WASHINGTON STATE BIODIVERSITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES

Day 1

DATE: April 23, 2007
TIME: 11:30 a.m.

PLACE: Kitsap Conference Center
Bremerton, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brad Ack	Puget Sound Action Team
Ken Berg	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Dave Brittell	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Bonnie Bunning	Washington Department of Natural Resources
Maggie Coon	The Nature Conservancy
Donna Darm	NOAA Fisheries
Rob Fimbel	Washington State Parks
John Marzluff	University of Washington
Dave Roseleip	Washington Agriculture & Forestry Education Foundation
Kate Stenberg	At-large
Naki Stevens	At-large
David Troutt	Nisqually Indian Tribe
Paul Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation
Dick Wallace	Washington Department of Ecology
Steve Tharinger	Local Government (Clallam County)

PRESENTERS and GUESTS:

Julie Colehour	Colehour + Cohen
Christopher Dunagan	Kitsap Sun
Molly Ingraham	The Nature Conservancy
Laura Johnson	Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Laila Parker	Cascadia Consulting
John Pierce	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Robinson	The Nature Conservancy
Elizabeth Rodrick	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

STAFF:

Marc Daudon	Cascadia Consulting
Lynn Helbrecht	
Sarah Gage	
Jen Dial	

ACTIONS TAKEN

Item	Action	Reference
Meeting minutes	Approved	Page 2

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- The Council provided feedback on preliminary recommendations for two issue areas, Education and Public Engagement and Science and Information Needs. They provided additional comment on two previously considered issue areas, Incentives and Markets and Development and Land Use.
- The Council reviewed all the recommendations considered to date and began to develop criteria for ranking them.
- Science Committee members presented revised map products for spatially explicit conservation priorities. The Council approved the overall approach and made further recommendations.
- The Council discussed the future of its work and how to ensure implementation of the Strategy.

HANDOUTS DISTRIBUTED AT MEETING
Updated Agenda (yellow)
Minutes of February Council meeting (white)
Budget Status (pink)
Updated Timeline (legal)
Legislative Session Bill Summaries (white)
Revised Key Components of Strategy (salmon)
Education and Public Engagement Proposed Draft Recommendations (lavender)
Science and Information Needs Proposed Draft Recommendations (tan)
Incentives and Markets Revised Draft Recommendations (green)
Development and Land Use Revised Draft Recommendations (blue)
Recommendations Sorted by Type of Action (ivory)
Matrix of Draft Recommendations to Date (white)
Explanatory Notes for Conservation Value and Risk Maps (white)
State Institutional Framework (PowerPoint handout)

CONVENE AND WELCOME
Maggie Coon, Chair, opened the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Introductions, overview, and announcements
Council members, staff, and guests introduced themselves. Maggie reviewed the agenda.

Lynn reviewed the documents in the member packets. She made two announcements:

- The firm Colehour + Cohen has been hired to assist with early messaging and presentation of the Strategy. She introduced Julie Colehour.
- Meeting dates for the rest of 2007 are August 16, October 16–17, and December 5.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Christopher Dunagan, environmental reporter for the Kitsap Sun, introduced himself.

COUNCIL BUSINESS ITEMS
Approval of Minutes
Maggie called for a **MOTION** to approve the February 15, 2007 meeting minutes. Dave Brittell **MOVED** approval of the minutes. Donna Darm **SECONDED**. The minutes were **APPROVED** as presented by unanimous roll call vote.

Budget:
Lynn highlighted the following on the budget handout:

- An additional $30,000 added to Cascadia Consulting contract to assist with stakeholder work and Council engagement.
- A portion of the budget (approximately $45,000) is expected to carry over to the next biennium. These are funds which have been allocated to enhancing the website, communications support and incentives.
- An additional small contract to prepare a white paper on the effects of climate change on biodiversity is expected to be completed before the end of the biennium.
- Budget for the next biennium will be discussed at the June meeting.

Work Plan:
Lynn referred to the timeline handout. The work plan is winding down, with most tasks completed. A new work plan will be presented at the June meeting.

She noted that public meetings for comment on the draft strategy are not planned, due to limited staffing. Suggestions for increasing exposure of draft Strategy included using the mailing list and holding a press conference.

