

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel  
Meeting Summary

December 16 & 17, 2008  
Senate Hearing Room #3, Cherberg Building, Olympia

---

**Day 1**

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Guy Gelfenbaum
- 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 Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record.*

---

Action Items:

- Approval of Revised Meeting Schedule

Meeting Summary:

- Introductions
- Action Agenda – Question 4 – Science Panel Roles
- Science Policy Integration Discussion
- Budget Overview
- Monitoring Discussion
- Targets and Benchmarks Discussion
- Strategic Science Plan Review of Outline
- Georgia Basin Conference Update
- Washington State Academy of Sciences Briefing

---

**10:15 a.m. WORK SESSION**

Science Panel Chair Joel Baker reviewed the agenda for the two-day meeting. The first two hours of the meeting are scheduled to be a work session to plan for implementation of the Action Agenda and Biennial Science Work Plan.

Scott Redman reviewed the documents that will be used during the work session discussion including a list of actions in priority order, pages from the Action Agenda, and a planning calendar.

The Science Panel voiced concern with not knowing the organizational structure of the Partnership's Science team and who is on staff to assist with the science work. Scott reviewed the prioritized list and explained who on staff is assigned to the various projects on the list and where additional needs are expected. The Panel discussed the need to not only assign someone to the projects but to understand what it will take to complete the projects.

The Panel then began discussion of needs and direction to take for implementation of the Action Agenda and Biennial Science Work Plan.

The Panel discussed:

- Use of the IEA as a way to organize the questions such as "What is healthy?"
- Creation of an overview committee consisting of two Leadership Council, two Science Panel, and four Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) members to focus on needs for the IEA over the next biennium
- Have a one time facilitated process to help develop the questions and then set additional meetings as needed
- Martha Neuman will review the Action Agenda for other science/policy links and will come back to the Panel with that information
- Additional working groups should be created as needed using members of the Leadership Council, ECB, and Science Panel for specific topics or questions

### **CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER – Joel Baker, Chair**

Joel Baker opened the regular meeting of the Science Panel at 1:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda for the rest of the meeting.

### **PANEL BASICS**

The Panel **APPROVED** the revised 2009 meeting schedule with meetings on:

- January 13-14, 2009
- February 26, 2009
- March 10-11, 2009
- April 29, 2009
- May 7-8, 2009
- June 24, 2009
- July 8-9, 2009
- August 26, 2009
- September 9-10, 2009
- October 28, 2009
- November 17-18, 2009

Conference calls would be scheduled for one week prior to each of the two-day meetings for meeting preparations.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No public comment

#### **ACTION AGENDA – QUESTION 4**

Martha Neuman introduced this agenda item by noting the need to get the Action Agenda more science-based in the future.

Mary Beth Brown reviewed development of the accountability process. The State of the Sound is due November 2009. She sees this as a performance report and not so much a science report although it reports how the science is being implemented in the Action Agenda. Information in the 2009 State of the Sound Report will be used for the 2010 legislative session.

Mary Beth explained how King County presents their performance measures in an accountability system called King Stat and she is proposing a similar format for the Partnership.

The group discussed the distinction between the State of Sound and the Puget Sound Science Update. The State of the Sound is evolving to be a performance report and the information presented in the Science Update should be used in the State of the Sound, but once again the reports are off in timing.

Martha Neuman is looking at the State of the Sound to be a companion document to the Action Agenda. The State of the Sound is due in November of odd-numbered years where the Science Update is due in April 2010 and then as needed in the future. After this round of reporting we should be able to sync up the reports.

The Partnership needs to have the outline for both documents agreed upon in the next couple months to meet deadlines.

Mary Ruckelshaus will present the draft outline of the Science Update at the January Science Panel meeting.

Mary Beth explained that the Science Panel role in the State of the Sound report would be to comment on practical aspects of the science presented in the plan – the document will be used for basing budget requests.

The Panel discussed Science Panel's role and what is needed for the State of the Sound and Science Update reports.

