and comment on the options. He discussed how providing comments on this reorganization may be a way to comment in general on how we are doing and ways to make more progress in the environmental arena.

Joel reminded the Panel about the legislative mandate for the Science Panel to provide comments on implementation of the Action Agenda, and this may be another way to include comments on ways to integrate efforts to make more progress.

This issue will be discussed at the next Council, Board, and Panel Administrative Committee meeting. This is an ad hoc group called by the Leadership Council Chair to discuss ways to coordinate activities of the three boards and the Partnership staff. It includes the Leadership Council Chair Ruckelshaus and Vice-chair Kongsgaard, ECB Chair Somers, Science Panel Chair Baker, Executive Director David Dicks and Deputy Director Lynda Ransley.

Citizen Science and STORM Campaign

Lynda reported that the Partnership received a Boeing grant to support citizen science. Jan noted that a panel was created to develop a report on ways to use citizen science. The Panel discussed the need for monitoring across the Sound and using citizen science as a way to meet our goals. Lynda suggested that the identification of areas where citizen science would be most beneficial could possibly be an issue for the Cross Partnership work groups to work on. There was a request to provide the citizen science report to the Science Panel for review.

The Science Panel asked about the STORM campaign and if the Panel will have an opportunity to revise the current message. Lynda noted that the campaign was developed through the STORM group and will be released on September 16 so there is not an opportunity for the Science Panel to revise this campaign. But this is only the first round of the campaign and the Panel will be able to comment during the next rounds. She noted that if the Panel has specific concerns about the current campaign, they could channel the questions through herself, Kristen Cooley, or the Cross Partnership work groups. She reported that the plan is to use the Cross Partnership work groups to develop the full suite of best management practices (BMP) for the remaining campaign rounds.

The Panel urged caution in using BMPs because there is need to have science before a BMP is decided; currently all we have is expert opinion. The Panel agrees with the need to move forward with commonsense actions but not say that they are science-based.

Audience member Kathy Wolf came forward to discuss social marketing and how this needs to be a progression in behaviors. We need to start with the easier things so that people can start making the changes and then make the harder changes. For example, we all know driving is not good for the environment yet, for the most part, everyone still drives.

Roles

Bill Ruckelshaus introduced the need to define the roles for different groups. The last discussion was an example of why we need clear roles. We are trying to put different systems in place, such as accountability and performance management, but sometimes we need to act before we have all the answers. We can't be criticized for not having all the processes in place if we are making progress and connecting the systems. We need to communicate a.) where we are with the various systems, and b.) how they are connected to each other. He also noted that roles need to be defined to be able to focus the various boards' meetings. They need to focus on the issues to best use the staff time needed to prepare for the meetings.

Joel Baker suggested using time at the September 25, 2009, combined meeting to work on the roles. Lynda responded that the meeting on the 25th is a staff-called meeting to

focus on performance management and the State of the Sound. She suggested a possible joint meeting later in the year to work on roles and coordination issues.

IMPLEMENTING THE BIENNIAL SCIENCE WORK PLAN (BSWP) (See meeting materials for details.)

Joel Baker facilitated this discussion. He would like two outcomes from this discussion:

- Review status of the projects listed in the handout
- Discuss how the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) and Open Standards Method should be used

The Panel began the discussion with the IEA and Open Standards. These are two different processes but this could be an opportunity to do a crosswalk between them. This hasn't been done before and the Panel needs continued discussion to determine if this is worthwhile.

Next the Panel reviewed the list of federal fiscal year 08 funded projects and noted the status of each.

The Panel talked about how NOAA will be sending a letter to the groups who received NOAA stimulus funding informing them that the Partnership will be coordinating with them on the project work. Joel noted that the idea is to reinforce the idea that the Partnership is the coordinating body for these funds.

After the Panel completed reviewing the project list, Bill Ruckelshaus asked if there was a way to track the list of projects. This exercise provided a start but we need to find a way to gather and keep the list updated. The Panel discussed some ways to track this information but did not make any decision on a path forward.