Pilot Projects Retreat
Participants from both pilot projects met in Easton April 4-5; both groups had good turnout. The group is very dynamic; both projects shared ideas and learned from each other. Both groups plan to continue their work, and they provided comments on the Council's draft recommendations. They will be providing final reports to the Council in June.

2007 Legislative Session—Highlights
Bill Robinson of The Nature Conservancy joined the group by phone and reviewed the handout summarizing key bills passed in the legislative session. The proposed clearinghouse for conservation incentives evolved into the new Office of Farmland Preservation (SSB5108). It will be housed in CTED, administered by the Washington Conservation Commission, and tasked to develop a long-range plan for agricultural development.

Budget items of interest included:

- ESSB5372 – New state agency responsible for the cleanup of Puget Sound by 2020. Creates strong accountability measures. The budget includes $238 million in the first installment to meet that goal.
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) funding doubled, to $100 million.
- Biodiversity Council activities received continued funding—$500,000 for the next biennium.

REVIEW KEY COMPONENTS – OUTLINE FOR STRATEGY
Agenda item presented by Marc Daudon. The Key Components now includes linkages (not just gaps) and future trends (high level trends such as population increase, economic activity, and climate change). This is not yet a formal outline.

Comments:

- Science seems to be missing from key components.
  - "Making the Case" section will include why biodiversity matters to people and the scientific underpinning.
- Will the Conservation Priorities section include recommendations or are they implicit?
  - That crosswalk needs to happen; depends on how far the Council gets.
- We need to think about investments; make some specific recommendations to invest in areas of high biodiversity conservation priority.
- The top five can also be seen in short term and long term. Short-term pilots or projects can feed into long term.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
Education and Public Engagement Draft Recommendations
Lynn Helbrecht presented this agenda item. She reviewed the stakeholder list and highlighted key themes from the feedback.

- Overall, stakeholders emphasized leverage; they wanted more acknowledgment of the good work already going on and how to leverage that.
- Citizen science programs are underdeveloped and have real potential to connect people to the landscape.
- *Working with OSPI:* Stakeholder feedback suggested that this might not be the most productive avenue for the Council, since educational standards and testing is a complex field with many invested players.
- *Networking:* Stakeholders agreed that collaboration and networking have a big role. Facilitating this could be a niche for the Council.
  - The Environmental Education Association of Washington (EEAW) is working on a statewide comprehensive plan for environmental education in Washington (E3 Washington). Biodiversity information should be part of that plan. Staff has been working with E3.
- *Media Campaign*: Such a campaign would make other groups' jobs easier. Other stakeholders noted that with limited resources, it might not be wise to spend most money here.

Discussion:

- Need creative ways to raise the profile of biodiversity conservation.
- Many Council members agreed that the media are an important component.
- Better to go through nonprofits and grassroots than to run an under-funded campaign.
- Earned media can be very effective (using local papers and writing op-eds).
- We don't want to lose track of landowner education about incentives and markets.
- Need to get it into popular culture to make a difference. We need to leverage our messages with existing campaigns (Tourism Board, Puget Sound Partnership, et al.)

Discussion of Specific Draft Recommendations

Community Stewardship

- Foster broader community discussions—local communities recognize the tension between biodiversity conservation and economic sustainability.
- Community stewardship programs should be titled "community sustainability"
  - Other Council members are not as fond of the word sustainability.
- Communities need paid staff to help facilitate stewardship.

Citizen Science

- NatureMapping is the most robust citizen science program in the state, but it doesn't provide feedback to locals and it's not a network at this time.
- Cornell University's program could be a good model for a larger program.
- Like the idea of creating a network with a summit, listserv, and website.
- An annual summit or even a kick off could be really valuable. Create synergy.

Nature-based learning programs, K-12

- The Council needs to recommend specific educational requirements, rather than making recommendations to explore/assess them. This is a key area for several Council members.

Messaging

- Add 8c: an earned media campaign.
- Goal here is to increase public awareness. This discussion is talking about *how* rather than *what*: what do we want people to know about biodiversity? What is the message? More emphasis needed on developing the message.
- Council needs a clearer decision point. Media campaign and other options are not mutually exclusive. A more integrated campaign is desirable.
- We need to call out the appropriate audiences: citizens, landowners, planners, decision makers, policy makers. We did identify who we want standing with us on the Capitol steps.
- The audience for educational materials and the strategy might be different from one another, but they both need to receive the same information.

