

Implementation Team Summary Notes

September 18, 2008

NRB 635, Olympia

Attendance: Brie, Patty, Curtis, Randy, Mike, Doug, Chris, Jenna, Robin, and Betsy

News/announcement

Jeff Dillon has been assigned a temporary detail to the Seattle District Regulatory Branch as Chief of the Northern Permits Section. His detail will be Sept 29 through January.

Future meetings

Sept. 26, Executive Committee meeting 9 am to 3 pm, AG's office, Olympia

Oct. 2, Project Management Team meeting 1 to 4 pm, Corps Civil Works Conference Rm, Seattle District

Oct. 2, SNAT meeting 10:00 am - 3:30 pm, TNC office, Seattle

Oct. 3, PSNERP "all-hands" (IT, NST, SC) meeting re SSRP findings and recommendations 1 to 4 pm, Pierce Co. Environmental Services Bldg

Steering Committee

Discussed: At the 9/17/08 SC meeting, the upcoming Executive Committee (EC) meeting was discussed. First on the agenda will be a presentation of the SSRP's findings and recommendations. The EC will be notified of the upcoming PSNERP "all hands" meeting to discuss SSRP recommendations on Oct 3. Next, with the updated budget and Project Management Plan (PMP), the EC will discuss what PSNERP will deliver, how long it will take, and what it will cost. Joe Ryan will discuss the evolving relationship between PSP and the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership and the PSP's support of ESRP and the completion of the GI.

Project Management Plan

Discussed: The IT discussed the new PMP and associated general costs. Patty will circulate the current timeline to the IT. The current plan and budget will deliver a Feasibility Report as part of the PSNERP GI to be delivered for WRDA 2010. This Feasibility Report will have two pieces:

- (1) a comprehensive, Sound-wide restoration plan that includes:
 - a) a nearshore ecosystem restoration project to be executed by USACE, and
 - b) actions to be carried out by other agencies and partners
- (2) a request for Congressional authorization for:
 - a) an initial nearshore restoration portfolio that includes 10 strategic restoration priority sites and 5 demonstration sites,
 - b) a science and technology plan that includes information management, monitoring and adaptive management, and applied research,
 - and c) authority for continued planning.

The IT also discussed the need to include NGO partners in the PMP especially with respect to how monetary contributions are counted both pre and post approval for the new

Implementation Team Summary Notes

September 18, 2008

NRB 635, Olympia

Attendance: Brie, Patty, Curtis, Randy, Mike, Doug, Chris, Jenna, Robin, and Betsy

News/announcement

Jeff Dillon has been assigned a temporary detail to the Seattle District Regulatory Branch as Chief of the Northern Permits Section. His detail will be Sept 29 through January.

Future meetings

Sept. 26, Executive Committee meeting 9 am to 3 pm, AG's office, Olympia

Oct. 2, Project Management Team meeting 1 to 4 pm, Corps Civil Works Conference Rm, Seattle District

Oct. 2, SNAT meeting 10:00 am - 3:30 pm, TNC office, Seattle

Oct. 3, PSNERP "all-hands" (IT, NST, SC) meeting re SSRP findings and recommendations 1 to 4 pm, Pierce Co. Environmental Services Bldg

Steering Committee

Discussed: At the 9/17/08 SC meeting, the upcoming Executive Committee (EC) meeting was discussed. First on the agenda will be a presentation of the SSRP's findings and recommendations. The EC will be notified of the upcoming PSNERP "all hands" meeting to discuss SSRP recommendations on Oct 3. Next, with the updated budget and Project Management Plan (PMP), the EC will discuss what PSNERP will deliver, how long it will take, and what it will cost. Joe Ryan will discuss the evolving relationship between PSP and the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership and the PSP's support of ESRP and the completion of the GI.

Project Management Plan

Discussed: The IT discussed the new PMP and associated general costs. Patty will circulate the current timeline to the IT. The current plan and budget will deliver a Feasibility Report as part of the PSNERP GI to be delivered for WRDA 2010. This Feasibility Report will have two pieces:

- (1) a comprehensive, Sound-wide restoration plan that includes:
 - a) a nearshore ecosystem restoration project to be executed by USACE, and
 - b) actions to be carried out by other agencies and partners
- (2) a request for Congressional authorization for:
 - a) an initial nearshore restoration portfolio that includes 10 strategic restoration priority sites and 5 demonstration sites,
 - b) a science and technology plan that includes information management, monitoring and adaptive management, and applied research,
 - and c) authority for continued planning.