The Panel discussed other work needing to be done:

- After the State of the Sound is completed on November 1, the Panel will use the results chains information to develop the next BSWP
- Establish procedures for the Request for Proposal (RFP) process. The new Science Manager will work on this
- Coordinate agency science programs and initiatives: This work is moving forward but mostly through the caucus format
- Provide a letter to each caucus emphasizing the need to develop a framework to coordinate efforts – Joel Baker, Frank Shipley, and Usha Varanasi will work on the draft letter

The Panel will begin working on the revised BSWP in first quarter of 2010.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Kathy Wolf, US Forest Service and UW College of the Environment, continued her earlier comments on need for social science and highlighted ways that social science should and could be incorporated into the work being done by the Partnership. (See testimony card for written comments.)

Lincoln Loehr, environmental compliance analyst, provided a citizen perspective. He is an oceanographer and works in a law firm. He discussed Ecology's Toxic Loading Studies and urged caution since the numbers that are in their studies don't fit with the numbers he believes are correct. He provided the example of a study by basins that shows the highest toxic loadings in Whidbey basin. This does not seem correct so he is working with Ecology to verify results and assumes there will be revisions to the report.

BRIEFING ON 2010 PUGET SOUND SCIENCE UPDATE (See meeting materials for details.)

Mary Ruckelshaus provided an update on the Puget Sound Science Update, which is due April 2010. She will be providing more detailed outlines for each section to the Science Panel, Leadership Council, and Partnership Staff.

She is not sure how big the final document will be and will want to get some direction on size from the Panel. The plan is to start with what is known then add additional information as time goes on using the science community to fill in gaps.

The State of the Sound and Puget Sound Science Update need to be coordinated. Mary sees the Science Update being refreshed and new when the next State of the Sound is being written so we will be able to use the Science Update information when writing the State of the Sound.

BRIEFING ON 2009 STATE OF THE SOUND REPORT (See meeting materials for details.)

David St. John updated the Panel on the State of the Sound Report and timeline for completing this document.

The Panel discussed ways to make sure the State of the Sound and Puget Sound Science Update complement each other and reviews are connected.

David St. John noted the need to show our work in the State of the Sound and that the Technical memos will be developed around the results chains and indicators.

The Panel discussed the need to make sure it is clear these are the high level indicators and not ranked threats. This information will continue to frame the work but it will take years to make changes and see results in many of the status and trends. We need to

start educating people about these status and trends reports. David St. John reported that status and trends are addressed in the Action Agenda.

SCIENCE PANEL REVIEW OF ECOSYSTEM STATUS AND TRENDS ANALYSIS FOR 2009 STATE OF THE SOUND REPORT (See meeting materials for details.)

Scott Redman led the Science Panel's review of the six goals and recommendations for two or three displays to tell the story in graphic form.

The Panel then went over each goal identifying possible graphics and deciding on the following recommendations:

Water Quality

- Contaminants in English Sole, Herring, and mussels,
- Dissolved Oxygen marine
- Roll up Water Quality index

Water Quantity

- Duration and magnitude of flows
- Floods and low flows
- Focus on four types of watershed

Habitat

- Four maps different time period – different land use changes
- Eel grass table
- Prairie – possible
- Intertidal wetlands from PSNERP

Species and Food Webs

- Food web graphic
- Pileated woodpecker
- Orca
- Salmon
- Herring
- Frog
- Puget Sound biodiversity at risk composite map

Human Wellbeing

There are not good displays for this information but the plan will be to explain why the indicators are important. This is also the category to show economic information.

Indicators would include:

- Behavior indicators such as vehicle miles per person
- Marine harvest land
- Agricultural land changes (selling or subdividing farms)

- Forest lands by different kinds of ownership
- Tax data – participation in tax incentive

The plan is to get as much done as possible before the due date; we may need to amend in later versions.

Human Health

Focus on fishable, dig-able, and swimmable indicators such as:

- Commercial shellfish
- Beaches
- Number of seafood meals
- Swimming advisories
- Recreation days

The Panel needs to finish this work by November 1, 2009.

4:50 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

September 9 & 10, 2009
Burke Museum, Seattle

Day 2

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Robert Johnston
- Frank Shipley
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- John Stark
- Usha Varanasi
- Katharine Wellman

8:30 a.m. RECONVENED MEETING – Joel Baker, Chair

Joel welcomed everyone, reviewed the agenda for the day and provided an overview of the first day of the meeting.

