

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Work Session Summary

February 26, 2009
Dumas Bay Centre, Federal Way

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 record.

Work Shop Summary:

- Science Related Activities Update
 - Strategic Science Plan Development
-

WORK SESSION

Joel Baker opened the work session of the Science Panel at 10:14 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the day.

SCIENCE RELATED ACTIVITIES UPDATE BY CHAIR

Joel reported that at the last Leadership Council, the Council approved both Mary Ruckelshaus' proposal for the Puget Sound Science Update and Martha Neuman's State of the Sound proposal. The Leadership Council will be making the decision on Monitoring Consortium governance at an upcoming meeting.

The Partnership's new Deputy Director, Lynda Ransley, has been invited to attend the March 10 & 11 Science Panel meeting and the Panel is hoping she will play an active part in the work of the Science Panel and be the main management representative to the Panel.

Scott Redman provided a quick update on where the agency is on the FFY08 science funding. The amount of money is still in flux but we may have clearer idea by the March meeting, at this point it looks like it is at about \$2.4 million. Panel members discussed

some confusion around the federal funds and discussed the need to make sure the Science Panel is clear about the science priorities. The Panel needs to clearly state what it feels must be done scientifically no matter where the funds come from.

The Science Panel discussed the need for getting a process in place for evaluating science related projects in the Puget Sound. The Partnership doesn't have control of all the funds and many groups are vying for the money. Although the Science Panel doesn't have a say in how the projects are funded, there should be a way to provide input on the science that is done in the Puget Sound. The Panel should have a process in place for evaluating all the projects and then have a science/policy link so that the policy makers understand which are the important projects.

Joel Baker discussed the need to look at a way to provide budget priorities to Partnership management and the Leadership Council between today and March 10. In the future, the Panel needs to work with the Leadership Council and Partnership management in moving forward with the science related budget recommendations. The Panel needs to make a strong stand on what is going forward and make sure they link with the BSWP. This link with the budget process needs to be stated in the Strategic Science Plan.

DRAFT STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN (See notebook materials for details.)

Joel opened this conversation with the need to finalize the Strategic Science Plan soon and to wrap back around to the morning's conversation about the structure for science in the organization.

The Panel was reminded that the Strategic Science Plan will be a reference document for the Partnership to use. The Panel needs to have a review process for this document once we have something to review but today we need to get to the content. After today's discussion the Panel will be able to better decide on who the audience will be for this document – if it is an organizational strategic plan or external communication plan.

The Panel then reviewed the February 25, 2009, draft version of the Strategic Science Plan section-by-section and made suggestions for changes and revisions.

- Section 1: Introduction - Tim Quinn and Frank Shipley
- Section 2: Description of Puget Sound Characteristics and Trends – John Stark, Trina Wellman, and Jan Newton
- Section 3: Frank Shipley and Tim Quinn
- Section 4: Scientific Information Required to Achieve the Six Puget Sound Partnership Goals – Jan Newton and Joel Baker
- Section 5: Foundations of a Rigorous, Durable, Responsive Puget Sound Science Program – Joel Baker, Trina Wellman, John Stark, and Mary Ruckelshaus

- Section 5.2: Required Capacity and Competency – Joel Baker, Trina Wellman, and Ken Currens
- Section 5.3: Peer Review – Guy Gelfenbaum
- Section 6: Implementation – John Stark, Joel Baker, and Jan Newton
- Section 7: Science Education and Outreach – Trina Wellman

The Panel will come back to this discussion before the end of the day.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Doug Myers, People for Puget Sound, thought this was the best Science Panel meeting he has attended so far. He wished this document was in place before the Biennial Science Work Plan. He went through his comments on the Strategy and then provided written comments to Tammy for distribution to the Panel.

Tim Towey, retired citizen, likes the document. He noted his comments are as a taxpayer and he believes this Panel represents good value for the tax dollar. He would like the Panel to be more of the “dog” and less of the “tail” – be more forceful on what they suggest and not apologize for things that might be wrong. He would like this group to make the decisions rather than the politicians.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and Science Panel have all indicated support for working together on critical issues and need to a science/policy connection. “Science policy” work groups have been proposed. (See meeting notebook for details.)

The Science Panel discussed how they would like to see these groups work and the organizational structure needed to support the efforts.

The Panel sees the “science policy” work groups and “question setting” groups and would rename them to make this clearer, such as:

1. Knowing status and trends group
2. Understanding threats group
3. Prioritizing management response group

They also discussed the need for an outreach work group. The “are we getting it” group.

The Panel discussed suggestions for these groups to move forward including:

- Using an adaptive management structure
- Using the State of the Sound to set priorities for the coming year
- Assigning a Partnership staff person to support each of the work groups and any associated subgroups plus a chief scientist to oversee the efforts

- Having the four groups work together to set the priorities for both budget and effort needed
- Having three ECB liaisons on the groups to better represent the Board
- Having one Partnership staff person oversee communication through the whole process by working up (Leadership Council, ECB, Science Panel meetings) down (subgroups) and across (making sure different sectors are informed)

The Panel's recommendations will be shared with the Leadership Council for its decision on the final set up of these groups.

DRAFT STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN (discussion continued)

Next steps on the Strategic Science Plan:

- Each section lead will provide revisions to Scott by March 5
- Scott will revise the draft document and provide to the Panel by March 9
- Panel will continue work on the Strategic Science Plan at its March 10-11 meeting

Bob Johnston will review all the comments received on the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) and highlight needs for Science Panel follow-up.

At the April Science Panel meeting, the Panel will review and discuss how we should organize the union of the BSWP and Action Agenda for budget and implementation planning.

4:00 p.m. ADJOURN

Respectfully submitted by:
Tammy Owings
Special Assistant to the Boards

Next Meeting: March 10 & 11, 2009
 WWU Campus
 Bellingham