The IT also discussed the need to include NGO partners in the PMP especially with respect to how monetary contributions are counted both pre and post approval for the new

restoration authority. This section should list local partners to compliment the federal partners outlined in PMP section 3.10.4.

Action: Patty will send out the project timeline. Patty and Chris will add months across the top of the gphant chart. Patty and Chris will work with Doug and Curtis to update PMP section 3.10.1 to include other state and NGO partners.

Develop IT Workplan

Discussed: IT walked through the PMP and highlighted IT responsibilities (see table below). Next step will be to identify the work load associated with each task and assess IT capacity. Because several IT tasks relate to stakeholder input, Margen and Andrea will be invited to the next IT meeting to discuss the stakeholder involvement strategy and communication plan.

Action: Each IT member will assess their future availability in advance of the next IT meeting's discussion of the work plan.

Large-scale project solicitation

Discussed: IT also discussed the letter that was developed to solicit large-scale projects. At the last IT meeting, the IT decided that phone calls, supported by the "letter" (more one-page talking points), would be an effective way to solicit projects that might not be captured in current project databases. The PMT had suggested using the letter as a stand-alone request in addition to a follow up to phone calls. The IT discussed the concern that restoration practitioners had recently received possibly 4 requests for project information and might not appreciate yet another request. IT also discussed concern that project selection criteria need to be developed so we know what data fields to ask project proponents to complete. The IT decided to table the letter for the moment and investigate the recent 4 requests and determine if mining others project databases will satisfy PSNERP's needs. Betsy and Robin may still contact select stakeholders by phone. Members of the IT expressed frustration at the changes in approach, concern about wasted effort, and the need for clear tasks and decisions from the PMT on future tasks.

Action: Mike will find out from PSP what RFPs they have sent out and request access to PSP project databases. Jenna will determine whether Capitol Lake is in PRISM and work with Erik Neatherlin to query HWS database. Betsy and Robin will informally contact restoration practitioners to solicit project ideas. A new subgroup of the IT (Jenna, Paul, Mike, Robin, Brie, Patty or Chris, and Curtis) will meet soon after Oct 6 (when Brie comes back) to develop selection criteria to narrow down the project list and inform any future solicitations for project ideas.

Strategic Needs Assessment

Discussed: Doug updated the IT on the last SNAT meeting and SNAT's progress through remaining methods challenges. The IT discussed the need to fill Jeff's important role on the SNAT and to make sure Scott is able to stay involved for GIS support. The SNAT will meet next Oct 2 at TNC's office in Seattle from 10-3:30. IT discussed how to support the SNAT with more help. The IT decided to look for assistance within Jeff's USACE group and also to look into Jim Johannessen's availability to help with the Whidbey Basin analysis (and maybe a local expert for every subbasin). IT discussed the utility of gathering a new group of analysts to apply the SNAR methods as documented

to test the repeatability of methods. Curtis encouraged the SNAT to define its needs and the PMT will find a way to support those needs.

Action: Patty or Doug will ask Jeff to attend this meeting to assist in transitioning his role to someone else. Patty and Curtis will work together to look into bringing on Jim Johannessen. Patty will look into getting someone from Jeff's group to join SNAT.

Goals and Objectives

Discussed: The IT discussed progress developing restoration goals and objectives and affirmed a need to wait for SNAR to help inform objectives development as well as a stakeholder involvement process.

Action: Brie will send out most recent version of the goals and objectives framework to the IT and requests a review and useful comments back from team by Oct 6.

Other topics

Discussed: The IT discussed splitting the IT meeting into morning discussions of the GI and afternoon discussions on ESRP to accommodate IT interests and staffing concerns. Curtis pointed to the need to keep these elements integrated on the IT and advocated against this split.

Discussed: Members of the IT expressed the need to stick to decisions that are made at the IT with respect to ESRP.

