

Meeting Summary Notes

8 April 2016

Task Force on Independent Scientific Review for Natural Resources

Monday, 28 March 2016, 9:00am-4:00pm

Department of Administrative Services West Building
155 Cottage Street NE, Conference Room B
Salem, Oregon 97301

Attending Task Force Members

Task force members: Mark Sytsma, Maryanne Reiter, Linda George, Jason Younker, Sara Gray, Dan Edge, Barbara Bond (Co-Chair), Adell Amos, Cass Moseley, Allison Aldous, Michael Harte (Co-Chair), Jennifer Allen. Absent: Tim Deboodt

Facilitator: Jane Barth

INR staff: Lisa Gaines, Jeff Behan, Sarah Brennan

Primary Meeting Outcomes

- Evaluate conclusions task force can make based upon documentation to date and meeting discussion.
- Determine what additional information is needed, if any, to accomplish Goal 1.
- Determine action items, roles and deliverables for the next meeting.

Discussion

Objective 1.1: Evaluate whether natural resource agencies, legislators, and public would benefit from independent scientific reviews.

- What does “ISR” mean?
 - External to policy development process
 - Reviewers have no vested interest in the issue/outcome/research
- Does ISR benefit agencies, legislators and public?
 - Depends on whether it is “done right” or not. We can’t say whether or not it is done right until we know what “right” is. It is clear that “one size does not fit all” – i.e. different approaches are necessary for different needs. Perhaps a tiered approach is necessary.
 - Potential benefits will include: Public education; transparency (which leads to credibility); clarification of the line between science and public policy choices; identification of where

science can inform policy decisions; elucidating the state of the science; guidance on how to improve management; connecting multiple agencies on major issues.

- The Task Force needs information from major stakeholders in order to evaluate potential benefit to the public. Lots of discussion about whether interviewing a limited (15) number of stakeholder groups would be sufficient for “public.” Concern expressed as to whether this would not reach beyond the usual voices. Task force members continued to point out the need to only seek input from people if in fact the input would be analyzed and utilized. As during the Feb 8th meeting, they questioned the value of a broad survey of the “public.” This led to discussion of outreach versus research approach to the public, but there is concern that outreach is beyond the scope of the task force’s responsibility.
- **Initial observations on attributes that make an ISR process successful**
 - ISR will only work well if there are strong, clear directives with an appropriate scientific charge to a science team. Carefully crafted, well-stated objectives and outcomes needed
 - Challenge to think about: Who writes the questions and where does the question(s) come from? How to ask questions in a politicized atmosphere.
 - It is best to be done early in the process (further upstream) before policy process has begun, but that is not always realistic. Often done once positions are taken.
 - It needs to be collaborative.
 - It needs to be supported by outside resources (outside of the agencies). This allows ISR to complement what the agencies do internally. Resources could be held in the Governor’s Office.
 - ISR focused on non-routine, multi-agency issues that are of high controversy and complicated (size and scope) seem most valuable. Also valuable on issues can get ahead on, anticipate. Challenge is to determine what would be an allowable trigger and who pays.

Objective 1.2: Evaluate whether existing state, federal and academic resources for conducting reviews are meeting agency and policy maker needs.

- In interviews with existing state agencies, they question how the Task Force defines “independent” (addressed as a “To Do” item – see below)
- State agencies report that some of their needs for ISR are being met, but some are not. Routine *internal* ISR is generally good. External ISR is limited in part by Oregon being a “small state” with somewhat limited scientific resources. Agencies say they have the networks to tap into but not necessarily the funding to do what they want.
- More information will be needed to fully address this objective.

Public Comment

Liz Dent – ODF

- ODF absolutely sees a value to ISR. However, it takes time and money.
- Think about designing a system that answer questions differently than what we are used to, particularly looking outside of the academic field
- Mechanisms need to address policy issues
- Even with the tools we currently have available to us, decision making is stymied. The resources/people we use are the same time and again that it remains the same inner circle.

