



RHODE ISLAND BAYS, RIVERS, & WATERSHEDS COORDINATION TEAM

November 28, 2006

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Department of Environmental Management

Conference Room A

Providence, Rhode Island

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Coordination Team Members in Attendance: W. Michael Sullivan, Juan Mariscal, Kevin Flynn, Paul Pinault, Sharon Pavignano for Meg Kerr, Jeff Willis for Mike Tikoian

Meeting Observers: Mark Adelman, Jane Austin, Kip Bergstrom, Tom Getz, Sue Kiernan, Don Pryor, Richard Ribb, Tom Uva, Sandra Whitehouse, Jell Willis, Chip Young, Ray Marshall, Malia Schwartz, Caroline Karp

Coordination Team Staff: Ames Colt, Melissa Stanziale

COLT

Called the Coordination Team Meeting to order at 2:15 pm at the Department of Environmental Management.

Motion was passed by the Team to approve the minutes from the last monthly meeting on 11/1/06.

Informed the team that work is being done to move the website from the URI to the DEM computer network with a new domain name, and that Melissa will be handling it day to day. Hope to expand the website and use it as a central communications tool over time.

Also affirmed that a roster of meeting dates for 2007 has been circulated and all dates have been approved with subject and locations to be announced. At this point, the location for the next meeting will be at the Narragansett Bay Commission. Suggested that it may be useful, since the location is at NBC, to

have a topical focus on NBC & focusing on where Paul Pinault sees NBC going in the future and how far it has come during his tenure.

Asked if part of the monthlies could be utilized for informative, though-provoking presentations. This could involve any number of academics or CT members could give presentations about their programs. Expressed interest in inviting Kevin Hively (consultant to the Economic Monitoring Collaborative) to present in either February or March. We could invite Federal Officials, GA Leadership, Governor's Folks, or the Governor. Scott Nixon has also offered to make a presentation of his findings. Would be interested in having Gary Brewer (a policy scientist from Yale) give a presentation. Be happy to propose possible topics and presentations in the future.

The Coordination Team responded in the affirmative without a formal motion to having topical speakers for each monthly meeting.

Stated that he would like to spend the bulk of this meeting on the Draft Proposal. It is 38 pages long, and far from complete. Wants to get initial feedback from CT members before it is circulated; it is still very much in draft form with several gaps. Spent a good deal of time on it, but did not want to go any further until getting a sense from the CT that this is the direction to go in. There is a deadline of December 15th to submit this proposal to the governor. It needs to be finalized over the next two weeks so they can focus on development of a fiscal strategy.

Also, he is scheduled to attend the Restore America's Estuaries National Conference December 11-14th in New Orleans, and work is being done to bring Restore America to Providence for its fourth national conference in the Fall of 2008. This still hasn't been confirmed yet; they are still negotiating with the RI Convention Center, but they are trying to complete negotiations in order to make an announcement at the conference in New Orleans. Stated that this is a thousand-person national conference, and believes that Rhode Island would be a great venue for it.

Also, working on a current Implications of Current Science for Management Chapter for the forth coming "Narragansett Bay Science Text" under development by Rhode Island Sea Grant.

SULLIVAN

Would like the Council to be aware of the magnitude of this event; it should not be taken lightly. It is a significant opportunity for the Coordination Team to practice what it preaches. Cuts across governmental, non-profit and on-the-ground practitioners that have made some of the good projects work.

COLT

Keep in mind we also have the Estuarine Research Federation coming in November 2007. The audience is not as diverse, but it is an important conference as well. Hopes he does not have to do too much with conference organization and logistics for Restore America's Estuaries, they seem to have a fairly sophisticated operation.

SULLIVAN

Wants the team to embrace the project; everyone should commit to the projects and make both conferences as good as possible.

MARISCAL

What does it mean to "host"? It can be an overwhelming task. What kind of support do you get from the National group and what is their expectation?

SULLIVAN

Locally it will be up to us to develop the local tour showcasing-success stories and things like that.

MARISCAL

Do they select the speakers, and line them up?

COLT

Yes. They handle all the logistics, but we should have input in terms of the sites that are visited, and seminars of local interest, encourage Rhode Islanders in the region to attend and support the conference, and use it to showcase what RI is all about, and use it as an opportunity for us to learn about what is going on in the rest of the country and the world.