IT responsibilities identified from the PMT include:

#	Item in revised Project Management Plan	Notes on task leadership
2.3	Strategic Needs Assessment/Comprehensive Restoration Needs	IT
2.4.1	Valuation of Ecosystem Functions Goods and Services	IT
2.5	Future Without Project Conditions Report	IT
3.1	Restoration Planning Objectives Development	IT
3.1.1	Stakeholder Involvement for Restoration Planning Objectives	IT
3.2	Plan Formulation Strategy	USACE team leads, IT and NST support.
3.2.2	Existing Conditions and Plan Formulation Strategy Report	USACE lead with IT and NST support
3.3	Identify and Describe Candidate Sites for the Initial Portfolio	IT lead with NST input
3.3.1	Stakeholder Involvement for: Nearshore Project Database population	WDFW lead with IT support
3.4	Develop Basin-wide Comprehensive	All PNSERP with IT support
3.4.1	Nearshore Restoration Portfolio	IT involvement
3.4.2	Alternative Strategies for Puget Sound Comprehensive Restoration	IT involvement
3.5	Management Measures	IT
3.5.1	Identify Management Measures	IT (completed)
3.5.2	Management Measures Technical Report	IT
3.5.3	Parametric Cost Estimates for each MM	USACE (not IT task)
3.5.4	Output/Benefit Quantification for each MM	IT with USACE
3.10	Stakeholder Involvement for Pan Formulation	IT involvement
3.10.1	Relationship with Other Restoration Programs and Partners	IT involvement
3.10.2	Support for PS Nearshore GI	IT involvement
3.10.3	Broad Program Understanding and Support	IT involvement
4.1	Screen and Evaluate Early Candidate 1 st Portfolio Restoration Sites	IT lead, NST lead for demo projects
4.1.1	Stakeholder Review of the PSNERP GI Project List	Communications Team lead, IT support
5.0	Comparing Alternative Plans	USACE lead, IT support
6.1	Plan Selection	USACE lead, IT support

Existing PSNERP Mission and Goals

PSNERP Mission

The mission of the Nearshore Partnership is to restore and protect the nearshore habitat of Puget Sound for the benefits of the biological resources and the integrity of the ecosystem, including the functions and natural processes of the basin.

Goals of PNSERP (*paraphrased*):

1. Process based ecosystem restoration for the benefit of native resources
2. Protect and restore habitat types that support things people like and need
3. Prevent future listings and achieve recovery of at-risk, native species
4. Prevent and reduce non-native species impacts in the nearshore
5. Improve and maintain water and sediment quality conditions in the Puget Sound nearshore ecosystem
6. Increase the understanding of the natural processes and functions of the Puget Sound Nearshore

Existing Puget Sound Partnership Mission and Goals

Goals of the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda

1. A healthy human population supported by a healthy Puget Sound that is not threatened by changes in the ecosystem; (**Human Health**)
2. A quality of human life that is sustained by a functioning Puget Sound ecosystem; (**Human Well Being**)
3. Healthy and sustaining populations of native species in Puget Sound, including a robust food web; (**Species, Food Web, and Biodiversity**)
4. A healthy Puget Sound where freshwater, estuary, near shore, marine, and upland habitats are protected, restored, and sustained; (**Habitat and Land Use**)
5. An ecosystem that is supported by ground water levels as well as river and stream flow levels sufficient to sustain people, fish, and wildlife, and the natural functions of the environment; (**Water Quantity**)
6. Fresh and marine waters and sediments of a sufficient quality so that the waters in the region are safe for drinking, swimming, shellfish harvest and consumption, and other human uses and enjoyment, and are not harmful to the native marine mammals, fish, birds, and shellfish of the region. (**Water Quality**)

Objectives of the Action Agenda

- a. Protect existing habitat and prevent further losses;
- b. Restore habitat functions and values;
- c. Significantly reduce toxics entering Puget Sound fresh and marine waters;
- d. Significantly reduce nutrients and pathogens entering Puget Sound fresh and marine waters;
- e. Improve water quality and habitat by managing storm water runoff;
- f. Provide water for people, fish and wildlife, and the environment;
- g. Protect ecosystem biodiversity and recover imperiled species; and
- h. Build and sustain the capacity for action.

Strategic Priorities of the PSP:

1. Ensure that activities and funding are focused on the most urgent and important problems facing the Sound.
2. Protect the intact ecosystem processes that sustain Puget Sound
3. Restore the ecosystem processes that sustain the Puget Sound
4. Reduce the sources of water pollution.

These four priorities will 1) form the initial part of the answer to the Action Agenda question: What do we need to do to move from where we are today to a healthy Puget Sound by 2020; and 2) form the basis for identifying actions in the Action Areas.