General comments on education and public outreach draft recommendations

- We need a tighter focus on biodiversity conservation.
- Should we consider education of the policy makers here?
- We need to look for links with other areas. For example, link public outreach and education with landowner incentives, such as requiring education and outreach in SFRB projects.

Public Testimony:

Christopher Dunagan noted that researchers do not often engage the newspapers. If reporters involved early then they can partner all the way through.

Science and Information Needs Draft Recommendations

Lynn presented this agenda item. She reviewed the stakeholders interviewed and acknowledged that federal agencies were missing. The Science Committee, which has broad representation, also

provided feedback on the draft policy options. Lynn highlighted the following themes from the stakeholders:

Biodiversity Science Team: Stakeholders emphasized the need for leadership and coordination of research on biodiversity in Washington.

Biodiversity Report Card: Everyone consulted thought highly of this idea. Some thought it should not be called a report card, as "grades" implies winners and losers.

Biodiversity Data Partnership: Stakeholders suggested that evaluating existing systems might be better than developing a data portal or clearinghouse at this time.

Statewide Biodiversity Monitoring Plan: Similarly, for monitoring, stakeholders suggested that we need to back up and develop a monitoring framework first.

Washington Biodiversity Survey: Several people were interested, sometimes keenly, in a biodiversity survey of the state. Others thought this was not the highest need and would be too costly, but they acknowledged that it would be a powerful way to engage interest.

Citizen Science Network: Stakeholders strongly endorsed citizen science. Such a network could be involved in a biodiversity survey that could inform a clearinghouse.

Discussion of Specific Recommendations

Biodiversity Science Team

- Could be an interdisciplinary biodiversity science team—both hard and social sciences. Or the team could put together teams to address problems in a scientifically effective way.
- How does this team fit in the overall structure of the strategy? Not clear how or where it fits. What does "stand-alone" mean? Need to revisit when we get closer to seeing the whole picture.
- Private sector and tribes' science staff should be included.
- Where does the state get its scientific advice? What would relationship be with the new Washington academy of sciences?
- Better to have an ad hoc science panel? Policy makers could ask specific scientific questions.
- The Science Committee needs to reconsider this recommendation—there's general support for a Biodiversity Science Team, but not 100% buy-off on its function. Clarify roles.

Biodiversity Data Partnership/evaluation of current system

- Can we conduct the evaluation instead of recommending one? If a data partnership is important, should establish need before recommendation (3a).
- Need to document some of the problems with existing data systems.
- It is daunting to determine what data is available (who has it, what quality is it). It's a good idea to proceed, but without saying we know the best way to proceed. Might not be meet-able goal.
- Bringing data together and translating it to a lay audience (clearinghouse) are different tasks.
- Bringing data sources together would be a *huge* task.
- Data are disorganized and disconnected. The recommendation could be to develop a hub; challenge the partnership to develop how to do it, how to improve current system.
- Establish the need and then choose how specific to make the recommendation.

State Biodiversity Clearinghouse

- Include more active outreach. Facilitate how science informs local policy in and out of government.
- Need to be certain this wouldn't duplicate what WDFW and WNHP already do.
    - Feedback is that WNHP is not that easy to use; the idea is that a clearinghouse would be accessible for non-technical users.

- There was a preliminary recommendation to give WDFW funding to work with planners. Perhaps that idea could be incorporated into this clearinghouse (3b).
- The 30-year goal could be that everyone should be able to get all the biodiversity information for their communities. Think boldly—how to measure success in 30 years.

Statewide Biodiversity Monitoring Plan

- What would be the relationship between this and the Salmon Monitoring Forum?
  - Salmon Monitoring Forum not currently addressing biodiversity.
- Monitoring very challenging; don't want to duplicate efforts.
- Streamline this recommendation; identify and build on existing programs.
- The Science Committee needs to reconsider—general agreement that monitoring is important, but question on how to meet the need.

Biodiversity Survey

- What would the relationship of this survey be to the efforts of WNHP and WDFW?
  - Such a survey would engage a broader suite of partners. The idea intrigues WNHP.
- No debate about whether this would engage people. Think of it as 80% engagement and 20% new information. Connects with marketing, citizen involvement. This could galvanize folks.
- The way this current recommendation reads it does not justify why a survey is needed.

Citizen Science

- How do you monitor citizen science information?
  - Trained volunteers give their data to people who know how to check it. Quality control is built into the system.