SCIENCE PANEL “COMMENTS ON PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING” THE ACTION AGENDA (See meeting materials for details.)

Joel introduced this agenda item noting that the statute directs the Science Panel to provide comments on the progress on implementing the plan. He believes this should be a separate letter, document, or chapter in the State of the Sound, which needs to be completed by November 1.

The Panel discussed how and what to comment on including:

- General overview of progress
- Need for performance review and action tracking systems to be put in place
- Need to tell a story on what progress has been made, where we want to be by the next State of the Sound
- Highlight need for monitoring money
- Acknowledge that it takes time to get the processes in place
- Need for crosscutting teams to get the work done
- Discuss how we are coordinating now and the need to increase coordination efforts

This will be the Science Panel’s input. Joel will draft the document and get to Panel members for review and comment. The final document will be presented to the Leadership Council at its October 8 meeting.

PANEL BASICS

July 2009 Meeting Summary Approval

Revisions to the July 2009 Science Panel meeting summary included:

- Page 5 add wording concerning letter from David Dicks needing peer reviewable reports
- Page 4 add Science Panel's recommendation to include support for science and building capacity for EPA funding

APPROVED as amended.

2010 Meeting Schedule Approval

Joel reviewed the proposed 2010 meeting schedule.

Tim Quinn **MOVED** to approve the 2010 meeting schedule. Trina Wellman **SECONDED**. Panel **APPROVED** the 2010 schedule of:

- February 9-10, 2010
- April 13-14, 2010
- June 8-9, 2010
- August 24-25, 2010
- October 12-13, 2010
- December 14-15, 2010

The Panel talked about the schedule and decided that 2-day face-to-face meetings every other month should be adequate with additional conference calls or special meetings if necessary. There was concern about the gap between the November 2009 and February 2010 meetings. The Panel discussed a possible one-day retreat or training session in December.

Science Panel Terms and Transitions

Leadership Council member Martha Kongsgaard reviewed the appointment procedures memorandum that was used by the Leadership Council at its September 2-3 meeting. (See meeting materials for details.) The Leadership Council is requesting a Science Panel recommendation on Panel size and criteria to use for selection and evaluation of potential members.

Science Panel recommendations to the Leadership Council on size and criteria for selection/evaluation included:

Size

- Increasing Panel size to 11 members to help distribute the workload and to represent more disciplines
- Stagger the addition of new members to one in 2009 and one in 2010

Frank Shipley reported that he is not going to re-up for the Panel due to his new position as chief scientist for the USGS western region. This will be his last meeting.

Selection and Evaluation Criteria

The Panel discussed the need to be clear to the Council that it is non-representational but it is important to look at the balance of disciplines. The Panel then discussed the various disciplines needed for a well-balanced Panel which included the need for experience and oversight in ecological modeling, risk assessment, decision modeling support tools, social marketing, and human behavioral sciences.

Trina Wellman and John Stark will work over lunch with Scott Redman to revise the draft solicitation for approval before the end of the meeting.

Process and Terms of Officers

Joel introduced this agenda item and provided background about the original election process.

John Stark reviewed the memorandum included in the meeting materials.

The Panel discussed the two options provided in the memorandum concerning the terms and process to use for election of officers and terms.

After discussion the Panel agreed to a revise the staff recommendation during the lunch break.

Staff worked with Panel members during the lunch break on revisions to the solicitation and election procedure. Both were then brought back before the Panel after the lunch break.

Trina Wellman **MOVED** to approve the process to use for election of officers. Usha Varanasi **SECONDED**. Panel **APPROVED**.

Both the approved election process and final Panel solicitation are attached to this summary.

STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN (See meeting materials for details.)

During this agenda item, Jan Newton is looking for agreement on the process to get the Strategic Science Plan to final format.

She reviewed the September 2009 draft version of the Strategic Science Plan highlighting changes from that last version. The Panel also discussed the summary of science-related comments on the Action Agenda and Biennial Science Work Plan that Bob Johnston compiled. They decided this should be a standalone document but that

both the Strategic Science Plan and Bob's comment summary would be posted on the Web.