Goals and Objectives Brainstorming Exercise

Overarching Problem: Cumulative environmental degradation threatens ecosystem

Introduction. This framework, modeled after the Illinois River Basin Plan, includes PSNERP-identified, system-wide problems associated with the Puget Sound nearshore. Problems listed here were pulled primarily from the CHiPS Research Plan, PSNERP reconnaissance report, project management plan, and restoration guidance document. At the largest scale, the problem is: *cumulative degradation threatens ecosystem integrity and resilience*, followed by an equally large overarching goal of *restoring integrity and increasing the ecosystems ability to respond to stressors and provide the services and goods we care about*. This overarching problem is divided into four contributing problems: *loss of estuarine and nearshore habitat, degradation of habitat, declines in species and things we care about, and gaps in our understanding of how the system works and what to do about it*. Under each of these four problems, we state a broad and visionary goal to address the problem. Under each of four goals, we list specific objectives that are essentially our goals for how we address the broad and visionary goal. It's under objectives where we state what we, PSNERP, will do about the stated problem – where on the landscape, when, and – where possible – how much. In this draft, the objectives read like mini-goal statements and sub-objectives or “strategies” listed under each objective is where we get to what, when, where, and how much.

Draft goals below map to Puget Sound Partnership objectives a, b, g, and h (somewhat) and to strategic priorities 2 and 3 and somewhat #1.

integrity and resilience.

The Puget Sound faces cumulative environmental degradation that threatens the ability of the ecosystem to maintain diversity and productivity in the face of substantial historic shoreline modification, future human population growth, climate change, pollutants, invasive species, or other threshold events. The resilience and integrity of the nearshore ecosystem is in jeopardy. This overarching threat can be expressed by four system limiting factors: complete loss of habitats, degradation of remaining habitats, declines in biological and natural resources we value, and lack of scientific understanding about complex ecological interactions and ramifications of ecological change.

Overarching Program Goal:

Restore ecological integrity and improve ecosystem resilience in order to improve the ecosystem's ability to provide functions, goods, and services, including habitats, communities, and populations of native species, and the processes that sustain them.

Objectives:

- A. Improve management and regulation of land use activities to prevent future or reverse past cumulative degradation.
- B. Provide accounting units to measure change to the integrity and resilience of Puget Sound as a result of restoration actions.
- C. Work within PSNERP and outside regional partners to improve restoration project delivery and improve capacity of local communities to protect Puget Sound from additional cumulative impacts.

System-wide Problem 1: Loss of estuarine and nearshore habitat (structure and process) and their associated EFG&S.

Historic and current development along the Puget Sound shoreline has resulted in a significant loss in estuarine and nearshore habitats (nearshore structure) **as well as local nearshore ecosystem processes**. DNR estimates that almost 80% of the original eastern nearshore habitat of Puget Sound's central basin has been modified through the construction of bulkheads and docks, filling of intertidal habitat, and removal of shoreline vegetation. DNR estimates that one-third of Puget Sound's shoreline – approximately 800 miles – has been modified by human development. Existing studies have documented a 73 percent decline in the area of Puget Sound covered by intertidal salt marshes. Nearly all of this loss is associated with modifications of river deltas within major urban areas. **Cite basin-specific losses, i.e., numbers of lost shoreforms, resulting change in original shoreline “rhythm”, and impairment in terms of EFGS.**

Goal (broad, visionary, inclusive): Protect and/or restore functional estuarine and nearshore habitat types (nearshore structure and processes) to maintain ecological and public values. (CHiPS Goal #2)

Objectives (measurable by some standard scale (percent, miles, acres) or time or place-specific): NOTE: consider three levels objectives, strategies, tactics.

- A. Protect remaining intact estuarine and nearshore habitats
 - a. Protect remaining pocket estuaries in South Puget Sound
 - b. Protect un-bulkheaded feeder bluffs in N., N. Central, S. Central, and S. Puget Sound.
 - c. Protect remaining intact small creek estuaries in Puget Sound
- B. Recreate critical estuarine and nearshore habitats
 - a. Develop an adaptively maintained strategic restoration plan including a working list of high priority and technically sound projects for construction through the PS Nearshore GI.
 - b. Review existing lists of potential restoration projects for shoreform restoration components.
 - c. Construct or coordinate with others to construct 10% of the prioritized list by 2020 and 25% by 2050.
 - d. Work with local agencies to develop and implement new shoreform restoration projects.
 - e. Restore 1 process based, ecosystem scale shoreform restoration project in each sub-basin by 2020. Restore an additional 4 throughout Puget Sound by 2050.
 - f. Recreate X units of pocket beaches in Central Puget Sound
 - g. Recreate X chunks of estuarine habitat in the Skagit Delta
 - h. Recreate the critical “rhythm” of shoreline features
- C. Rehabilitate ecosystem processes in Puget Sound that create and maintain habitats for the benefit of native species.
 - a. Engage in ecosystem process restoration actions.
 - i. Review existing lists of restoration projects for candidate projects.
 - ii. Construct or coordinate with others to construct 10% of the prioritized list by 2020 and 25% by 2050.

