

PugetSoundPartnership

our sound, our community, our chance

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel Meeting Summary

February 9-10, 2010
NWIFC Conference Room, Lacey

Day 1

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
 - Robert Johnston
 - William Labiosa
 - Jan Newton
 - Timothy Quinn
 - John Stark
 - Katharine Wellman
-

It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting. Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record retains a recording and notebook from this meeting.

Action Items:

- Approve November 2009 Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary:

- Agency Update
 - Monitoring Program Development
 - 2010 Performance Management Products and Process
 - Puget Sound Science Update
 - Science Panel Roles and Work Plan Proposal Discussion
 - Biennial Science Work Plan
 - EPA Science RFP
 - Status of Comment Summary
 - Strategic Science Plan
 - Work Session - Science Panel Roles and Work Plan
-

CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER

Science Panel Chair Timothy Quinn opened the regular meeting of the Science Panel at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the first regular Science Panel meeting of 2010.

The agenda was reviewed and approved. Tim discussed the work session and how this will be a time to develop the plan for both the year and the next biennium (2010-2013).

The Science Panel has been identified as a major player in the Puget Sound Science Update, and time to work on this will need to be included in the plan.

Meeting Summary Approval

Trina Wellman **MOVED** approval of the November 2009 meeting summary. Joel Baker **SECONDED**. The Panel **APPROVED** the November 2009 meeting summary as presented.

AGENCY UPDATE

David Dicks provided the agency update. (See meeting materials for details.)

Legislative Issues

The agency is focusing on two pieces of legislation this session:

Limiting the use of copper substances in vehicle brake pads – passage of this bill would phase out copper in brake pads because copper is toxic for salmon and the environment. This effort was listed as one of the actions in the Action Agenda. Senator Ranker is lead on this bill, and it has a good chance of passing.

Marine special planning for management of marine waters – is also listed as an action in the Action Agenda. The President's budget has federal money identified to do Marine Spatial Planning. This bill would put the State of Washington in place to be one of the pilot areas. This would involve surveying the Puget Sound, Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the Pacific coast. It would begin the process of harmonizing all the state's efforts concerning marine spatial planning.

The agency is also supporting passage of the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) funding proposal, which would triple the fees on oil and other toxic substances coming into the state. The fund currently provides approximately \$125 million a year. If the bill passes the amount would increase to approximately \$400 million depending on the price of oil.

The funds generated would be divided to provide for Washington State Department of Transportation retrofits, to fully fund Ecology's oil spill program, to run Ecology's stormwater program, to fund Puget Sound Partnership's stormwater work, to provide monies for local governments' retrofits, and to add to the general fund. In the beginning most of the funds would be diverted to the general fund to help with the budget shortfall, but by 2016, most funds would go to the environmental programs as originally intended.

David reported that Dennis J. McLerran was just named as the new Regional Administrator for EPA's region 10.

David will be giving testimony at a hearing in Washington DC. If passed, this legislation would put the Puget Sound into the "Great Waters" category and provide a dedicated federal fund source. He believes there is a good chance of passage. This would be

additive to existing efforts and include an EPA Puget Sound office. He is working with others to figure out exactly how this might work. He will provide updates as this moves forward.

David and Governor Gregoire met with Dr. Jacqueline Kinkaid, director of the European Environmental Agency working on the “Eye on Earth” project. Eye on Earth is a two-way communication platform, which brings together scientific information with the feedback and observations of ordinary people. It is the result of a partnership between Microsoft and the European Environment Agency (EEA). During this meeting they talked about the possibility of including the Puget Sound as a pilot area. For more information see <http://eyeonearth.cloudapp.net/>.

MONITORING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

New Monitoring Program Manager, Nathalie Hamel, provided this presentation. (See meeting notebook for details.) Her objectives for the meeting were to introduce herself, review monitoring goals and the current monitoring plan, and find out the level of involvement the Science Panel wants in the monitoring program.

Once she provided her background, which includes a science policy interface, she provided a draft monitoring structure and her short-term work plan for Panel discussion.

Nathalie’s short-term work plan includes:

- Form a steering committee
- Write an EPA grant proposal
- Expand knowledge of monitoring interests
 - Continue meeting interested entities
 - Keep an inventory of various monitoring efforts
- Represent monitoring program
 - Meet with San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) and Southern California Coastal Water Research Program (SCCWRP) in May
- Keep current as a scientist by working as a Co-principal investigator on one of the Puget Sound Science Update chapters

Bill Ruckelshaus suggested the Board Coordination Group (BCG) assist Nathalie with the formation of the steering committee. Note: *The BCG is an ad hoc group called together by Leadership Council chair Ruckelshaus to address cross-board issues. It includes the chairs of the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB), Science Panel, and Salmon Recovery Council, as well as the Leadership Council chair and vice-chair, the Partnership Executive Director and Deputy Director, and associated staff board liaisons.*

Tim agrees with the suggestion to request assistance from the leadership group. The Panel will continue to discuss monitoring during the work session on day two of this meeting.