This is only the fourth RAE conference. There is substantial participation in the upcoming one by Rhode Islanders already, a lot of us are aware of it, and Save the Bay is very excited about Restore America's Estuaries coming to Rhode Island in 2008.

WHITEHOUSE

Do they expect the Coordination Team to do any fundraising?

COLT

Not explicitly. No. They're requesting help with the convention center.

SULLIVAN

They would like DEM to put up the money. Mostly what they need is financial and public relations support.

WHITEHOUSE

Advises that they get a handle on exactly what they are asking for.

MARISCAL

Wants to know if Colt could get some indicators from the local host in New Orleans as to what their level of participation is?

COLT

Yes. He will look into it. Has worked with the Coastal Society on organizing conferences before, and is familiar with the process. New Orleans gave them a good deal, that's why they're located there. They are non-profit, and they run a good conference. But they do need assistance, and feels it is in the CT's interest to participate. We should try to make it the best conference possible with a regional scope as well. It would take place in the fall of 2008.

WHITEHOUSE

Wanted to know if this would be after the election.

COLT

It would take place October, 2008 during the Columbus Holiday week. The time is not set in stone, but they very much want to come to RI. Providence is, by far, the best place to hold the conference in New England.

MARISCAL

Expressed concern that timing will be an issue as far as budget concerns go. It will affect either one-year's budget or another. So it's important to know whether or not it will be in 08.

COLT

October is a difficult time for the convention center; it's the time they are the least willing to try to bargain. Initially RAE was considering holding the conference

during the Spring of 08, but then they changed back to the Fall. Not certain of what is going on at this point.

SULLIVAN

The first conference had 150-250, the second 250-350, the third 450-550, and now it is up to over 1,000. There is an extremely rapid learning curve. All of that background may not be all that relevant. We should do this because we have a great story to tell.

COLT

It is also a great way to educate the public about these issues, and call some attention to them.

YOUNG

The fall of 2008 will be a difficult PR time.

COLT

if they cannot get their price points, they will go back to the spring of 08 as the date of the conference. That would ease some of the pressure in terms of cost and competing with the election.

Asked that the Team turn to the proposal.

Has tried to build the proposal around four basic goals. The first question to the Team: Are these the right goals and, if not, what should they be?

In response to discussions from the November 1st meeting tried to prioritize goal number One. That is the whole idea of the “fix-it theme” that Michael and Saul had mentioned. Trying to address current, on-the-ground, relevant coordination issues/challenges. This would entail a certain degree what Colt does from day-to-day. Intentionally left that part of the proposal, the part that speaks to goal 1, very “outliney” because he has yet to get specific feedback from the team on the listed specific issues and problems.

When he sent out the Draft Proposal, he also sent out a Matrix based upon the Watershed Applying Commission’s Phase I report of March 2004, and the requested actions by Governor Carcieri that he provided in response to that report.

This was put together after speaking with Mark Adelman, and trying to get a sense of what they are interested, as an administration, in having the Team focus on. The impression that Colt received was that they are interested in concrete achievements, accomplishments which are tangible and relevant to public

interests; versus a lot of time spent comprehensively planning or monitoring. Their viewpoint is that we have planned enough (although not necessarily monitored enough) to now proceed forward in the next four years with specific actions. In a sense the matrix, which is somewhat dated (material produced in 2004), indicates that a lot of the Governor's requested actions have actually been completed or taken on; but, the Team could task Colt to take a look at these actions, find out their status, report back to the governor, get more feedback on specific actions and activities. This would be a way to fill out that goal One agenda.

Finally, upon submission by the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative of the 11 one pagers incorporated into the proposal, Colt received an additional two one-page environmental monitoring requests from CRMC on shoreline erosion and SAV mapping, and five additional environmental monitoring one pagers from the Division of Marine Fisheries. Peter August is adamant that we vet these requests through the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative, and most likely the Science Advisory Committee, before they are formally submitted to the Coordination Team for incorporation into any CT proposals an up or down vote.

Colt understands Peter's view and does not want to short-circuit the process that the Collaborative has set up and is responsible for. At the same time, with these seven additional monitoring requests, he feels that it is important to put something before the decision makers during this budget cycle and is not certain of exactly how we should proceed.