- iii. Work with local agencies to develop and implement new shoreform restoration projects.
- iv. Revegetation at Tier 3 and 4 level
- b. Reconnect processes in specific locations on the landscape where restoring the process will restore the lost habitat with no additional restoration required
- c. Protect areas of process-based (passive) restoration
- D. Promote Best Management Practices to address future projected losses.
 - a. Coordinate with regional and governmental regulatory agencies to establish BMP's for primary management measures.
 - b. Work with regional planning offices and recovery groups to identify areas that could benefit from greater protection of public resources.
 - c. Work with other entities to develop regulatory tools to avoid future nearshore habitat loss and degradation (improved enforcement, expanded permitting authority).
 - i. Develop and provide alternatives to established practices with negative nearshore impacts (soft armoring).
 - d. Develop methods for reducing impacts to necessary degradations or in areas of heavy human use where process based restoration is infeasible.
 - e. Improve agency coordination so regulatory agencies know when they're considering a permit for the LAST pocket estuary in S. Sound.
 - f. Support GMA and SMA updates by providing counties assistance and technical support where needed. OR ensure counties SMA updates (and HCAs, ACE permits, leases by DNR) support PSNERP goals.
 - g. Answer critical science questions needed to identify and quantify the "cost" of future loss.
- E. Measure the value of protection, recreation, rehabilitation, and prevention of further loss in terms of EFGS and VECs

Constraints: Private property access and cost of real estate, land use practices or zoning inconsistent with restoration and protection activities, lack of scientific understanding, lack of large-scale pilot projects to learn from, lack of scientific understanding about Puget Sound delta systems, complicated web of agency jurisdictions, economic structure based on natural resource extraction and degradation.

Measures: Habitat protection would be accomplished by property acquisition, public education, or landowner incentives and partnerships. Restoration measures would vary depending on the site characteristics and extent of shoreline modification, but would likely include armoring and over water structure modification or removal, revegetation, beach nourishment, sediment replacement or enhancement, elevation restoration, or debris removal.

Outputs: Anticipated project outputs associated with instituting appropriate measures to reach stated objectives include an increase in intact estuarine and nearshore habitats and a decrease in

the rate of loss of remaining habitats. Recreating and protecting habitats will benefit VECs, the regional economy, and ecosystem.

System-wide Problem 2: Impairment of remaining Puget Sound Nearshore structure and processes.

Changes in physical structure have resulted in detrimental alterations which include loss of shade, reduction in leaf fall, which limits terrestrial food sources and nutrient inputs; lowering of the beach profile; coarsening of beach sediment; narrowing of the beach; loss of area through dredging and filling; and the alteration of groundwater flows. Urban and suburban developments along the shoreline and in the uplands have modified the ability of the watershed to provide ecosystem functions, goods, and services and have taken away critical shoreline, and estuarine and nearshore habitats. Changes in the physical processes include limiting food and nutrient sources for marine life, deteriorating beach sediment movement, and altering the flows of surface and groundwater.

The number and diversity of the species in decline in Puget Sound suggest systemic rather than isolated problems. Other warning signals include the chemical contamination of marine food chains. Early signs of eutrophication are becoming more evident. Another alarming trend is an increased threat of alien and invasive plant and animal species. Poorly documented but thought to be of great importance are the alterations to the hydrology of rivers, streams, and ground-water flow into Puget Sound. Cite basin-specific degradation, i.e., miles/acres modified features, resulting change in quality of the original shoreline “rhythm”, and quantitative or qualitative impairment in terms of EFGS and VECs.

Goal: Rehabilitate ecosystem processes that create and maintain ecosystem structure (habitats) and functions in Puget Sound to support, with minimal ongoing human intervention, natural aquatic and associated native species. (*CHiPS goal #1*)

Objectives: (*CHiPS goals 2, 4 and 5*).