General/Linkages

- Recommendations should be as action oriented as possible.
- Suggest a partnership to work on developing a clearinghouse. This partnership would be independent but linked to the Biodiversity Science Team.
- Visualize a "Biodiversity Google System."
- Science also informs education and outreach, policy at state and local level, adaptive management. Need to stress the interdisciplinary aspects.
- Streamline this list—include items not being done elsewhere and that demand attention.
- Can't wait 30 years to use data to protect biodiversity.

Marc summarized the next steps for these recommendations:

- Reframe; make recommendations tighter and crisper.
- Biodiversity Science Team. Achieve more consensus on function. Should it be ad hoc? Explore linkages with other teams. Add tribes and private sector scientists. Address question of interdisciplinarity.
- Biodiversity Report Card. Strong support; no questions to address.
- Data Partnership. Add language on gaps and inefficiencies. Identify solutions; link back to partnership. Work out existing entities and gaps at state agency level.
- Biodiversity Monitoring Plan. Tie in with Statewide Monitoring Forum and other activities.
- Biodiversity Survey. Acknowledge its real value: building public awareness and involvement.
- Citizen Science. Strongly linked with Education and Public Outreach recommendations

Incentives and Markets

Marc Daudon introduced this agenda item. These draft recommendations incorporated changes suggested by the Council at the February meeting.

Discussion:

- Add agriculture to 4b (Accelerate market for carbon credits for forestry); no-till agriculture sequesters much carbon.

- No. 7 (Explore new, innovative funding to generate income for and from conservation). Less opportunity on agricultural land now because of tension about losing lands to mitigation banks.
- Do energy conservation and sustainability fit here?
  - They are considered in the development paper.
  - Recommendations on lifestyle choices have not been included.
- Frame recommendations as actions rather than as studies and evaluations.

Development and Land Use
Discussion:
Provide Direct Assistance to Local Government

- 1a: Very prescriptive, down to the level of staffing. Do we need to be that specific?
  - No, but received that feedback—presents a recommended scope.
- 1c: Needs more specificity. Compliance with *which* existing laws? Tie it in with monitoring.

Make Needed Changes in Laws and Policies

- 6a: Not sure about putting something on SEPA checklist if information not available. Even if not expanding but revising. Timing might not be right; it would be more than a little revision.
  - But when would the timing be right? We have to look out 30 years and not just what we are ready to do today. Need near-term and long-term recommendations.
- 6b: Why limit to Growth Management Act (GMA)? What about Shoreline Management Act, Salmon Recovery Act? Include others so we can discuss more than terrestrial.
  - Planners suggested this recommendation.
  - With GMA must plan for certain mandated criteria and anything else local jurisdiction thinks is important.
  - Biodiversity conservation not prohibited by GMA, but planners don't have the technical ability; don't understand natural systems well enough to make the case to politicians.
  - Opening up these acts may not be the best way.
- 6c (and 3d): Don't need to amend the Current Use Taxation statute; need to include assistance to local governments. Local jurisdictions should be able to decide what's important; educating locals would be easier than amending statute.
  - Stakeholders said that if Current Use Taxation statute were more explicit about biodiversity, it would be easier for counties.
- As written, not a lot of support for 6. These may not be the right changes to recommend, but keep it as a placeholder; discuss other laws.

Break until 6:30 p.m.

Evening Session
Dinner speaker Tom Banse, Public Radio Regional Correspondent, addressed the Council on "Five Elements to Capture the Public's Attention." He made the following main points:

The "5 S" strategy suggests including one or more of the following elements to engage the public: sex, sleaze, smut, scandal, or self-serving. If those elements don't suit the situation, he suggested Garrison Keillor's strategy: "The great stories all have five elements: religion, money, family relationships, sex, and mystery. Here's a story that has all five of them in twelve words: 'God,' said the banker's daughter, 'I'm pregnant. I wonder who it was.'"

Banse emphasized putting a person at the forefront of any story. He also noted that most people are interested in WIFM (what's in it for me).

Day 2 – Tuesday, April 24, 2007

Maggie Coon called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Biodiversity Conservation Priorities

Donna Darm and Lynn Helbrecht presented this agenda item. The Council previously agreed to display conservation priorities through maps. The Okanogan ecoregion was used as an example.

