



May 1st, 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM

Science, Policy and Partnerships

Katharine (Trina) Wellman
Northern Economics (Firm), kfwellman@comcast.net

Joel Baker
University of Washington Center for Urban Waters

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cedar.wvu.edu/ssec>

 Part of the [Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology Commons](#)

Wellman, Katharine (Trina) and Baker, Joel, "Science, Policy and Partnerships" (2014). *Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference*. 202.
<https://cedar.wvu.edu/ssec/2014ssec/Day2/202>

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences and Events at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Science, Policy and Partnerships

Salish Seas 2014

May 1, 2014

Joel Baker, Angela Bonifaci, Tracy Collier,
Tom Leschine, Ian Perry, John Stein, and Katharine Wellman











Question 1

The integration of science into policy has been widely discussed. The Puget Sound Partnership claims to be science based and does have as part of its structure a Science Panel. However, it is not clear that the Partnership has been clear in a strategy for successfully integrating science into a robust policy making process.

What are the three things that we could do immediately that would contribute to a better integration of scientific knowledge about Puget Sound and specific policy actions?

What are three things that we could do to better account for the social benefits of different dimensions of ecosystem restoration in the Puget Sound region?

What are critical scientific syntheses that are not happening now that would benefit ecosystem recovery?

Question 2

The stated goals of the Puget Sound Partnership bely an underlying policy choice. Given the size of the Puget Sound region, the amount of inputs, and the forcing function of climate change ecosystem, recovery by 2020 is like trying to turn a supertanker in 5 minutes.

Are policy decision makers being truly honest about the ability to change the big drivers of ecosystem change?

Should the scientific community communication be different? How?

How can we best deal with the potential that society is opting for policies whose side effects will constrain practical realities of ecosystem recovery?

Question 3

The Governor has clearly stated that the Partnership should “focus” its efforts and not “spread the butter too thinly”.

From your (science/policy) perspective, what are the merits and drawbacks to various approaches to “focus” (e.g. selected geographies, selected pressures)?

What approach to “focus” would offer the most certainty of meeting the Governor’s interest in seeing benefits from expended resources?

What do we foresee as the measurable benefits/results of different approaches to “focus”? Would “focus” allow for better application of adaptive management?

How would we get from a “focused” effort to Sound wide recovery (i.e., how and when do we scale up)?

How do we recommend that the PSP Leadership Council and Executive Director respond to the Governor’s call for “focus”?

Thank You for Sharing Your
Time and Thoughts!!