The following process and timeline was agreed to:

- Panel members review the September version of the Strategic Science Plan and submit any edits to Jan Newton by close of business on September 17
- She will compile and accept changes, assuming minor, but will bring any that are of issue to the small team for their input
- A small team (Jan, Tim Quinn, Frank Shipley, and Trina Wellman) will work September 18 through October 5 to edit the document for clarity, flow, references, and any other items that come up
- Partnership staff will format the week of October 5
- Science Panel will have final review/blessing the week of October 12
- The public review draft would then be distributed to public in mid-October and end public review on November 6
- Staff will summarize comments for November 17-18 Science Panel meeting

At the same time, Bob's summary and response to comments on the BSWP will be completed. Send comments to Bob. Another small team (Joel Baker, John Stark, and Guy Gelfenbaum) will work with Bob to incorporate edits to this draft by October 5.

To give closure to the work on the Strategic Science Plan, Usha Varanasi suggested having a combined meeting in November with both outgoing and new Panel members present.

FOOD WEBS/FORAGE FISH PRESENTATION

Frank Shipley introduced this agenda item and the two presenters: Paul Hershberger, USGS Western Research Center, and Phil Levin, NOAA.

Paul Hershberger provided his thoughts on forage fish, calling them the linchpin of a healthy Puget Sound. He thanked the Department of Fish and Wildlife for the work they are doing with forage fish.

His presentation was focused mainly on herring. He noted that herring in this area have a lifespan of 5-7 years but the farther north, the longer the age span. We are losing some of the older fish and need better production. There is concern with climate change and diseases that affect the herring.

He presented his list of what we need to know about forage fish:

1. Provision of absolute or relative abundance of the primary forage fishes
2. Relative contributions of the primary forage species to the health of Puget Sound

3. Factors influencing abundance and demographics of the primary forage fishes (disease, predation, contaminants, ocean circulation patterns)
4. Basic forage fish biology (migration patterns, population structures, feeding habits, behavior)

Paul also stated that addressing these knowledge gaps would include a request for proposal to gather the data and an integrated forage fish program that would work closely with all forage fish experts in the Puget Sound region.

Phil Levin, NOAA, then provided his thoughts on the role of forage fish in the Puget Sound food web. Forage fish are low on the food chain and are a food source for many species. He presented examples of indirect effects resulting in other parts of the food web due to changes in forage fish abundance.

He presented a few of the key unknowns:

- Distribution and abundance, which includes non-spawning herring and other small pelagic species
- Forage fish relationship with jellyfish is important and not well explored
- Functional response of predators to forage fish

Chair Baker thanked both speakers for their presentations.

PUBIC COMMENT

George Hunt, citizen, provided his thoughts about forage fish and talked about the work he has done on this issue. He discussed a 10-year gap from late 90's to now from a study on forage fish food and the need to fill this gap. He would like to take an ecosystem approach for this study but believes it will cost in the 100s of thousands of dollars.

Martha Kongsgaard asked who would be responsible to provide the funding when looking at whole systems. Currently groups just monitor what they manage,

Mr. Hunt noted how there are always projects that are interesting but no money for.

Joel noted that the EPA Request for Proposal should be coming out soon and it might provide for this kind of study.

HOOD CANAL BRIEFING AND REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE

Jan Newton introduced this agenda item and introduced Hood Canal Coordinating Council Director Scott Brewer. (See meeting materials for details.)

Scott then introduced the panel including Jan Newton, Dan Hannafious, and Duane Fagergren.

Objectives for the discussion today:

- Provide awareness of current study/program status
- Provide awareness of the Technical Advisory Committee process
- Request Science Panel input on current science-policy process
- Consider role of the Science Panel in this effort

Panel members then each presented information on the Hood Canal dissolved oxygen program and science-policy process. This process was designed to address low dissolved oxygen in Hood Canal. The goals of the science-policy process were to:

- Permanently remove Hood Canal from the list of impaired water bodies and ensure a healthy watershed in perpetuity
- Develop a recommended “action plan” that will lead to the removal of Hood Canal from the list of impaired water bodies

Usha Varanasi believes the biggest need is a monitoring program to see the resilience of the system. She noted that the Science Panel might be the link to get the monitoring on the science that has already happened.