Colt does not think they are going to get the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative to sign-off on these new proposals prior to December 15th, but would at least like to identify their existence in the proposal and then once the process of review and approval has been finished, get them in to the Governor's Office as soon as possible, or at least to the attention of the General Assembly.

MARISCAL

Is there a target for the budget for the Coordination Team that has been given by the state Budget Office? Because it is amazing that we got the money we got this past year -----If we have not funded yet all of the proposals that have been reviewed and proposed by the Team already, then what is the chance of one of the additional proposals becoming a higher priority than what we have already prioritized? If you spend any time reviewing those proposals, at some point you have to draw the line and say "we have to go forward with something." I'm not sure that what is in here already is going to receive sufficient funding.

COLT

Agrees and does not think that they should stick them into the FY 2008 proposal at the last minute without the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative signing off

on them. However feels that these, particularly the fisheries, are urgent monitoring needs that fulfill specific state legal mandates for the marine fisheries division and thus are important, as are CRMCs monitoring requests. The monitoring collaborative has not re-prioritized the whole set-up of requests in relation to these new ones, and the funding request is already very high at a two million dollars. Feels they should go forward with the environmental monitoring component of the proposal as it stands, but also note in the proposal that there are others in the pipeline that will need attention.

This brings up the point of whether the Coordination Team, at this point in time, wants to prioritize the monitoring programs currently listed in the FY 2008 proposal. Do you want to go forward with this, or do you want to make a cut now? In terms of what total amount of funding we should shoot for, I haven't received anything specifically.

SULLIVAN

Given current FY shortfalls forecast, in terms of revenue, it's exceedingly optimistic to believe that this budget request would be fully funded; but if we were to get a million dollars it would be great; a million dollars including staffing costs. A \$2.6 million budget? That won't happen.

MARISCAL

Believes it is important to send a message as to what we think is needed. It always comes down to money. We need to say this is what it is going to take; obviously we have priorities within that. If you gave us \$500,000 well this is what we would do. But the other thing is, we had done an exercise, I think with the environmental monitoring collaborative specifically on the top projects within the five-year window. Often people will say they need 2 million dollars, and they think that's all, but it's actually 2 million annually. We do have some very specific numbers going out over the next few years

COLT

Yes. The Monitoring Collaborative still has a lot of work to do on that; it needs to provide me with additional budgetary information. But we can certainly send that message that this is an annual need, not a one-time thing.

It strikes me that monitoring economic and environmental, and its assessment, and its utilization and policy is a issue statewide in and of itself, and the gap between what we need to do and what we are doing is so large, and has been there for such a long time that we have to begin to ask "what are we doing wrong as a state"?

BERGSTROM

I don't think it makes any sense to consider things if they have not been considered by the environmental monitoring collaborative.

COLT

We are going to go forward, without trying to insert these in. I wanted to bring it to the Coordination Team's attention that these do exist and they need to be addressed. It's more of a timing issue that they were not considered already.

WHITEHOUSE

A lot of work was done last year to identify possible revenue streams, and prioritizing as to what might be realistic to request.

COLT

I have built upon that work and I have a draft "fiscal strategy" document. Wanted to focus on what we are going to do, before focusing on what are the new ways that we are going to do to raise funds. I'm trying to get us to look at what are the projects we should be doing.

SULLIVAN

I suggest there is some calculated risk in the new approach. If you identify two prematurely revenue streams you run the risk of losing at the budget office. They will say "good idea, thank you."

As Ames indicated we made some on that in terms of some of the background. Most of them could be presented at the December meeting. Maybe they were added, someone might council the needs in terms of more pressing needs and at this point identifying the shortfalls of monitoring information Whether you can afford them or not, they exist, and I still would fall on that sword if you wish. General funds won't get us there.

COLT

Mark, do you want us to give you the proposal and then follow-up with a fiscal strategy?

ADELMAN

The Governor will consider whether there potential for a dedicated revenue stream, or is all the funding to come out of general revenues? Once you hand the proposal to the Governor, then he thinks, where/how can I fit this in? Provide him

with the biggest picture you can provide. He may not think of it in terms of offsets unless their potential is specifically noted.