The Panel stressed the need to be clear about the strategy to move forward and the need for a coordinated and integrated monitoring program that includes some indicators that haven't been monitored in the past, e.g. human well-being.

Scott Redman introduced Frank Mendizabal, the new Puget Sound Partnership Communication's Director.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES

Jim Cahill and Martha Neuman presented this information. (See meeting materials for details.)

Jim reported that John Becker, the new Performance Management Director, will begin his duties on February 16, 2010.

Martha reviewed the process, products, and timeline for implementation of the Performance Management system.

Ken Currens reported that the Open Standards framework is also being used in the salmon recovery work, but there is not one owner of the data and no funding. Regional Integration Technical Team (RITT) members are now going to each of the 14 watersheds and entering their recovery plan into the results chains to set the outcomes and identify who is doing the monitoring of the different questions. This may not be the best way to do the work, but this will provide an immediate watershed picture. A regional picture of the monitoring can then be produced.

Jim explained how the logic chains work with measures and goals.

The group talked about deadlines, the need for science input, and the time needed by the scientists for their review. The scientists agree that the Sound is in decline, that there are threats, and they don't want to hold up the process, but insist that getting science input is important and this needs to be included in the timeline. Timing and schedule will be part of the discussion during tomorrow's work plan.

Martha reported that the current plan is to start work on the Action Agenda Assessment the first part of 2011.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Naki Stevens, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), reported that DNR is currently setting 2020 eelgrass targets. They are moving forward on this for two reasons: to model good behavior and encourage sister agencies to do the same. Secondly, if

completed by April, this would put the agency in a stronger position to keep their eelgrass programs budgeted. DNR would welcome review of the eelgrass targets by the Science Panel. DNR is looking at historic information to see how other large ecosystem groups have set eelgrass targets. They plan to use this to build a framework for numeric targets.

PUGET SOUND SCIENCE UPDATE

Scott reviewed the memo on the Puget Sound Science Update (PSSU). (See meeting materials for details.)

The Science Panel is invited to attend a workshop on March 8 to further develop the PSSU. The draft will be out prior to that meeting.

The group discussed the Synthesis and Policy documents and a timeline for completing work.

Martha Neuman, David St. John, Mary Ruckelshaus, and Nathalie Hamel will identify key questions to be addressed in the policy document. A cross-program workshop will be set up for this work, but they are not yet sure who will be included. Martha thought the key questions could be ready for Science Panel review by April.

The group then discussed how to present this information on the Web page since wiki won't be done until after the document is complete. The decision was to post the chapters as pdf documents as they are ready and then develop the wiki format later.

The Panel will continue to work on the timelines and make Science Panel assignments during the work session on day two of this meeting.

SCIENCE PANEL ROLES AND WORK PLAN PROPOSAL DISCUSSION

Tim reviewed the Science Panel Proposed Roles and Work Plan Proposal memo that was presented to the Leadership Council at its January 28 meeting. (See meeting materials for details.)

Tim reported that during the January meeting the Leadership Council requested the Science Panel develop a process to provide ad hoc responses to questions. David Dicks has also requested a process for this.

Bill Ruckelshaus agreed. He also suggested the need for a discussion with the Leadership Council and Science Panel to define what is science and policy.

Tim explained that Michael Grayum has talked to him and Joel about preparing for the next legislative session and he stressed the importance of having science support the information. The Panel needs lead time to respond to questions.

The group discussed the importance of correct information for the Partnership and how to provide facts that can be relied upon. Tim would like to discuss a path forward on this issue with the Ecosystem Coordination Board and then take recommendations to the Leadership Council once the Science Program Manager is on staff.

Action – development of scientific and technical support capacity for the Partnership is deferred until hiring of PSP Science Director

PUBLIC COMMENT

Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, agrees this is exactly what the Partnership should do. The Partnership needs to supply the truth and rebut false statements. She suggested that Frank, as the Communication Manager, add a questions-and-answers page on the Web page.

BIENNIAL SCIENCE WORK PLAN

Scott reviewed the spreadsheet on Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) actions and current status. (See meeting notebook for details.)

The Panel discussed translation of the State of the Sound information into an Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) type process. The goal for future iterations of the BSWP is to have an ecosystem-wide synthesis.

There was still confusion on how the IEA fits into the Partnership work. Some of the Panel members believe that open standards may have taken the place of the IEA work, but others believe these are different products. Jan Newton reminded the Panel that the IEA is addressed in the Strategic Science Plan as one of the tools. Ken Currens explained that open standards are tools for assessing threats to make decisions to go forward with.