Tim Quinn agreed with Usha for need to have monitoring program in addition to management, but he would get the local buy in first. He would encourage a bottom up process but the Science Panel may want to weigh in on the need to have a monitoring program at certain stress points.

The Science Panel agreed that there will be a need for their support when there is push back on the need for doing this work. Both groups will need to work together to figure out what needs to be done and how to fund the efforts.

See www.hoodcanal.washington.edu for additional information on this work.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Lincoln Loehr, environmental compliance analyst, suggested the creation of a septic district to raise funds. He also reported that the current dissolved oxygen standards are part of the Clean Water Act standards but that the target numbers could be changed.

MEETING CLOSING

October/November Meeting Agenda Items

- Natural Resource Agency reorganization options - update
- PSNERP – November meeting presentation
- Performance Management updates

Science Panel Operations: Chair & Vice Chair Elections and Terms Procedure

- The Panel will hold an annual election process at the September/October meeting (whichever is latest) and vote for a chair and vice chair for a one year term,
- Current members of the Science Panel are eligible,
- Interest in serving as the chair will be provided to staff in written form one-month prior to the election meeting,
- Staff will provide a memorandum to Panel members two weeks prior to the meeting providing listing of interested candidates,
- The election of officers will be conducted via ballot at an open meeting of the Science Panel,
- Highest vote is elected chair, person with second highest number of votes becomes the vice chair, and
- New officers will take their seat on January 1.

Moved by: Trina Wellman

Seconded by: Usha Varanasi

Approved on September 10, 2009

**Call for Applications for Nomination to the
Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel**
September 11, 2009

The Leadership Council of the Puget Sound Partnership is soliciting nominations for appointment to the Puget Sound Science Panel.

The Puget Sound Partnership was established as a state agency by the 2007 Legislature and the Governor to develop and implement an aggressive action agenda for restoring the health of Puget Sound by 2020.

The Partnership is a new and dynamic organization charged with taking a collaborative and accountable approach to accomplishing its mission. It relies on the contributions of a variety of entities, including state, local, federal and tribal governments, community and environmental organizations, businesses, watershed and salmon recovery groups. The Partnership's work will require creativity, innovation and a wide variety of tools and approaches to engage the public, track performance and guide progress, disseminate information to stakeholders, manage data and work collaboratively with individuals and groups throughout the region.

The Partnership is guided by the Leadership Council, consisting of seven individuals committed to the environmental and economic prosperity of Puget Sound. As the decision-making body for the Partnership, the Council depends on the Ecosystem Coordination Board to provide policy recommendations and the Science Panel to provide the scientific guidance needed to reach the goals set forth in the Action Agenda.

The Science Panel is an integral link between the Leadership Council and the scientific work being carried out in Puget Sound. The Panel is also key in communicating the scientific work and analysis to the broader public and to policy decision makers around the Sound.

More information on the Partnership is available at our Web site:
<http://www.psp.wa.gov>.

Applications are due no later than October 5, 2009. Please see the details below.

Overview of the Science Panel

The statute creating the Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership) states that the Leadership Council of the Partnership shall determine reappointments and select replacements or additional members of the Panel. The role of the Science Panel is to provide independent, nonrepresentational scientific advice to the Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and Executive Director of the Partnership on issues related to Puget Sound's ecological and human health. The Science Panel consists of experts from natural and social science and engineering disciplines representing

different groups engaged in the conservation, recovery and management of Puget Sound. Panel members are established scientists or senior managers with recent hands-on field experience. Prior to considering the applications, the Leadership Council will request that the Washington State Academy of Sciences (WSAS) review the applications and endorse the applicants regarding scientific qualifications. The Leadership Council will make the final appointments.