- A. Restore degraded habitat and processes
 - a. In places where the cause of degradation is not on-going, but resulted from a past action, restore the habitat and the nearshore processes to maintain it.
 - b. Revegetation at Tier 3 and 4 level
- B. Control pollution
 - a. Develop or adopt means to identify and track areas of contamination such that is can be used to facilitate restoration project prioritization.
 - b. Use MM technical paper to identify BMP’s for restoration projects to ensure pollution generated by restoration projects themselves are controlled and minimized
 - c. Support the PSP’s stormwater efforts
- C. Control invasive species
 - a. Control the spread of invasives in places already heavily impacted (treat the leading edge of giant knot weed patches along the Big Quilcene River)
 - b. Protect and monitor as-of-yet unimpacted, but susceptible sites
 - c. Promote public education and citizen monitoring in high risk sub-basins on the worst or most likely to spread invasives
- D. Improve hydrology regime to address water quantity issues

Constraints: Private property access and cost of real estate, land use practices or zoning inconsistent with restoration and protection activities, lack of scientific understanding, lack of large-scale pilot projects to learn from, lack of scientific understanding about Puget Sound delta systems, complicated web of agency jurisdictions, economic structure based on natural resource extraction and degradation.

Measures: These would include secondary measures as well as primary measures. Restoration measures would vary depending on the site characteristics and extent of shoreline modification, but would likely include armoring and over water structure modification or removal, beach nourishment, pollution control, invasive species control, sediment replacement or enhancement, elevation restoration, or debris removal, physical exclusion, revegetation, and hydraulic manipulation.

Outputs: Anticipated project outputs associated with instituting appropriate measures to reach stated objectives include an increase in estuarine and nearshore habitat productivity and an increase in function habitat availability across the nearshore. Recreating and protecting habitats will benefit VECs, the regional economy, and ecosystem.

System-wide Problem 3: Decreases in native biodiversity, including specific nearshore populations and VECs, and natural resources (that people care about).

The direct link between physical conditions and habitat, and habitat and biological resources have resulted in significant impacts to critical fish and wildlife resources, including habitat that supports all species of salmonids. Impacts include food web dynamics, species mixes, landscape positioning, and primary production. Remnant habitat patches have now become critical support features to remaining fish and wildlife populations, including two threatened salmonid species (chinook salmon and bull trout). Nine of the ten species listed as endangered or threatened within the Puget Sound region inhabit the nearshore. Pollution in parts of Puget Sound has caused lesions and tumors in flatfish that eagles, seals, birds, and porpoises eat. That jeopardy can result in further contaminated shellfish and reduced habitat, not only for the aquatic environment, but also for people whose livelihoods depend on shellfish and fish.

Goal: Create and support biodiversity, sustained target populations, and important natural resources

Objectives: (*CHiPS goals 1, 3, 4, 5*)

- A. Rehab ecosystem processes that create and maintain habitats and natural cycles (see objectives under problems #1, and 2.)
 - a. Rehabilitate sediment supply in specific locations along the shoreline to restore the “rhythm” of beaches needed by juvenile salmon.
- B. Recover listed or at-risk species and minimize future listings.
 - a. Do species-specific enhancement activities to support something we care about while we’re bringing up the system average
- C. Prevent colonization of non-native species and reduce the impact of those already here.
- D. Improve or maintain water and sediment quality conditions to eliminate toxic impacts to people and species
- E. Revegetate forest in Tier 3 and 4

F. Recover biodiversity

Constraints: migratory species are hard to help and the impact of help is hard to measure, chemicals sometimes used in invasive eradication are harmful to the env't...

Measures: Invasive species control, pollution control at restoration sites and broader activities to support the PSP, species enhancement...

Outputs: Improved status of target populations resulting in improved persistence and abundance, increased opportunities for harvest or non-harvest enjoyment.

System-wide Problem 4: Lack of public understanding and access to information about conditions and actions that affect PS and significant science knowledge gaps.

Puget Sound recovery hangs on hundreds of good decisions by millions of Puget Sound residents every day. Many residents are motivated to make purchasing, transportation, or other decisions that are good for the environment, but too often lack easily accessible and timely information to support personal or collective decisions. Sophisticated and innovative education and outreach efforts are needed to ensure that existing information gets to residents when they need it and that individuals understand the cumulative impact of individual decisions on the health of the Puget Sound nearshore.