Staff will prepare a work plan for the State of the Sound Report for discussion at the January Science Panel meeting.

#### **BUDGET**

Jim Cahill provided an overview of the budget status. The governor's budget has not been released yet but discussions to date sound favorable for the capital budget. He

doesn't believe the operating budget will provide any new money so he is not expecting to be able to add staff to the agency.

Current science spending should remain close to the same but the \$26 million request the Science Panel estimated for implementation of the Biennial Science Work Plan is not likely to be received. There is about \$10 million in the federal money and Jim asked for Science Panel's assistance in thinking of a list of items this funding could go toward. Staff has already started to develop the list of high priority projects.

The Puget Sound should be getting additional funds from EPA in the next grant round, and staff will be working through the work plan of priorities. There will need to be a lot more discussion and prioritization of budget requests and funding. The Science Panel's priority would be to have staffing level correct. Jim thought the agency could use some of the EPA funds for staffing but would need to show why this is a priority. Jim doesn't see any cuts for the Partnership at this point but other state agencies may need to cut back and that may affect the Partnership.

Bill Ruckelshaus reported that the Puget Sound Non-profit Foundation has been formed and is in the process of recruiting its board. The principle responsibility of the Foundation will be a focus on public communication.

## **INDICATORS AND BENCHMARKS**

Martha Neuman, Mary Beth Brown, and Scott Redman presented this information.

Scott Redman discussed the King Stat four indicators and how with the Partnership there are six legislative goals with indicators in the next level. The Partnership could use the same roll up process that King County does but we would need to decide how to weigh each of the indicators and outcomes.

Mary Beth discussed the performance measures and need for targets – she doesn't believe we need to set indicators at this time. Her priority would be agreement on performance measures for management actions.

The Panel will continue this discussion on day two of the meeting after they have had time to review the handout and see if the legislative goals, provisional indicators, and indicator descriptions are correct and discuss how to finalize the list.

## **MONITORING**

*Monitoring Consortium* (See meeting materials for details.)

Karen Dinicola and Rob Duff provided an update on Monitoring Consortium's accomplishments and report findings.

They stressed the need for a decision on governance structure of the Monitoring Consortium and need to make sure there is adequate capacity to make the transition successful.

They discussed how stormwater was one of the center driving forces but not the only thing – stormwater is a way to keep the local governments engaged. The monitoring structure recommended by the Consortium is much bigger than stormwater.

Karen reviewed the two possible monitoring umbrella structure models:

- Model 1 – state agency-based program housed in the Partnership
- Model 2 – Independent private institute

The Consortium would support either model but want an independent and transparent process, science based, cost sharing, and provide accountability (adaptive management) and easy access to data. Under both models the BSWP would be the basis of the program.

The Panel discussed the pros and cons of the different models and how the different models could or should work. The consortium would be agreeable with either of the models. They are not asking for a decision today but need to have a decision by June 2009.

Karen and Rob were reminded that which of the Monitoring Consortium models to use is a David Dicks and Leadership Council decision, not the Science Panel's.

#### *Monitoring and Assessment Work Group*

Scott Redman introduced this agenda item and Tim Quinn provided more information about thinking behind this work group that Ken Currens would pull together. This work group would pull together assessment work and would jump-start the indicator work – they would help flesh out the information needed for the ecosystem wide indicators.

Joel Baker noted that the Consortium is working on how to get monitoring done and this group would be setting up what needs to be done. This group would get to agreement on the ecosystem wide status and trends monitoring needs and would be structured in a way that it could expand if needed.

Scott noted the other connection would be that the Consortium would start focused work groups such as stormwater and this group would help with the questions and technical assistance.

This discussion will be continued at the January and February Panel meetings.