Conservation value:
Methodology

- Is this methodology going to give the Council credibility?
  - Yes, irreplaceability is a standard in the science community; that is what is used here.
  - Yes, because coarse and fine filters are used.
- This method has been adopted by WDFW, DNR; that also gives credibility.
- If *low value* is the same as *common*, then seem to have a lot of low value/common in high risk areas. Need to watch out for that: they may not be at low risk in 20 years.

Weighting filters

- How were the filters weighted to determine their importance? We need to explain this in a few words.
  - Targets occur in different places on the landscape; darker green equals more targets represented.
  - The fine filter targets equal about 500 species and coarse filters include 130 communities on the Okanogan map. Do darker green areas include more of those 630 elements?
    - Yes in some of the areas, but not all.
- Are rare species weighted more?
  - Rare species will show up in the darker green areas because there are fewer occurrences for the filters to find.
- What is the threshold between dark and light green areas?
  - In the top irreplaceability ranks: 33% dark green, 33% medium green, 33% light green

Nearshore and marine

- Nearshore and marine areas need to be included in the coarse filter targets.
  - Each ecoregion was treated differently. For the Puget Trough assessment, marine was separated out from terrestrial and freshwater. For the Northwest Coast assessment, they were integrated.
  - The species in the nearshore areas were included.
- Are data available for open waters?
  - Need to find out about data gaps in the marine and nearshore assessments.
- Assessments only included data that scientists were confident in.
- If hexagons are 500 hectares, how do they pick up linear data (e.g., nearshore)?
  - Nearshore data were handled with different analysis units to accommodate that.
- The Council agreed that its policy statements should include marine and aquatic.

Next steps

- Capture the questions posed here; staff to work on phrasing and explanations.
- Need to explain these maps in plain talk.
- Council could recommend support for identifying and addressing marine data gaps.

Conservation Risk:
The Science Committee reassessed the suitability map. It is now called the Conservation Risk map.

Methodology

- Conservation risk is largely based on development pressures. Protected lands are considered to be at low risk; public lands are considered to be at medium risk.
  - State trust lands have only a minor possibility of conversion
- What was the source for the protected population density?
  - Western Futures Growth Model, based on census data; it is spatially explicit.

- Concerned that using only ownership and population density as filters, especially with our focus on working lands. Working land and its potential gets lost in this depiction.
- Need ranks (33%-33%-33%; low, medium, high) like on Conservation Value map.
- The map with three colors is good.
- The Science Committee found that available data are not as fine as needed to distinguish between different private lands.
- A study shows that on lands with 40–45 people per square mile there's a 50–50 chance of conversion.
- Note that Conservation Risk data set is much coarser—there's a misfit between the Value and Risk data sets.

Tribal lands

- We need to be sensitive to how we characterize tribal lands. Some tribes may not want their lands included in this assessment.
- The analysis for tribal lands is further complicated. In many cases we don't have maps that show tribal trust lands or private lands. For some reservations trust lands are a major portion.

Risk data sets

- Is it possible to spatially represent other risks, e.g., fire, climate change?
    - Climate change and fire risk could be dealt with independently, but it would take some time. They could also be considered in a non-spatial way.
    - Proximity to population growth is the best surrogate for other risks. Population growth is related to road densities etc., but keeping it simple seemed best.
    - Could high risk of fire be spatially represented as a separate map?
- Statewide data sets are limited; the Science Committee looked at the ones that are available. Predicted population growth was the best surrogate.
- So long as we are explicit about limitations, it will work for now.
- If lands are already degraded they will show up as low conservation value, but restoration value could be high.
    - May want additional product: Conservation Potential
    - Wetlands and estuaries could be shown as an exception on the conservation value map.

Using the maps

- Putting out maps like this could guide funding.
- These maps show a land-based strategy; want aquatic and marine too.
- Could take the map with all overlays and divide into three maps. Use the maps to point locals in a direction. Leave people with a sense of the various tools and approaches they could use.
- Message from the maps must not be about acquiring or preserving only.
- Need to show that the whole landscape has some value.
- Oregon called areas at risk "Conservation Opportunity Area"—maps should empower people.
- Give stewardship dollars to low risk areas near urban areas so that they stay low risk.
- Concerned that these maps give the message: "people are the problem." Message must be more sophisticated; must engage the public in every way.