MARISCAL

It seems to me that the established priorities for this fiscal year, which are partially funded; you cannot end funding at the end of this fiscal year. Because certain projects are multi-year, you just have to carry those forward, hopefully at a higher level.

COLT

So is this a good point to emphasize in the proposal itself, to build upon current projects? Is the rest of the Coordination Team on board with the process that Adelman described? Do you want to add this fiscal strategy in? I think we can put forward some decent ideas although they need to be fleshed out.

Returning to the FY 2008 goals, I think they are pretty straight forward. The most important one to consider today is the first and really specifying what that means for FY 2008. But, I want to hear of any concerns the CT may have about these goals. Are they specific enough? Are they the right ones?

FLYNN

My concern about Goal one is it doesn't say, toward what end? It assumes that the leader knows what you are trying to do. I think you need to say, "to do what."

COLT

On page four, there is a very out-lined form of specific issues. I've been talking a little bit with Tom Getz about Scarborough Beach who has been working with the Department of Transportation; that is very much an engineering issue. I've been talking a little bit with the Quonset Business Park about an issue with regard to Frye's Cove and the water quality standards along that water front, and possibly trying to refine those to enable a boating facility to be built, and I can show you a diagram of that. They are looking for some help in figuring out this waterfront proposal for ferry terminal; a boating facility and an inter-modal air/weather connection. This is catering to the mega yacht business and connecting it with issues in Newport bringing some of that work up into the Quonset Point to ease pressure on Newport Harbor boat yards, and then connecting to the Air Field, which could be very attractive to these yacht owners.

FLYNN

That is a very specific example. You wouldn't want to put that as something under goal one; you would want to have some more general statements.

SULLIVAN

With regard to the work at Scarborough Beach we are talking about engineering solutions. I think you should describe it in simple terms that the plumber from Providence can understand.

COLT

Those are some of the more immediate case-specific issues that I have already been drawn into a bit. I also identified some longer-term issues at the last monthly meeting that we could use to flesh out goal one, depending on what the Coordination Team wants me to focus on. Again, goal one is more about what I am going to be doing from day to day to move forward with the Coordination Team, in addition to planning and working with the sub-committees.

KARP

Develop capacity and means to use work on specific issues as a lens into larger planning and coordination contexts. This general language currently in the proposal will not mean much to anyone.

BERGSTROM

There are some quick hits you could do such as expedited state and local permitting.

COLT

That is certainly an issue that I hear from the economic folks pretty consistently. How we should address it is not clear to me.

UVA

I am concerned about focusing on a problem like Scarborough Beach. One of the things we have tried to avoid in the past is to focus on one specific area. When you put this budget forward before the General Assembly, it may seem that you're looking at just Narragansett. One of the problems is that we always have monitoring money to close the beaches, but we never have money to find out why the beaches are closed. I think what we need to do is find out why we have these beach closings. NBC monitoring in the upper bay on many occasions showed that the water quality for fecal coliform was meeting standards, yet Conimicut Beach

still was closed quite often. To take it to the next level, I think we might focus on finding the source of the beach closures, and opening up more beaches along Narragansett Bay.

SULLIVAN

I think we need to look at the theme. We know we have fecal coliform problems at Scarborough. We also have coliform problems in Highland Park in Portsmouth. Identify political distribution of closures whether its swimming or shellfishing- that is the reality of the problem. It may be that Scarborough is a high density neighborhood with a high population of raccoons in the sewer pipes, whereas Highland Park is high density whose soil ends at four feet and effluent seeping out from under it. But overall we're focusing on greater utilization of Bay and shoreline resources by the public. Some distribution of attention to problem areas would be good so legislators buy into it as a worthy Coordination Team task.

ADELMAN

Why not show the legislators a success and use that as a catalyst for more? Otherwise there is just this discussion at a high level of "we're going to fix the beaches, we're going to start monitoring." And then three years later you're still talking about everything you're going to do.

Scarborough is singled out by the Governor when we're talking about beaches because we know what the problem is, and it's just a matter of trying to figure out what the solution is. Take that first step to characterize the problem, but the Governor wants to take the final step to fix it.