- The challenge with including and ISR is that decision making takes longer, so we need the extra support
- Independence: Being independent is not solely limiting input from who is funding it, but also recognizing that in everything we do we bring in biases.
 - o The best approach is to make biases explicit and known.
 - o Work needs to be independent but the work and process has to be a relationship

Chris Maguire – ODOT

- ODOT is often left out of Oregon natural resources events and is simply handed down legislation or tasks decided on by others.
- Clearly craft the question. Yes it may be a science review but it needs to be considered within the context, which is politics, because without politics you might not be asking this question

Karen Tarnow – DEQ

- If you can provide hypothetical situations on where this will be helpful, it will better illustrate how the ISR can be used and what benefit it would provide.
- How does creating a new body actually add value more so than any other processes that we go through to get to a decision?

Objective 1.3: Evaluate mechanisms and structures that are in place in other states and at the federal level for natural resource policy science reviews.

- Sarah reported conversations with the Washington State Academy of Science and the California Council on Science and Technology. The Task Force was charged with leading the efforts to speak with current state agencies to get a better, in-depth understanding of their function and processes.
- NEW TEAM FORMED: Adell, Michael, and Allison agreed to team with an INR staff member to gain more information from other review processes. Michael suggests interview wording to be advisory, not about the individual agency: “If you are advising us on this process, what would you tell us to do?”, rather than “what would you change about your own organization”.

Discussion of Goal 1: Assess need and capacity for independent scientific review in Oregon

It was the consensus of the task force that they would not vote on any preliminary findings at this meeting. They did support INR crafting a summary of observations, considerations that are influencing the task force’s thinking. They felt that meeting notes read by Lisa Gaines summarized these factors well.

- **Looking ahead**

- Changing the order of the goals: The committee and Lauri Aunan agreed that the goals are currently not aligned with the ideal order of operations. All agree that Goal 4 should be addressed before Goal 2.

- There may already be a list of entities for Goal 2 (*Identify entities best situated to conduct or coordinate ISR*). A good place to start looking is the IMST documents which might already have a list of organizations available.
- For Goal 3 (*Make recommendations on whether the entities identified would need legislative authority to act as independent scientific review bodies for Oregon*) Look at legislation from other similar organizations – could Jeff/INR provide more information on similar institutions and associated legislation?
- Sara Gray: Any impactful process would need legislative backing, or at least their blessing (this comment received many agreeing comments and non-verbal cues from other task force members but was not discussed further).
- What can we hope to accomplish at the next meeting (May 25)
 - o Meeting will be focused on concluding of Goals 1 and starting on Goals 2 and 4.
 - o We should be able to accomplish tasks 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5 (written in the kickoff meeting briefing documents) at the next meeting:
 - o Task Force will need to decide how the analysis aspect of Goal 2 will be accomplished if INR is unable to do that work due to conflict of interest.
 - o Task Force will determine outreach plan to be completed prior to July meeting.
 - o High priority research still to be done is **need to make sure that we have input from the regulated community and stakeholders...**
 - Is there a list already of public events that can be a resource for us to tap into, rather than creating something new or trying to get people to come to us? We need to know what opportunities there are, if they arise.

To Dos

Action	Tasks by Whom	Action Completion & Accountability
Objective 1.1: Benefits		
Drafting definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating working definitions of “independent” and “bias”. <i>Who: Sara and Michael</i> [INR sent information about both to Sara and Michael,] • Continue to provide body of information through the literature review process and research: (1) lessons learned from scientific review processes (high priority); and (2) tiered approaches to scientific process (but this will possibly be more useful as we get towards goal 4. <i>Who: Jeff</i> • Send author information to Jeff. Adell wants Jeff to include certain authors, and will 	<p>Before May 25th meeting</p> <p><i>(Michael and Jeff)</i></p>