Despite the known importance of the nearshore in cycling nutrients, sediment, fresh water, and plant matter – processes that sustain habitat for such broadly valued species as shellfish, shorebirds, juvenile salmon, and orcas – we have historically under-invested in nearshore restoration, data, and research. Direct loss to nearshore environments outside of major river deltas has not been as well documented.

Many small restoration projects in the Puget Sound have achieved important results at the local scale; however, there has been little consideration of how multiple small-scale efforts may affect each other or how they may cumulatively affect the restoration of the greater Puget Sound ecosystem. There is, in addition, a critical need for restoration projects at a landscape scale to achieve sustainable, long-term restoration of the entire system. Many different agencies over the years have collected and analyzed monitoring data and scientific information for different aspects of the Puget Sound ecosystem, including nearshore habitat. To date, however, this information has not been integrated to develop a comprehensive understanding of nearshore ecosystems, including the natural and human factors that have changed conditions over time.

Goal: Improve public's decision making capability through education and outreach activities and making info more accessible.

Goal: Increase understanding of natural processes and function of the Nearshore (CHiPS goal #6)

Objectives:

- A. Improve educational opportunities for landowners, regulators, and elected officials, ect.
 - a. Develop and education and outreach consortium among agencies, tribes, NGOs, etc, to develop and distribute educational materials.
- B. Understand nearshore ecosystem processes and linkages to watershed and marine systems

- C. Understand the effects of human activities on nearshore ecosystem processes
 - a. Conduct comparative studies in PS
- D. Understand and predict the incremental and cumulative effects of restoration and preservation actions on nearshore ecosystems
 - a. Implement restoration treatment experiments (adaptive mgmt)
 - b. Monitor restoration treatment effect over time and at various scales
- E. Understand the effects of social, cultural, and economic values on restoration and protection of the nearshore
- F. Understand the relationships of the nearshore processes to important ecosystem functions such as support of human health and at-risk species
 - a. Rehabilitate sediment supply in specific locations along the shoreline to restore the “rhythm” of beaches needed by juvenile salmon.
- G. Understand the roles of information - its representation, conceptualization, organization, and interpretation - related to nearshore ecosystem processes on the preservation and restoration potential of Puget Sound.
 - a. Increase coordination of those who collect data so we at least know what we already know.
- H. Achieve measurable improvements in collaboration
- I. Develop an adaptively maintained strategic restoration plan.

Constraints: Cost of research, research is hard to fund, human subjects are difficult

Measures: adaptive management experiments, sociological studies, information management and presentation experiments.

Outputs: Reduction in uncertainty in decisions regarding what and how much to protect and restore. Reduction in the risk of unintended consequences associated with uncertainty, an assessment of the potential interactive effects of multiple actions at various spatial and temporal scales, informed selection of beneficial restoration and preservation actions, direction for management decisions by suggesting which action or combination of actions is most likely to meet specific objectives within specific limitations. Also, increased precision and therefore improved success of restoration and protection actions in the nearshore, improved ecological understanding of the Puget Sound ecosystem, better conservation and recovery of things we care about.

restoration authority. This section should list local partners to compliment the federal partners outlined in PMP section 3.10.4.

Action: Patty will send out the project timeline. Patty and Chris will add months across the top of the gphant chart. Patty and Chris will work with Doug and Curtis to update PMP section 3.10.1 to include other state and NGO partners.

Develop IT Workplan

Discussed: IT walked through the PMP and highlighted IT responsibilities (see table below). Next step will be to identify the work load associated with each task and assess IT capacity. Because several IT tasks relate to stakeholder input, Margen and Andrea will be invited to the next IT meeting to discuss the stakeholder involvement strategy and communication plan.

Action: Each IT member will assess their future availability in advance of the next IT meeting's discussion of the work plan.

Large-scale project solicitation

Discussed: IT also discussed the letter that was developed to solicit large-scale projects. At the last IT meeting, the IT decided that phone calls, supported by the "letter" (more one-page talking points), would be an effective way to solicit projects that might not be captured in current project databases. The PMT had suggested using the letter as a stand-alone request in addition to a follow up to phone calls. The IT discussed the concern that restoration practitioners had recently received possibly 4 requests for project information and might not appreciate yet another request. IT also discussed concern that project selection criteria need to be developed so we know what data fields to ask project proponents to complete. The IT decided to table the letter for the moment and investigate the recent 4 requests and determine if mining others project databases will satisfy PSNERP's needs. Betsy and Robin may still contact select stakeholders by phone. Members of the IT expressed frustration at the changes in approach, concern about wasted effort, and the need for clear tasks and decisions from the PMT on future tasks.