SULLIVAN

What we have at Scarborough is an interim, inadequate solution to a broken stormwater management system, a better solution to which will require the Depart. of Transportation's financial support and will provide much greater swimming opportunities at Scarborough Beach. What we need to chart out are real long-term solutions utilizing new systems of higher technology to high-density development water quality impacts such as those seen at Scarborough.

The situation at Highland Park will require a solution emerging from an Aquidneck Island partnership that may be consider utilization of a dormant sewage treatment plant that is in need of technological upgrades, but it's the closest treatment plant to address Middletown's needs and the needs of

Portsmouth's Highland Park which may entail a \$8-14 million dollar pipeline solution.

WILLIS

EDC offers a certificate of critical economic concern. This might be something that the Team is interested in looking at, and see where we can use that to address the issue of expedited permitting. Because if a development project is issued one of these certificates, then that application has to be put at the top of their list.

MARISCAL

If you are talking about improving that certification process I think that is where the focus would be. The Water Resources Board has already looked into this process, and we would be charged \$25,000 by EDC.

SULLIVAN

We have the means to try to put together four goals. We are asking the CT to prioritize. EDC is good at collecting the fee and then shipping the work to Coastal or DEM. At this point, we have got to prioritize. Having four goals is great but I can make it into three, or two. I would rather come to some consensus as a Team on what are we going to get done in one year.

Advises that Colt should take the thirty-something page document and turn it into an eight-page implementation plan for 2008. Would like to see some long-term plan-setting budget/fix-it, as it should be. Long-term may mean the collaboration on Aquidneck Island on how do you get the Navy and communities working together on improving the island's wastewater treatment plans.

COLT

It has to be the right balance of a good fix that connects to the longer-term process of developing a systems integration plan.

At this point, he is prepared to put forward more ideas, or take in any ideas that the team might want. Also, emphasizes that Sullivan is making a good point that either we prioritize now, before it goes to the governor, or next summer when we get one quarter of the funding we asked for.

SULLIVAN

The Governor also has to prioritize whether or not he wants to give us three million dollars for a fantasy, or three million dollars for a set of prioritizations that we can review progress toward a year from now. If true coordination is brought to bear upon priorities that we have implemented/achieved over the next year and

then move on to the next priorities. Or do we want to have this same conversation a year from now? The less we reduce the proposal to some achievable, prioritized tasks, we may be casting our own fate. Asks Adelman, "Do you want a half-million dollar budget with cold, hard predictions, or do you want three million dollars with everything we wildly need this year?"

ADELMAN

The Governor wants to see what we will get for the money.

MARISCAL

If we could provide a list of priorities, we could list them one through twenty and give them cumulative totals, we can do that prioritization with all the projects we have.

Feels that, on an annual basis, the seven agencies achieve a lot. One of the things we are trying to do is to get all the agencies to work together in order to address some projects and some problems that are bigger than any individual agency, and so we have a lot of projects that are quantifiable on an annualized basis, but you're not necessarily seeing tangible results. It may be a study that shows using monitoring data that the Bay is good or that the Bay is bad. With better monitoring, we will know what stream flow conditions are and we can make better decisions based on that information that we couldn't before. To a certain extent, thought that was what these one page summaries from the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative represented.

When we pick a project like Scarborough, there is actually a clearly defined solution to that. So, it doesn't feel as if it needs the CT's involvement. Something like the Quonset Business Park waterfront development issue is way beyond our capabilities to some extent so he doesn't think we can do that either. We need to identify some projects that will have long-term impact that we can chip away at. For the projects we do identify we need to have better information about them so we can make better management decisions. He feels that they are moving in the right direction, but is unsure of whether they will have quantifiables, like "a project was built because of this." It may set the Bay Commission off in a certain direction to build a new project. Five years from now, a certain design standard, because of information that we have, but it isn't going to happen in one year. Does not feel that the Team should be prioritizing construction projects.

COLT

Would like to build on both approaches. Also, within the planning process that we are supposed to be undertaking, the Quonset Business Park project is a perfect coordination issue because it involves aligning the environmental quality

standards with economic development interests. At least it is something, that helps the CT align with economic interests.

COLT

How much does the CT want to see non-team members reviewing this proposal? Should there be a wider circulation? Or do we want to just work at this level and try to get something in to the Governor on the 15th?

MARISCAL

It is a public document, and anybody should have access to it.