Next steps for Conservation Priority maps (value and risk)

- Determine important actions to take in local areas.
    - Brainstorm activities for different colored squares.
- Need to tie Strategy's recommendations to maps.
- The Ecoregional Assessment for the Columbia Plateau, which is a large part of the state, is not yet available. Could be done in three months.
    - Commitments from partners are in place; resources are available.
- Blue Mountains and Canadian Rocky ecoregions are not yet completed.
    - Identify needs for additional research; what future analysis is needed.

- The maps are really important; they are critical to the Strategy. If there are other resources that the map team needs, should ask for help. Partners have GIS staff.

Marc summarized the discussion:

- The Council approves this approach. Asks the Science team to proceed and produce maps for the whole state.
- Communication about the maps must send the correct signals.
- Add or overlay: nearshore, marine, climate change, fire. Value of estuaries, wetlands.
- Address gaps in data. Address depiction of tribal lands.
- Proceed on getting data from the three ecoregions not yet completed.

Integrating Recommendations

Lynn introduced this agenda item and Marc facilitated the discussion. Council members chose one recommendation that they feel is critical to the strategy and explained why. They also rated the recommendations into tiers (1, 2, 3) and placed an X next to any they felt should be deleted.

Ken Berg: *Biodiversity Report Card* (Science and Information #2). It would provide accountability. Hopefully it would provide an objective look at what other folks are doing.

Steve Tharinger: *Develop Pilot Projects to Coordinate Local Plans into Regional Context* (Development and Land Use #5). Engage and link local government to the regional effort.

Dick Wallace: *Accelerate Development of Conservation Markets* (Incentives #4). Carbon credits are only one example. Money is what makes the world goes 'round.

Dave Roseleip: *Explore Innovative Funding to Generate Income from Conservation* (Incentives #7). We need to get information out to individuals and fund some programs to get money into the system.

Dave Brittell: *Build Well-Supported Citizen Science Network* (Science and Information #6). This gives a face to biodiversity and promotes strong family ties.

Bonnie Bunning: *Expand and Strengthen Website* (Education and Public Engagement #7): A website partnership would help weave together the many things going on.

Kate Stenberg: *Network of Nature Centers* (Education and Public Engagement #6). There is a lot of positive action going on, so giving these efforts a small nudge would help.

John Marzluff: *Washington Biodiversity Survey* (Science and Information #5). Statewide biodiversity assessment and large scale survey would get people excited to see what is around their own houses.

Rob Fimbel: *Expand Consumer Education* (Education and Public Engagement #8c). Consumer education and "what you can do" is important so people feel empowered.

Donna Darm: *Make Needed Changes in Laws and Policies* (Development and Land Use #6). Current laws and policies reward people for doing the wrong things.

Brad Ack: *Support Nature-Based Learning Programs for K-12* (Education and Public Engagement #3). People will take care of what they love. Kids need to come out of school being environmentally literate.

Maggie Coon: *Make Strategic Investments* (Incentives #3) Encompasses new funding and links those programs with people on the ground. It is strategic and action oriented.

David Troutt: *Invest in Community Stewardship Programs* (Education and Public Engagement #1). We need to give community groups funding and they need to include economic development.

Paul Wagner: *Seek Funding to Develop Key Biodiversity Messages* (Education and Public Engagement #8a). Influencing people to carry these messages themselves is the most important.

Naki Stevens: *Provide Direct Assistance to Local Government* (Development and Land Use #1). It is important to implement work at the local government level. Lack of capacity and resources limit this.

Marc Daudon summarized. Council members prioritized 3 recommendations from the Incentives list, 3.5 from Development, 8 from Education, and 3 in Science and Information Needs. He noted that with all of the #1's that Council members chose, the plan is pretty comprehensive already.

Discussion on Integrating Recommendations
Lynn introduced this discussion. Before ranking, the Council needs to be clear on what key factors and criteria they will use to choose and prioritize recommendations. Staff will provide a distillation of Council feedback at the June meeting. Council wants to have 3 to 6 top recommendations.

Council members suggested the following criteria:

- Effective; will recommendation work towards desired states?
- Simple, punchy.
- Bold, compelling; captures attention.
- Motivating and exciting, so people say "what can I do?"
- Specific enough for good accountability (who's responsible, what resources, timeframe)
- Action-oriented.
- Leverage current efforts.
- Synergy; must be integrated with momentum toward vision.
- Need recommendations with elements of all 5 issue areas: "science-based public engagement for conservation policy and action."
- Accessible.
- Tied to measurable outcomes.
- Feasible.