Action: Provide updated summary of BSWP needs ahead of the legislative agenda, i.e. identify the actions outlined in the BSWP that have not yet been initiated (restate current science needs to build capacity, see below.)

EPA SCIENCE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Scott provided an overview of the Partnership's proposals for presentation to EPA. (See notebook for details.)

- a. Develop and implement a coordinated regional ecosystem monitoring and assessment program (\$700 k)
- b. Coordinate integrated ecosystem assessment efforts and modeling/assessment work groups relevant to Puget Sound ecosystem recovery (\$400 k)
- c. Synthesize available information about characterizations (\$300 k)
- d. Maintain and refine Puget Sound Science Update (\$400 k)
- e. Create information management working groups and detailed work plan (\$200 k)
- f. Assess basin-wide restoration progress (\$200 k)

Scott noted that:

- a and d are the highest priority for staff and the Partnership
- b and c are items already funded but that haven't been entirely spent
- e is in the "not begun" category and staff may decide to not put this request forward
- f is the academy assessment

The total request is for \$2.2 million.

STATUS OF COMMENT SUMMARY

Tim introduced this agenda item providing background of the Action Agenda and Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) Comment Summary. (See meeting notebook for details.)

Bob Johnston provided his thoughts about this document and why and how he developed the response. The document included summaries of comments organized by specific areas and SP responses that he drafted for each comment area. He noted that the comments were considered in the development of the Strategic Science Plan. He created this summary on behalf of the Science Panel and wants it to be a usable product. The Partnership responded to comments received on the Action Agenda but not to the science-related comments. He stressed that while the responses to comments may not be "explicitly" required by a legislative requirement, the Science Panel is mandated to provide nonrepresentational and independent advice and direction to the Partnership. Feedback and critical review are important aspects to any science program, and the extent that the PSP's Science Program is successful depends on how well we are able to engage the larger scientific community. One way to help that process is to respond to criticism, embrace good advice, defend sound decisions, and make a conscientious effort to be responsive to reviewers that have taken the time to provide us with input.

He reported a lot of the responses he provided were obtained from the Strategic Science Plan, BSWP, or had been discussed as a group during a Science Panel meeting. He does not believe the responses are far from the consensus of the group.

Scott provided staff response to this document. Staff is most comfortable with summarizing the comments to shorten the responses. If the Panel wants a responsiveness summary then he would edit the comments. He really likes the organization of the document and finds it helpful.

The discussion addressed whether the SP should devote time to reach a consensus on each of the draft responses or shorten the document by removing the responses and noting that issues raised during the review were incorporated into the Strategic Science Plan. The Panel agreed to post a condensed summary of comments on the Web and stated that the comments were considered when drafting the Strategic Science Plan. They will be taken into account in the next version of the BSWP. Bob would still like a discussion about responses. The Panel decided that the response document will be used as an internal document, and Scott will work with Bob to revise the introduction and preamble to the comment summary document prior to posting it on the Web.

Tim thanked Bob for his work on this herculean task.

Action – Bob will provide condensed version of comment summary for review by Science Panel for posting on PSP web site.

STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN

Jan noted that the Strategic Science Plan is posted with a preamble. Comments are due by March 31. The Panel will look at the comments received at its April meeting and take the Strategic Science Plan to the Leadership Council for final approval in May.

Jan stressed the need for the Panel to read through the document again and make sure this is what the Panel wants to say.

5:05 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

February 9-10, 2010
NWIFC Conference Room, Lacey

Day 2

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Robert Johnston
- William Labiosa
- Thomas Leschine
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- John Stark

The work session was not recorded.

CONVENED WORK SESSION

Science Panel Chair Timothy Quinn reconvened the work session at 8:40 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the day.

Puget Sound Institute

Joel Baker provided an update on the Puget Sound Institute. This Institute will be located at UW Tacoma at the Center for Urban Waters but will be open to other colleges and universities. He will be writing the final work plan for the \$4 million received from EPA. He is expecting capacity for 3 studies per year, which will be coordinated with the Partnership. The Institute will also house some of the activities that are not in the Partnership budget.

Next steps:

- Finalize work plan
- Executive Director of Partnership and Dean of UW Tacoma will appoint steering committee members
- Joel will then come back to Science Panel for first round of studies (paper studies, not primary research field studies)
- Post RFP for the studies

Joel reported the \$4 million from EPA is a one-time amount and needs to be spent in two years. It will be part of the Institute Director's responsibility to find ongoing funding and fund raising efforts.

Science Panel Work Plan

Margen Carlson facilitated this portion of the agenda with the objective of developing a generic biennium calendar.

Scott provided an overview of the schedule and upcoming deadlines. He explained that the state biennial flow is to get us in place for budget discussions in 2012, but the Panel may also want to take into account the federal fiscal year flow of work.