COLT

There are still gaps to fill in but this could be done concurrently. We could submit it to the Governor and also hand it around for review/comment by other folks simultaneously. Would that be acceptable, or should it be kept private?

ADELMAN

When it is accepted here it becomes public knowledge; the Governor is not secretive.

COLT

Will attempt to post a complete version on the Website next week and will also send it to the four sub-committees, and they can disseminate it. Can work with you directly to get extra review from PAC. Wants to know do they want to prioritize at this point? Believes that the way the budget has been laid out on a line item basis allows them to pick and choose fairly easily, or for the governor to do so, especially in combination with a proposal for offsets using alternative funding strategies.

Keeps coming back to monitoring, and the issue of putting on the table, in black and white, what the true core monitoring needs are for the year and the information gaps that are not being filled. Do we really want to send the message that these are important, but some are less important? Or do we want to keep pushing on the basic environmental monitoring agendas we have laid out along with the economic monitoring, which is, in a way, even further behind than the environmental monitoring. We have to put these things on the table, so we really understand what our true needs are.

SULLIVAN

Again, you have a one-pager simply showing office operations. How much of this money is new activity, and how much else are you investing? In terms of CT office ---- there is an additional \$33,000.00 of expenses which shows that comes in the form of what DEM gets billed for office space, phones, etc. These are real costs, and in the balance of these other things, whether they are in monitoring or economic or others. Feels that one thing that we need to convey is what is currently being invested. Paul Pinault did this well when showing him some of the expenses that NBC deals with. It is important to convey that we are already spending two or three million dollars on much of this, but this is an increment of additional activities that flesh it out.

At a minimum, the budget needs to reflect direct/indirect costs, and some have to convey the other message as well. I turn the thing the other way and then string it out over a couple of pages. Also, multiple-year costs. Because that is how you convey, and that is how we cause ourselves to prioritize. Do we need 16 stations in the Bay? That seems like a good number, but maybe it's just this year that we need 16. Four years from now, maybe it will only be 12; five years from now maybe we rotate 10 because that is the kind of integrated planning that we need.

COLT

Collaborative is going to provide me that additional information. Such as, what are the other sources of funding, and how does that relate to what we are asking for? the four-year projection of monitoring program costs can be added.

SULLIVAN

The conversation we need to have around this table is how do we adjust in time and space. We are not going to be able to just throw this budget out. Sooner or later we are going to have to prioritize and coordinate how we do these things. At some point, you have enough data, or you have enough stream flow information, or you know enough about out flow, or we are done with 2025 planning

BERGSTROM

Responds that he does not think so. The only reason we do any monitoring at all is that it's the trends that matter.

COLT

But when you look at the DO monitoring work in the upper bay, you may eventually be able to say, "We can predict the system based upon four-key fix-site stations, and we do not need the boat time because we have a model that allows us

to make decisions based fewer data points. Forces us to ask: What are the end points for our monitoring programs as they evolve? It's a very difficult question. It takes a lot to figure that out, and that has to be part of the systems integration planning process

SULLIVAN

A question that will be asked of you, and of all of us is "how much does it grow?" And how do we make incremental progress on ----the deficit knowledge and maintain the ongoing capacity?

COLT

He feels a lot of that material can be found in the work that the Environmental Monitoring Collaborative has produced to date. Some of these are ongoing, and will evolve. There is enough material from the Collaborative that we can draw on to put that picture together. He is just trying to get a proposal in to Mark by the 15th, and continue to flesh it out over the next six months. That is what we should focus on.

SULLIVAN

Advises that he take the thirty-plus page document and break it down to a 5-10 page Executive Summary refocusing on shortcomings that need to be addressed.

COLT

Trying to do that in the first few pages. Trying to make that the executive summary. Again, where the most guidance is needed is with goal one. Understands what is wanted with the monitoring piece, in terms of more detailed quantitative funding information. Can come back with more ideas for the team to respond to. But is the Team going to prioritize shoreline water quality for recreation in FY 08? Another project worth considering is Greenwich Bay SAMP implementation. The Greenwich Bay SAMP lists specific action items calling for coordinated action among Team members.

BERGSTROM

Whatever goals and projects there are, make the connections between those projects and monitoring. They are not academic project, they are for the purpose of solving these problems-that should be made explicit.