Audience

- Audience is the Legislature and the Governor; affects focus and tone.
- Multiple audiences: decision makers, landowners, general public. We could shape and package recommendations for each group.
- The work needs to be more ground up rather than government down; it needs to be more than "here are the five laws that you can pass and that's it." We need to engage people.
- The Legislature is not that different from the public other than needing a strategic element.

Marc summarized the discussion:

- Recommendations should be focused to the Legislature, but accessible to a broader audience. May want spin-off products aimed at specific audiences.
- Recommendations should be action-oriented, specific, and include accountability.
- Approach can be thematic, but lumping recommendations generally not favored.
- Timeline: 2 years, 6 years, and beyond.

The Future Biodiversity Council
Marc presented a PowerPoint on the State Institutional Framework, ending with these questions: Council—yes or no? What functions in a biodiversity council? What else needs to happen in state government to ensure that the recommendations can and will be implemented?

Urgency

- Biodiversity does not seem to have the same urgency as Puget Sound and Invasive Species.
- Emphasize the increase of population, land conversions, and the scientific literacy of citizens might encourage the sense of urgency with the Governor.

    - The Governor is working on them already—danger in emphasizing thing that other people are working on.
- Politically, need to get the Governor on board. The Council's current charge is to address
    - Preventing species endangerment
    - Getting away from species by species approach
    - Current system not working; need more comprehensive way of looking at conservation investments.

Other models for addressing cross agency, cross sector issues:

- The Oil Spill Advisory Council.
    - Example of the difficulties a citizen council can have without the support of a legislative team. It was created by law two years ago with two full time employees.
- Watershed planning. Initiating governments and planning units are locally based, with funding and administrative efforts provided by the Department of Ecology.
- Some kind of institute where people are actually working on these issues.
- Legislatively mandated has more oomph
- Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC) was established with money from multiple agencies because the Legislature and citizens saw that there was not enough coordination.

Relationships of a permanent Biodiversity Council

- How would a Council relate to state agencies?
    - Some agencies work for the Governor, some for statewide elected officials, some for commission. It depends on their common goals and to the individuals in the agencies.
- This Council has been fortunate to have the participation of the federal agencies.
- METRO and the salmon groups, higher education, federal, tribal, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) need to be considered.
- Is biodiversity the umbrella for these others to work under or is it just another facet?
    - John Mankowski saw biodiversity as an organizing principle.

How to proceed

- If we lead with a structural recommendation for a new Council, might take away from biodiversity action agenda.
- Support from the Governor is crucial. Gary Locke's EO explicitly states that the Council expires 12/31/07. An EO could extend this Council without a sunset date.
- Seek new EO to continue work and take stock; this group continues with clear responsibility for implementation. Start now to begin to connect with Governor.
- Perhaps a two-part strategy
    - 2008 would include a set of action items and that the EO be extended. Fund Science Team (not as many political pitfalls as whole Council—it's more applied/concrete).
    - 2009-11
- Need to get biodiversity conservation into the missions of other agencies. Agencies can form core team with an outside council that brings together locals to build central coordination.
    - Would bring down the need for more FTEs.
    - Could try to get to this point by the end of the fiscal year.
    - Maybe DNR and WDFW could be the lead to manage these efforts.
    - We should get on this sooner than later. It is not as controversial as it may seem.
- Federal agencies and NGOs are very important. Needs to be some entity that addresses key issues for the whole state, not just agencies.
- We need a back up plan in case not able to get a new EO.
- Suggest leading with models from other states.

Marc and Maggie summarized the discussion:

- Develop the idea that the Council would continue (not to be a permanent entity, not legislatively mandated)
- Seek conversation with the Governor's Office to test the waters.

- Seek Governor's support and a new EO
- Seek early actions in 2008
- Seek new funding to engage a biodiversity science team.
- Keep other options open.

PUBLIC COMMENT
None.

CLOSING COMMENTS:
Council agreed that the October meeting would be in eastern Washington.

Maggie thanked the Council and staff. She asked everyone to come to the next meeting with one sentence that describes the Council's work using the elements that Tom Banse described.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Maggie Coon

Maggie Coon, Chair