The Science Panel's responsibilities include the following:

- Assist the Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and Executive Director in carrying out the obligations of the Puget Sound Partnership, including preparing and updating the Action Agenda;
- Provide recommendations on scientific issues identified by the Partnership and evaluate the technical merit of scientific and technical projects proposed to the partnership;
- Assist the Partnership in developing an ecosystem level strategic science program that:
 - addresses monitoring, modeling, data management, and primary research;
 - identifies science gaps and recommends research priorities in an biennial science work plan.
- Develop and provide oversight of a competitive peer-reviewed process for soliciting, strategically prioritizing, and funding research, monitoring, modeling and other science projects;
- Provide input to the Executive Director in developing biennial implementation strategies; and
- Offer an ecosystem-wide perspective on the science work being conducted in Puget Sound and by the Partnership.

Science Panel appointments will be four-year terms. Science Panel members may be reappointed after their initial term but no member may serve longer than 12 years.

A key function of the Science Panel will be communicating scientific results to the public and policy makers. Panel members should be currently engaged in the interaction of science and policy on a professional level. Members should also be familiar with the implementation of science and have recent experience in applied science and research. Science Panel members must be prepared to commit sufficient time to fulfill the duties of the Panel, including conducting scientific analysis and review, writing up findings, conclusions and recommendations, attending meetings, and communicating results to the Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and the broader Puget Sound community. Science Panel members should expect to commit at least 10 hours per week (and more during weeks with Science Panel meetings) to the work of the Science Panel. Panel members shall serve without compensation. However, members will be compensated for their travel expenses.

Criteria for Science Panel

Each member **must meet** the criteria:

1. Knowledge, recognized expertise and achievement in a relevant discipline, which could include but is not limited to natural sciences – such as terrestrial and marine ecology, wildlife biology, genetics, toxicology, fisheries, hydrology, oceanography, climate sciences, river geomorphology, epidemiology; social sciences – such as land use planning, resource economics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, institutional analysis; and engineering.
2. A demonstrated ability to work effectively in an interdisciplinary team setting.
3. Strong communication skills.
4. Clear understanding of the distinction between policy decisions and the scientific analyses/conclusions that can be used to guide policy decisions.
5. Objectivity, flexibility and independent thinking.
6. Hold a scientist or management position with recent hands-on research experience.

Each member **should have** experience in one or both of the following:

1. A record of scientific achievement documented by contributions to peer-reviewed literature or other evidence of success in creative scientific endeavor.
2. Experience in ecosystem modeling, risk assessment, decision support, social marketing or other application of science and engineering in support of ecosystem recovery.
3. A demonstrated ability to inform policy-makers so they are able to forge creative solutions to complex management problems.

Process for Appointment to the Science Panel

The Partnership is soliciting nominations for the Partnership Science Panel. Self-nominations are encouraged. The WSAS will evaluate all nominations to ensure that they meet the selection criteria provided above. A subcommittee of Leadership Council members, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and staff will evaluate the applicants using evaluation criteria developed by the Science Panel and provide the top names to the Leadership Council. The Leadership Council will make the final appointments of members to the Science Panel.

Nominees with recognized expertise in fields and disciplines of science directly related to the recovery of Puget Sound will be considered for appointment to the Science Panel. Nominees may include scientists associated with federal, state and local agencies, tribes, businesses, environmental organizations and institutions of education (including K-12, colleges and universities).

There are two options for application of a candidate for consideration by the Partnership:

1 **Self-nomination:** Candidates interested in submitting themselves for consideration to the Science Panel must submit a cover letter and resume. The cover letter should indicate why the candidate is interested in this position and how the candidate meets the criteria identified above (up to 2 pages). Candidates must also submit contact information for three individuals who support their nomination.

2 **Nominate a candidate:** To submit the name of an individual for consideration to the Science Panel, a letter of support for the candidate indicating how he/she meets the criteria listed above must be submitted (up to 2 pages). In addition, contact information for two additional individuals who support the nomination of the candidate. Contact information for the candidate must be included.

Application Submittal Guidelines

Submit electronic or hard copies of materials described above by **5:00 p.m. on Monday, October 5, 2009** to:

Puget Sound Partnership
Science Panel Nominations
Box 40900
Olympia WA 98504-0900
Applications@psp.wa.gov

An email will be sent confirming that the information has been received.

For questions on the Science Panel appointment process, please contact Scott Redman, Puget Sound Partnership at (360) 725-5448; email at scott.redman@psp.wa.gov