COLT

The other way to handle goal 1 is to keep the list the way it is, and try to develop an issue agenda that says to Governor and General Assembly, “these are the key difficult challenges we face as a state and a region.” Freshwater/stormwater control, coastal hazards resilience and recovery, and state these as these issues we need to deal with. Should create an agenda of what is important, and put our particular spin on them, and not trying to prioritize and say “this is what will be done in twelve months.”

Or, there is the matrix of Governor’s activities. If we stick with this-Mark will be pleased. Feels this is a good idea-it provides specifics to be built on.

MARISCAL

The proposal should provide a better sense of what needs to be done with regard to these short-term and long-term issues.

WHITEHOUSE

Not all goals in this proposal are in the legislative mandate for the Team. The General Assembly will evaluate monetary requests according to the mandates they provided and whether what was proposed was actually done. Nevertheless, the Governor may have a different take of what will be in his budget.

COLT

Last topic for the team to address today is the systems-integration plan, goal two. That does respond to the most specific legislative mandate before the CT. Have met with Richard Ribb and worked on the systems level plan or systems integration plan outline that the Ad Hoc group put together in 05. It tries to incorporate the specific planning request of the General Assembly without getting into a massive comprehensive process that would take years and a lot of money to complete. We do not have the time or money. We need to get going on this. The Estuary program has offered staff support (this plan fits their needs as well). URI Coastal Resources Center has offered to help out-not clear how much they can help. It would be via Sea Grant support. Propose that the CT reconvene the Ad Hoc working group to help work through the planning process in 07. Would like feedback now as to what this outline is all about. Tremendous challenge because we trying to come up with a plan that covers all the bases, in terms of our major watershed and our marine waters and all the agencies that are involved. We are at a very different point as a state than where we were when the Narragansett Bay Project was in full swing in the 1980’s and early 1990’s. Strategic planning is much more prominent it seems to me for individual agencies and programs. Therefore, we should build upon such strategic planning efforts-not duplicate them. Coordinate and integrate them How do we go about doing that quickly and cheaply?

FLYNN

It's huge, all-inclusive

COLT

The Team needs to set up a process for producing a strategic plan that is living and can be easily amended.

FLYNN

Do we have one year or three to produce the plan?

COLT

I have tried to set a deadline of next December to issue a draft plan.

SULLIVAN

Suggest that Pete August, Judith Swift could provide help through their multi-year IGERT program which provides monies to support doctorate and post doctorate environmental students who could provide planning support. Why not make an official request for one or two to be lent to the program-high quality assistance.

COLT

Will the team allow such a request to be sent to Peter August?

TEAM

Yes.

COLT

Ad Hoc group could be very helpful and hopefully permission will be granted to reconvene that group again. Other sources of help-possibly the federal agenciesE? Will talk with the General Assembly to get a time frame from them for completing the plan

COLT

The Science Advisory Committee is asking for help to develop research strategy should be part of an overall plan. Build upon a fairly general plan. Identify a

process for being more specific about goals, actions toward achieving those goals, and means for evaluating the progress toward them. That's how we could build upon the MRUOP.

KARP

No one here is new to planning. A paper by Donald Robadieux provides a good summary of major planning investments that have been made so there is no need to start a new plan from scratch.

COLT

We should look to the two monitoring collaboratives to help us ask what are the problems, and how is monitoring helping us to articulate and solve those problem?

BERGSTROM

The Economic Monitoring Collaborative has asked the ad hoc group to assess available information on public expenditures on infrastructure to support the marine economic cluster, a required task of the Economic Monitoring Collaborative.

COLT

Put proposal to CT saying I would like some staff support in regard to systems-integration plan and related activities.

FLYNN

Focus planning and team efforts on what is broken despite all previous planning, despite all our best efforts in the past, we still have these problems. We should lay those things out, be hard on ourselves and say –this is what's broken and this is how it effects the quality of life/economy as we know it, and use that as the driving force for our existence and the funds that are needed. Are the monitoring, and other projects that you have in mind good illustrative examples of where you and the Team fit into the overall management structure of the state?

At 4 PM, a motion was approved to adjourn the meeting. The next monthly meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 20 at Narragansett Bay Commission.