	send him new information via email. <i>Who:</i> Adell	
Objective 1.2: Needs		
<p>INR conduct interviews planned with legislative committees, tribal groups, stakeholder groups.</p> <p>(highest priority)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question revision: work with INR on revised questions. <i>Who:</i> Original subcommittee (Cass, Jennifer, Adell, Sara) • Develop list of stakeholders to be interviewed. <i>Who:</i> task force, with input from INR (<i>see below for detailed steps and task force involvement</i>). • Email invitation to legislative committees and tribal groups: send second invitation email to schedule interviews. <i>Who:</i> INR [DONE: Email invitations sent 6 April] • Email invitation to stakeholders: Send invitation email to schedule interviews. <i>Who:</i> INR. • Conduct interviews, 11 April-23 May. <i>Who:</i> Sarah Brennan, with Lisa. 	<p>Before May 25th meeting</p> <p><i>(Sarah and Lisa)</i></p>
Objective 1.3: Other scientific review programs		
<p>Conduct interviews about structures used in other states, federal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question development: work on slate of questions and circulate to task force for feedback. <i>Who:</i> New subcommittee (Adell, Allison, Michael) [Original questions resent to the subcommittee (7 April)] • Schedule and conduct interviews: team with INR staff to conduct interviews. <i>Who:</i> new subcommittee with INR staff. 	<p>Before May 25th meeting</p> <p><i>(Task Force)</i></p>
Outreach		
<p>Outreach to state-tribal cultural resources work group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation: provide an overview of SB202 Task Force work. <i>Who:</i> Michael, Jason, and Lisa 	<p>13 April</p>
<p>Outreach to more stakeholders to reach broader public by 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational document about existing convenings to attend: create document drawing upon INR’s notes from March 	<p>Before May 25th meeting</p>

<p>going to convenings where stakeholders will be to explain TF work and get feedback; 2) expanding mailing is that INR sends TF information to</p>	<p>meeting. <u>Who</u>: the Task Force (Michael volunteered to take the lead), input from Lauri</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional contact information: sent to INR (Lisa) the names and contact information for groups, organizations, individuals TF members want added to the email list. <u>Who</u>: the Task Force to Lisa. • Conduct Outreach at designated locations. <u>Who</u>: Michael, Lisa, other TF members as needed 	<p>By April 28th</p> <p>Before July meeting</p>
<p>Objective 2.1: Existing entities</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create factual list of existing entities. <u>Who</u>: Lauri takes lead, with input from INR. 	<p>Before May 25th meeting</p> <p>(INR)</p>
<p>Logistical – INR, Facilitator, Co-chairs</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finish interviews with agencies, legislative committees, and tribes. <u>INR</u>. [Invitations resent, 6 April] • Draft and then have the subcommittee vet questions for legislative committee and the questions for stakeholders. (Subcommittee = Sara, Adell, Cass, and Jennifer). <u>INR</u>. [Invitations resent, 7 April] • Resend to Task Force: <u>INR</u>. [Done, 7 April] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Questions for Objective 1.3 ○ Kick off meeting document • Consider rewriting goals and roadmap to reflect TF desire to have Goal 4 be Goal 2. <u>Jane</u>. • Before next meeting, provide the task force with agenda to review and provide feedback (give 48 hours) before the agenda is posted publicly. <u>Jane; Barbara to send to task force</u>. • The agenda should include specific goals and objectives for the day, and a clear list of what needs to be decided by the end of the meeting. <u>Jane, Barbara, Michael</u>. 	<p>(INR, lead)</p>

Creating a list of stakeholders and contacting them.

- INR is to create list of stakeholders gathered mostly from primary agency interviews
- Send this list to the task force – ask them to “fill the holes” by adding groups that may be missing or underrepresented on that list.
- Work with sub-committee to prioritize who should be contacted. Lisa mentioned that the INR staff has a top capacity of 15 interviews for stakeholders.
- Then the whole task force agrees that the top 15 are okay to interview (48 hour approval)
- The task force will have to decide how to encompass feedback from the other stakeholder groups that are beyond the first 15.