Action: Mike will find out from PSP what RFPs they have sent out and request access to PSP project databases. Jenna will determine whether Capitol Lake is in PRISM and work with Erik Neatherlin to query HWS database. Betsy and Robin will informally contact restoration practitioners to solicit project ideas. A new subgroup of the IT (Jenna, Paul, Mike, Robin, Brie, Patty or Chris, and Curtis) will meet soon after Oct 6 (when Brie comes back) to develop selection criteria to narrow down the project list and inform any future solicitations for project ideas.

Strategic Needs Assessment

Discussed: Doug updated the IT on the last SNAT meeting and SNAT's progress through remaining methods challenges. The IT discussed the need to fill Jeff's important role on the SNAT and to make sure Scott is able to stay involved for GIS support. The SNAT will meet next Oct 2 at TNC's office in Seattle from 10-3:30. IT discussed how to support the SNAT with more help. The IT decided to look for assistance within Jeff's USACE group and also to look into Jim Johannessen's availability to help with the Whidbey Basin analysis (and maybe a local expert for every subbasin). IT discussed the utility of gathering a new group of analysts to apply the SNAR methods as documented

to test the repeatability of methods. Curtis encouraged the SNAT to define its needs and the PMT will find a way to support those needs.

Action: Patty or Doug will ask Jeff to attend this meeting to assist in transitioning his role to someone else. Patty and Curtis will work together to look into bringing on Jim Johannessen. Patty will look into getting someone from Jeff's group to join SNAT.

Goals and Objectives

Discussed: The IT discussed progress developing restoration goals and objectives and affirmed a need to wait for SNAR to help inform objectives development as well as a stakeholder involvement process.

Action: Brie will send out most recent version of the goals and objectives framework to the IT and requests a review and useful comments back from team by Oct 6.

Other topics

Discussed: The IT discussed splitting the IT meeting into morning discussions of the GI and afternoon discussions on ESRP to accommodate IT interests and staffing concerns. Curtis pointed to the need to keep these elements integrated on the IT and advocated against this split.

Discussed: Members of the IT expressed the need to stick to decisions that are made at the IT with respect to ESRP.

IT responsibilities identified from the PMT include:

#	Item in revised Project Management Plan	Notes on task leadership
2.3	Strategic Needs Assessment/Comprehensive Restoration Needs	IT
2.4.1	Valuation of Ecosystem Functions Goods and Services	IT
2.5	Future Without Project Conditions Report	IT
3.1	Restoration Planning Objectives Development	IT
3.1.1	Stakeholder Involvement for Restoration Planning Objectives	IT
3.2	Plan Formulation Strategy	USACE team leads, IT and NST support.
3.2.2	Existing Conditions and Plan Formulation Strategy Report	USACE lead with IT and NST support
3.3	Identify and Describe Candidate Sites for the Initial Portfolio	IT lead with NST input
3.3.1	Stakeholder Involvement for: Nearshore Project Database population	WDFW lead with IT support
3.4	Develop Basin-wide Comprehensive	All PNSERP with IT support
3.4.1	Nearshore Restoration Portfolio	IT involvement
3.4.2	Alternative Strategies for Puget Sound Comprehensive Restoration	IT involvement
3.5	Management Measures	IT
3.5.1	Identify Management Measures	IT (completed)
3.5.2	Management Measures Technical Report	IT
3.5.3	Parametric Cost Estimates for each MM	USACE (not IT task)
3.5.4	Output/Benefit Quantification for each MM	IT with USACE
3.10	Stakeholder Involvement for Pan Formulation	IT involvement
3.10.1	Relationship with Other Restoration Programs and Partners	IT involvement
3.10.2	Support for PS Nearshore GI	IT involvement
3.10.3	Broad Program Understanding and Support	IT involvement
4.1	Screen and Evaluate Early Candidate 1 st Portfolio Restoration Sites	IT lead, NST lead for demo projects
4.1.1	Stakeholder Review of the PSNERP GI Project List	Communications Team lead, IT support
5.0	Comparing Alternative Plans	USACE lead, IT support
6.1	Plan Selection	USACE lead, IT support