We are currently working on a two-year cycle, but Tim asked the Panel to look at the information and decide if this is the best cycle. Some projects will need to be on a 2-year cycle but some information could be on a different cycle.

The Panel discussed the need for assessment of the work being done by the Partnership. They don't want to base the Panel's work on the assessment process but to figure out the best way to make the process work.

Joel and Jan discussed the need for a "business plan" to implement the strategic science plan.

The capacity discussion needs to happen with the new science director once he or she has been hired.

At the April Science Panel meeting the Panel will need to finish the timeline and efforts.

Assignments:

Recommendations for Agency Budgets – Scott Redman, Nathalie Hamel, Joel Baker, John Stark, and Tim Quinn

- Start with BSWP and define what is needed to fill gaps in funding
- Draft due in 2 weeks
- Check with Martha and Jim for a final proposal date

Science Update

- End of February: draft chapters 1, 2a, and 2b ready for review - June for chapters 3 and 4
- All Science Panel members need to read all chapters as they become available
- Mary Ruckelshaus will send out to reviewers for external reviews
- Science Panel chapter leads will do assessments of reviews and summary letters to authors
- Resolve revisions

Joel and Tim will work with Mary to develop questions to guide the reviewers and provide guidance for the review process.

Chapter leads will comment both on the guidance going out to the external reviewers and associate editing process. The chapter leads are:

Chapter 1 – indicators

- Bill Labiosa
- Tom Leschine
- John Stark

Chapter 3 – threats and drivers (social systems)

- Joel Baker
- Bob Johnston
- Tim Quinn

Chapter 2a – biophysical status (examine relevant indicators)

- Jan Newton
- Tim Quinn

Chapter 4 – strategies for recovery

- Joe Gaydos
- Trina Wellman
- Bob Johnston

Chapter 2b – socio-economic status (examine relevant indicators)

- Trina Wellman
- Usha Varanasi
- Tom Leschine

Synthesis (review in late summer)

- Written by Mary and the lead authors
- Whole Science Panel reviews synthesis

Summary for Policy Makers

- Cross-partnership work groups (or leadership committee) will identify questions from policy makers (w/Partnership staff) (possible Leadership Council, ECB, and Science Panel combined meeting)
- Science Panel reviews the questions and revises as necessary (by early summer) Hopefully w/face-to-face iteration re: questions
- Scientists answer questions – will need to provide editing for language level
- Take existing documents and pull together a summary to answer the policy questions – short document – will do a moderated process possibly with lead authors, ECB, and Leadership Council members (fall workshop) resulting in the summary
- Second workshop – roll-out event – for broader public
- Consider final product that is visual, interactive, Web site – this also may be appropriate for the synthesis document

Joel described a Great Lakes Conference as a good example of a public rollout of information. <http://www.epa.gov/solec/>

The Panel discussed authorship of the summary. After discussion it was agreed that the Science Panel should take this on as its role and use national academy and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) models.

Monitoring

Nathalie provided her objectives for this agenda item:

1. Discuss Science Panel role in developing the monitoring program
2. Decide on where and when the Panel wants to engage in forming a steering committee
3. Solicit input on developing the monitoring program and the EPA proposal to increase capacity for the program

PUBLIC COMMENT

Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, reminded the Panel that a lot of monitoring work has been done already and suggested the new Panel members look at this information. She noted the Leadership Council is scheduled to revisit the monitoring governance issue in June. She notices the Science Panel defined its role to advise, integrate, and educate, and has included monitoring under "advise". However, it has fewer meetings scheduled so it seems to her that the Panel is changing its role in monitoring efforts.

Karen Dinicola, Department of Ecology, told the Panel that as the stormwater monitoring lead at Ecology, she will support Nathalie. She discussed a meeting with the monitoring consortium, Bill Ruckelshaus, Martha Kongsgaard, and Bill Wilkerson who is the monitoring forum chair. She believes the Leadership Council approved the work plan at its meeting so that Nathalie already has her work plan. Picking the steering committee is the number 1 assignment on the work plan.

Tom Mumford, Department of Natural Resources, reminded the group that Nathalie has a monitoring program and huge amount of resources through the Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP). The people and entities are still there even though the group hasn't met for a while. He also suggested Nathalie change her title to adaptive manager since it is not really a monitoring program but a system for accountability to change people's behaviors.

After Panel discussed the monitoring program and the role of the Science Panel, Leadership Council chair Bill Ruckelshaus committed the leadership group to assist Nathalie with formation of the steering committee and to clarify the roles.

Nathalie will follow up with everyone.

3:00 p.m. ADJOURN

Science Panel Approval



Timothy Quinn, Science Panel Chair

April 21, 2010
Date

Next Meeting: April 13 & 14, 2010