**5:15 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING**

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel  
Meeting Summary

December 17, 2008  
Senate Hearing Room #3, Cherberg Building, Olympia

---

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Guy Gelfenbaum
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Katharine Wellman

**8:55 a.m. RECONVENED MEETING – Joel Baker, Chair**

Joel opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda for the day. Due to weather conditions, the agenda was revised to conclude early.

Joel talked about the agency's budget request and the need for the Science Panel to engage with the Partnership with budget concerns and priorities. Jim Cahill had asked for the Science Panel to provide its priorities for spending \$3 million in federal funds but the Panel does not know what projects are already being funded and which still need funding.

The Panel discussed the integrated ecosystem assessment (IEA) and whether this has been funded already or if this is something that the Panel needs to request funding for.

Concern was voiced that the Partnership is over a year old now and there still isn't a process for other entities to plug in to the Science Panel. The Panel discussed need to identify groups and ways they could/should be linked into the Partnership's Science Panel process.

The Panel discussed if they are at the point to set work groups up yet or a pilot project. Four groups are currently in place that could be used to move forward – monitoring, toxics, modeling, and IEA and indicators. The Panel discussed the need for a holistic approach to the process and not to put work groups in place without looking at the big picture first. A year from now the Panel would like to have a monitoring staff person who is the "go to" person for Puget Sound monitoring.

The Panel talked about the disconnect between the Science Panel and the agency's funding strategy and need for a better communication link between the agency and the Panel. The Panel would like to be better integrated in the funding strategy and other work of the Partnership.

The Panel brainstormed other possible groups the Panel needs to have connections with:

- Nutrient Monitoring Team
- Nearshore Science Team
- Salmon Technical Teams
- Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP)
- Emerging issues groups
- Education, Training and Outreach groups

Joel would like to formalize ways of engaging with groups that are doing good work around the Sound.

Jan discussed the need to focus efforts on the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) and how pointing to the BSWP would be the way that groups can get linked to the Partnership.

Joel noted the main need is to get capacity – Scott can't do this all on his own and staffing is the highest priority at this point.

Cullen pointed out that the agency budget request for the state funds includes science staff so the Panel may not need to focus any of the federal funds that way. He also reported that he sent a note to David and Jim to include the Science Panel in budget discussions.

The Panel discussed how to convene and organize the groups whether one-time, ongoing, new or existing, coordination or a work group. The difference between the coordination and work groups would be that the coordination groups would coordinate work that would feed an IEA, but no Partnership funds would be used, where a work group would advise and direct coordinated work.

The Panel agrees on the need to move forward even if we don't have funds available at this time. We need to figure out how to provide the work whether we have funds available or not. A year from now the Panel will want to put RFPs out for this work and need to do homework before doing that. There was a suggestion for development of a white paper on each of the topics.

Frank Shipley believes the Panel is honing in on three groups – IEA, restoration, and monitoring. He believes we need to get down to actual decisions and get a ballpark amount for staff funding which is around \$1.2 M and looks like getting closer to the

restoration group linked to the IEA – would take a cut at the budget and staffing. Would also get a subgroup to look at the holistic work with roles, assignments.

Trina Wellman noted one budget item that hasn't been talked about is the State of the Sound Report, the Puget Sound Science Update, and the other must dos, which is probably close to \$1 million of the science budget.

The Panel agreed it is essential to move forward with the additional science staff positions.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No public comment requested.

#### **ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING SESSION**

The regular session was adjourned at 12:05 p.m. the Panel then went into a work session.

#### **WORKSESSION ON STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN**

Jan Newton led this discussion. She reviewed the Strategic Science Plan outline and confirmed assignments and deadlines. February 26, 2009, will be a one-day work session on the Strategic Science Plan. Assignments are due to Jan by February 19, 2009.

To assist with budget planning, the Panel will look at a crosswalk between the Biennial Science Work Plan and Action Agenda at the January meeting.

#### **12:55 p.m. ADJOURN**

Respectfully submitted by:  
Tammy Owings  
Special Assistant to the Boards

Next Meeting:        January 13-14, 2009  
                             Puyallup